



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/014,056	12/15/2017	6959293		1361

7590 01/26/2018
Image Processing Technologies LLC
75 Montebello Road
Suffern, NY 10901

EXAMINER

BANANKHAH, MAJID A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/26/2018

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

MARC PENSABENE
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
7 TIMES SQUARE
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/014,056.

PATENT NO. 6959293.

ART UNIT 3992.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

DECISION GRANTING EX PARTE REEXAMINATION

Table of Contents

1.0	DECISION ON REQUEST.....	3
2.0	REFERENCES.....	3
2.1	References Cited by the Requester.....	3
2.2	IDS.....	3
3.0	PROSECUTION HISTORY.....	3
3.1	Background.....	4
3.2	Reasons for Allowance at the time of Issuance of Patent.....	5
3.3	Related Proceedings	7
4.0	CLAIMS UNDER REEXAMINATION.....	7
5.0	SNQs ALLEGED IN THE REQUEST.....	8
6.0	DISCUSSION OF SNQs	9
6.1	Issue 1 (Pirim PCT and Siegel) (SNQs for proposed rejections based on Pirim PCT, p. 1 of Request).....	10
6.2	Issue 2 (Pirim PCT and Hirota) (SNQs for proposed rejections based on Pirim PCT and Hirota, p. 1 of Request).....	12
6.3	Issue 3 (Hirota alone) (SNQs for proposed rejections based on Hirota alone, p. 1 of Request).....	14
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	15

Art Unit: 3992

1.0 DECISION ON REQUEST

At least one substantial new question of patentability (SNQs) affecting claim 1 of United States Patent Number 6,959,293 (hereinafter ‘293 patent) issued October 25, 2005 to Pirim of Holding B.E.V.S.A. is raised by the request filed December 15, 2017 for ex parte reexamination.

2.0 REFERENCES

2.1 References Cited by the Requester

The requester alleges that substantial new questions of patentability (SNQs) have been raised by at least the following prior art references:

1. International Patent Publication WO 99/36893 (“Prim PCX”), published July 22, 1999
2. Siegel, Howard J., et al., “PASM: A Partitionable SIMD/MIMD System for Image Processing and Pattern Recognition,” IEEE Transactions on Computers, Vol. C-30, No. 12 (December 1981) (“Siegel”)
3. U.S. Patent No. 6,118,895 (“Hirota”), filed March 5, 1996, issued September 12, 2000

2.2 IDS

With respect to the Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08A and 08B or its equivalent) filed on December 15, 2017 and considered with this action, the information cited has been considered as described in the MPEP. Note that MPEP 2256 indicate that degree of consideration to be given to such information will be normally limited by the degree to which the party filing the information citation has explained the content and relevance of the information.

3.0 PROSECUTION HISTORY

3.1 Background

Art Unit: 3992

- Application filed 02/23/2001: Claims 1-28 are the current claims 1-16 and 18-29 in the '293 patent which issued on October 25, 2005 from U.S. application serial no. 09/792,436 ("the '436 application") originally having claims 1-28 filed February 23, 2001. Among those, claims 1, 3, 17, 21, 22, and 27 were independent claims.
- Non-final mailed 03/26/2004: In this non-final, claims 3-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph for failing to particularly point out the subject matter and claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 5,359,533 of Ric Ka et al. ("Ric Ka"); and claims 3-16 were allowed if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph proposed in that Office action.
- Amendment filed 08/30/2004: Applicants submitted claim amendments along with remarks on August 30, 2004. Applicant amended claims 1-4, 8 and 9; and newly added independent claims 29. Among those, claims 1, 3, 17, 21, 22, and 27 were independent claims.
- Telephone interview on 12/27/2004, and 04/27/2005: On 12/27/2004 Applicant initiated an interview and on 04/22/2005 the Examiner initiated an interview. It appears that during the interview on 12/27/2004, the Examiner agrees to allow the claims, and during the second interview the Examiner agrees to an Examiner's amendment to correct a typographical error.
- Notice of allowance mailed 10/06/2004: In this notice of allowance, claims 1-29 (corresponds to claims 1-16, 18-29 and 17 of the '293 patent) were allowed. Claim 29

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.