Exhibit J

AMENDMENT		
	Application #	10/893,534
	Confirmation #	2395
	Filing Date	July 19, 2004
	First Inventor	PRYOR
	Art Unit	3711
	Examiner	Mendiratta, Vishu K.
	Docket #	P06410US02/DEJ

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S I R:

In response to the Office Action dated May 29, 2007:

A) please consider the responsive **Remarks** provided herewith in **Attachment A**; and

B) please amend the above identified application as follows:

- **Amendments to the Claims** are reflected in the listing of the claims provided herewith in **Attachment B**.

In view of the amendments made and the remarks provided, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2007

By: Douglas E. Jackson
Registration No.: 28,518

STITES & HARBISON PLLC ◆ 1199 North Fairfax St. ◆ Suite 900 ◆ Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: 703-739-4900 ◆ FAX: 703-739-9577 ◆ CUSTOMER NO. 00881

ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

By this Amendment, independent claims 9 and 21 have been amended to better define the invention over the cited prior art. Other dependent claims have also been amended consistent with the changes to the independent claims and/or for clarity. It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

What is now claimed in both amended independent claims is that where a board game is played, a computer is used to analyze an output of a TV camera viewing the board game and to recognize a relative position at least one of the markers with respect to information on the board. Then, when the marker is moved to a new position during the play of the game, the computer recognizes the new position. As a result of the newly recognized position, the computer also is then used to automatically generate a sensory output, associated with the new position, which is designed to be perceived by the person(s) playing the game.

In paragraphs 1-3 of the outstanding Action, the examiner rejected the independent claims (and most of the dependent claims) under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Hedges patent, the Levy patent, or the Karmarkar patent. In this rejection, as noted in paragraph 1 and again in the *Response to Arguments* section, it is the examiner's (re-stated) position that these patents disclose casino monitoring systems and that:

> The newly added limitations do not further limit the game as claimed. As explained in previous office action all casinos are equipped with cameras that constantly monitor in real time all movements of every casino activity on every table including identifying all game pieces and their positions. Cameras placed in strategic locations constantly record all casino movements that are monitored. Newly added limitations do not further add any structure to the claimed apparatus. With reference to "generating sensation" such limitations are personal reactions and not part of apparatus.

Therefore, it will be appreciated that the presently amended independent apparatus claim 9 and the presently amended independent method claim 21 both now clearly and more particularly differentiate from the apparatus and method where casino games, or any such live game, are monitored. In particular, it is claimed that the apparatus includes a computer means performing the following specific functions (and likewise the method recites a computer performing the noted steps):

a) analyzing the output of said TV camera and recognizing from the analysis a relative position of said marker with respect to the information on said board,

b) analyzing and then recognizing, after a movement of said marker during the play of the game which is viewed by said TV camera, a new position of said marker with respect to the information on said board, and

c) automatically generating, after the new position of said marker is recognized, a sensory output designed to be capable of being perceived by the person, said sensory output being different from a view of said board and marker thereon and being associated with the recognized new position of said marker with respect to the information on said board.

No such analyzing and recognizing by a computer takes place in the situation described by the examiner of a casino which monitors activity with TV cameras. In particular, such a monitoring system does not "analyze" the TV camera output in order to "recognize" (which together are definitionally different from to "display" or even "monitor", as readily recognized by those of ordinary skill in computer vision which is the standard which should be applied) a relative position of a marker and a new position of the marker with respect to the information on the board. Further, and significantly, such a prior art monitoring system does not generate a "sensory output" after the new position is "recognized", where the sensory output is different

from a view of the board or game. Rather, the monitoring system described by the examiner merely displays, without any analysis or recognition, whatever is within the field of view of the TV camera.

The examiner also particularly noted that the term "generating sensation" was a personal reaction and hence did not limit the claimed apparatus. By this Amendment, this term has been changed to "sensory output" by which it is made clear that it is the computer means which functions to generates this "output", and this generated output (e.g., an emitted sound or image shown in a video display) is "designed to be capable of being perceived by the person" playing the game. The prior art monitoring system obviously does not generate any such "output", as it incapable of recognizing the need to generate a sensory output and instead merely displays the game(s) (or game board(s)) in the field of view of the TV cameras.

In view of the above, it is submitted that these specified functions of a computer means of independent apparatus claim 9 (and the method steps performed by the computer of independent method claim 21) are neither disclosed or made obvious by the Hedges patent, the Levy patent, or the Karmarkar patent. Therefore, it is submitted that:

- the rejection of independent claims 9 and 21 together with dependent claims 10-13 and 22-28 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Hedges patent should be withdrawn;
- the rejection of independent claims 9 and 21 together with dependent claims 10-13 and 22-28 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Levy patent should be withdrawn; and
- the rejection of independent claim 9 and dependent claims 10-13 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Karmarkar patent should be withdrawn.

Likewise, the various rejections of the other dependent claims based on these references should likewise be withdrawn; and the other rejections directed to various other dependent

DOCKET ALARM

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.