

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this patent application, with claims 9-33 having been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected group. Minor amendments have been made to claim 1 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Applicants requests entry of the claim amendment.

Claims 1, 5, and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore (US 2015/0371456) and Hillstrom (US 2002/0002469). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Amended claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

1. A mobile lawyer system comprising:
 - at least one video camera configured for mounting inside the passenger compartment of a vehicle and capture video images of at least one passenger pass in the vehicle;
 - a display screen configured for mounting inside the passenger compartment of a vehicle;
 - a remote server and a database configured to store information about a plurality of lawyers licensed in a plurality of jurisdictions;
 - a mobile device executing a mobile application and in wireless communication with the video camera and display screen, configured, upon command from at least one passenger, to communicate with the remote server, *wherein the remote server is configured to automatically and immediately determine a location of the vehicle, automatically and immediately identify a jurisdiction associated with the vehicle location, automatically and immediately identify at least one lawyer licensed in the identified jurisdiction, and automatically and immediately notify the at least one identified lawyer*; and
 - the display screen configured to *automatically and immediately* live-stream a video image of the at least one identified lawyer, and the at least one video camera is configured to *automatically and immediately* live-stream video captured by the at least one video camera for viewing by the at least one identified lawyer and for storage in the remote database, where the at least one mobile device being configured to enable bi-directional audio and video communication between the at least one identified lawyer and the at least one passenger.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Moore and Hillstrom is improper because the Office Action relies on information gleaned *solely* from Applicants' specification. *MPEP* § 2142 states that "**impermissible hindsight must be avoided** and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of **the facts gleaned from the prior art**" and **not** from only Applicants' disclosure. (emphasis added). "Nonobviousness can be shown when a person of

ordinary skill in the art would not have reasonably predicted the claimed invention based on the prior art, and the resulting invention would not have been expected.” *MPEP* § 2145. Applicants believe that the Examiner has used the claims as a road map to pick and choose elements of prior art references to arrive at the combination. There is ***no motivation or suggestion*** within these references to include or implement all of the limitations in claim 1 because the need for these limitations is lacking for each of the intended goals and purposes of the prior art.

Further, *MPEP* states that “[i]t is improper to combine references where the references ***teach away*** from their combination. *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983).” *MPEP* § 2145 (emphasis added). “A prior art reference that ‘teaches away’ from the claimed invention is a ***significant factor*** to be considered in determining obviousness.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Moore teaches a system that is initiated by “an incident signal from a vehicle” that indicates a vehicle breakdown or collision. Paras. [0013] and [0027]. A human operator may then “initiate voice communication” with the driver of the vehicle or view the scene. Paras. [0021] and [0016]. Therefore, Moore specifically teaches away from a driver-initiated communication session. Hillstrom teaches a system that enables a Managing Lawyer to respond to an inquiry “within a prescribed number of hours of the initial contact.” Para. [0026]. The response by the Managing Lawyer is “[a] normal telephonic and/or in-person consultation.” Para. [0026]. Therefore, Hillstrom teaches away from a system that responds immediately upon user command because of urgent need. Further Hillstrom teaches a system that requires a Managing Lawyer’s manual/in-person action to respond to the initial inquiry, as well as subsequent selection of counsel. Therefore, Hillstrom explicitly teaches away from the limitations of claim 1 that require automatic selection of at least one lawyer who appears immediately by video. Accordingly, it is improper to combine Moore and Hillstrom because these references explicitly teach away from their combination.

The *MPEP* also states that “the claimed combination ***cannot change the principle of operation*** of the primary reference or ***render the reference inoperable*** for its intended purpose.” *MPEP* § 2145 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Hillstrom to Moore substantially changes its principle of operation and renders it inoperable for its intended purpose. Moore requires real-time communication between the user and a remote operator when

the system automatically detects the occurrence of vehicle breakdown or accident. However, Hillstrom teaches a Managing Lawyer responding to an inquiry “within a prescribed number of hours of the initial contact.” Para. [0026]. The response by the Managing Lawyer is “[a] normal telephonic and/or in-person consultation.” Para. [0026]. After the initial consultation, the Managing Lawyer “negotiates and executes a retainer agreement” with the client, and thereafter selects a Primary Lawyer who can provide legal service to the client. Para. [0026]. Therefore, the proposed combination of Hillstrom with Moore would fundamentally “change the principle of operation” of Moore, and render Moore essentially inoperable for its intended purpose, since Moore’s system is intended to provide real-time assistance to a driver who has a vehicle breakdown or accident. To require the driver in Moore to wait for a few hours for assistance entirely defeats the purpose and function of Moore’s system. Therefore, the combination is improper.

Even if it were proper to combine Moore and Hillstrom, the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Amended claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

1. A mobile lawyer system comprising:
 - at least one video camera configured for mounting inside the passenger compartment of a vehicle and capture video images of at least one passenger in the vehicle;
 - a display screen configured for mounting inside the passenger compartment of a vehicle;
 - a remote server and a database configured to store and access information about a plurality of lawyers licensed in a plurality of jurisdictions;
 - a mobile device executing a mobile application and in wireless communication with the video camera and display screen, configured, upon command from the at least one passenger, to communicate with the remote server, wherein the remote server is configured to *automatically and immediately* determine a location of the vehicle, *automatically and immediately* identify a jurisdiction associated with the vehicle location, *automatically and immediately* identify at least one lawyer licensed in the identified jurisdiction, and *automatically and immediately* notify the at least one identified lawyer; and
 - the display screen configured to *automatically and immediately* live-stream a video image of the at least one identified lawyer, and the at least one video camera is configured to *automatically and immediately* live-stream video captured by the at least one video camera for viewing by the at least one identified lawyer and for storage in the remote database, where the at least one mobile device being configured to enable bi-directional audio and video communication between the at least one identified lawyer and the at least one passenger.

Applicants respectfully submit that Moore combined with Hillstrom do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations in claim 1. Moore teaches a system that is initiated by “an incident signal from a vehicle” that indicates a vehicle breakdown or collision. Paras. [0013] and [0027]. Therefore, Moore specifically teaches away from a driver-initiated communication session. Although Moore’s system conveys a GPS location of the vehicle some time during the communication session, the location information is used by a customer service agent who may then manually dispatch assistance to the vehicle’s location if needed. *See* para. [0021]. Therefore, Moore’s system does not “automatically and immediately” communicate the location information upon receiving a command from the user. Hillstrom teaches a system that enables a Managing Lawyer to respond to an inquiry “within a prescribed number of hours of the initial contact.” Para. [0026]. The response by the Managing Lawyer is “[a] normal telephonic and/or in-person consultation.” Para. [0026]. Although Hillstrom discusses matching “clients and their legal matters to the lawyers” based on “the jurisdiction where the legal matter occurred,” Hillstrom’s system does not “automatically identify at least one lawyer licensed in a jurisdiction that corresponds to the current location of the mobile device.” If forcefully combined, the resultant system would be one that receives an incident signal from a vehicle indicative of a vehicular breakdown or accident, notifies a Managing Lawyer, who may respond to the request within a prescribed number of hours to conduct a telephonic or in-person consultation, and then selects a Primary Lawyer who may provide legal service to the driver, after the negotiation and execution of a retainer agreement. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, amended claim 1 is patentable over Moore-Hillstrom. Claims 5 and 7 depending from claim 1 are thus also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 2 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore, Hillstrom, and Hatori (US 2015/0015706). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 depends from amended claim 1 and recites additional limitations of the 360-degree high definition video camera. Hatori does not remedy any of the deficiencies in Moore or Hillstrom. Accordingly, claim 2 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 8 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore, Hillstrom, and Hatori. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and recites additional limitations of at least one video camera configured for mounting outside the passenger compartment. Hatori does not remedy any of the deficiencies in Moore or Hillstrom. Accordingly, claim 8 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore, Hillstrom, and Hassan Zureikat (US 2016/0173742). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and recites additional limitations of “the at least one video camera comprises a video camera mounted on a drone.” Zureikat discloses drone-mounted cameras but does not remedy any of the deficiencies in Moore and Hillstrom. Accordingly, claim 3 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore, Hillstrom, and Mokashi (US 9288446). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and recites additional limitations of “the at least video camera comprises a plurality of video cameras mounted on the vehicle configured to capture video images in a plurality of directions.” Mokashi does not remedy any of the deficiencies in Moore and Hillstrom. Accordingly, claim 4 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Moore, Hillstrom, and Yuen (US 2016/0140179). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and recites additional limitations of “the database is configured to store encrypted data.” As discussed above, Yuen does not remedy any of the deficiencies in Moore or Hillstrom. Accordingly, claim 6 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

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.