



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.
12/728,699	03/22/2010	Robert Loney	TEK-PT001	5848
3624	7590	03/29/2012	EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			LEE, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2422	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2012	ELECTRONIC

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eoffice@volpe-koenig.com

Office Action Summary

Application No. 12/728,699	Applicant(s) LONEY ET AL.	
Examiner MICHAEL LEE	Art Unit 2422	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/22/10.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hajjar (7,878,657).

Regarding claim 1, Hajjar discloses a scanning beam display system showing a laser projector for projecting laser light to the back of the screen (610, col. 5, lines 34-36), a sensor (620, 630), and a processor (640). The rear projection system mentioned in column 5, lines 34-36, indicates that the laser projector, the sensor, and the processor are enclosed in the same housing.

Regarding claim 4, the projection system of Hajjar is a rear projection type.

Regarding claim 7, the processor 640 also inherently controls the contrast of the projected image.

Regarding claim 8, the processor also conserves energy by reducing the brightness of the projected image.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Hajjar employs coordinate mapping system to project light on the screen (note the reference markers in Figure 11). The processor inherently

Art Unit: 2422

uses the reference markers as reference points in a coordinate map to ensure the scanning laser light is stayed within the active image area.

Regarding claim 11, see reference markers in Figure 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajjar (7,878,657).

Regarding claim 2, Hajjar does not mention that the rear projection system is a cube as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the projection system is a matter of design choice. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hajjar so that the rear projection system could have a shape of cube.

Regarding claim 3, Hajjar does not disclose that the rear projection system is a hexagonal as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the projection system is a matter of design choice. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hajjar so that the rear projection system could have a shape of hexagonal.

Art Unit: 2422

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Hajjar does not teach that the sensor is a CCD sensor or CMOS sensor as claimed. The sensor (620, 630) in Hajjar can be any conventional light detector. Since a CCD sensor and a CMOS sensor are well known light detectors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a CCD sensor or CMOS sensor as the sensor to perform the well-known functions as claimed.

Regarding claims 12-15, in addition of above, Hajjar does not disclose the multi-screen multi-projector as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using a plurality of display device to form a video wall or multi-screen as claimed is well known in the art. This enables a large audience to view a displayed image, such as in a concert. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a plurality of display system of Hajjar to form a video wall so that a large audience could view the image displayed on the screen.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sugawara et al. (7,364,309) discloses a screen marker.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

Art Unit: 2422

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold, can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2422