



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	09/26/2012	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
			09/26/2012	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

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 –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yonekubo et al. (7,393,107).

Regarding claim 1, Yonekubo discloses a color laser projector (1100), a sensor (1113), and a processor (1103).

Regarding claim 4, see Figure 11.

3. Claims 1, 4, and 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyazawa et al. (7,410,263).

Regarding claim 1, Miyazawa discloses a color laser projector (col. 8, lines 22-25), a sensor (142), and a processor (110).

Regarding claim 4, see Figure 14A.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, see Figures 22-30.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, see col. 15, lines 31-46. The correcting unit 150 inherently includes a mapping software.

Art Unit: 2422

Regarding claim 11, the whole screen 108 meets the reflective pattern as claimed.

Regarding claims 12-15, in addition of above, Miyazawa shows n number (An) of projectors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. 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.

5. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonekubo et al. (7,393,107).

Regarding claim 2, Yonekubo does not mention that the display system is a cube as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the projection system in Yonekubo 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 Yonekubo so that the display system could have a shape of cube.

Regarding claim 3, Yonekubo does not disclose that the display system is a hexagonal as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the display 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 Yonekubo so that the display system could have a shape of hexagonal.

Art Unit: 2422

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Yonekubo does not teach that the sensor is a CCD sensor or CMOS sensor as claimed. The sensor (113) in Yonekubo 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, Yonekubo 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 Yonekubo to form a video wall so that a large audience could view the image displayed on the screen.

Regarding claims 16-18, the projector in Yonekubo can be constructed in any size. It is a matter of design choice. Thus, the pico-projector as claimed would have been obvious at the time of the invention.

6. Claim 2, 3, 5, 6, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa et al. (7,410,263).

Regarding claim 2, Miyazawa does not mention that the display system is a cube as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the projection system in Miyazawa is a matter of design choice. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2422

art at the time of the invention to modify Miyazawa so that the display system could have a shape of cube.

Regarding claim 3, Miyazawa does not disclose that the display system is a hexagonal as claimed. It is understood that the shape of the display 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 Miyazawa so that the display system could have a shape of hexagonal.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Miyazawa does not teach that the sensor is a CCD sensor or CMOS sensor as claimed. The sensor (113) in Miyazawa 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 16-18, the projector in Miyazawa can be constructed in any size. It is a matter of design choice. Thus, the pico-projector as claimed would have been obvious at the time of the invention.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. 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.

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.

Art Unit: 2422

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