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.
10/733,727	12/11/2003	Kenneth L. Addy	H0006399/4874/107934	8574

92556 7590 09/23/2016

HONEYWELL/HUSCH
Patent Services
115 Tabor Road
P.O.Box 377
MORRIS PLAINS, NJ 07950

EXAMINER
DIEP, NHON THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2487	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/23/2016	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):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com
amy.hammer@huschblackwell.com
pto-chi@huschblackwell.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte KENNETH L. ADDY

Appeal 2015-004069
Application No. 10/733,727[1]
Technology Center 2400

Before MARC S. HOFF, CATHERINE SHIANG,
MONICA S. ULLAGADDI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOFF, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a Final Rejection of claims 1–20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

Appellant's invention is a security system including intrusion security sensors provided on the perimeter of a protected space and wireless RF, battery operated, low current drain video cameras elsewhere in the protected space. Each video camera is capable of operating in a standby inactive video mode having low electrical power consumption, or in an active video

---

[1] The real party in interest is Honeywell International, Inc.

recording mode. Upon detection of an alarm event by a security sensor, the security sensor transmits an RF security/alarm event message, causing the security system video cameras to awaken from standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode. *See* Abstract.

Claim 1 is exemplary of the claims on appeal:

1. A security system comprising:

a security system control panel;

a plurality of battery operated security video cameras, each having an RF receiver and operating in a standby inactive video mode, providing a low electrical power consumption, or in an active video recording mode that consumes a greater amount of electrical power;

a plurality of security sensors for detecting a security/alarm event, each located elsewhere with respect to the plurality of video cameras and each having an RF transmitter for transmitting an RF security/alarm event message indicating detection of a security/alarm event;

wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to immediately activate the security system cameras by transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode and collect pre-alarm video and wherein the initiating message is also received by the security system control panel for processing.

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art in rejecting the claims on appeal:

Naidoo et al.	US 6,658,091 B1	Dec. 2, 2003
Kanayama et al.	US 2005/0154598 A1	July 14, 2005
Stuart	US 7,012,523 B2	Mar. 14, 2006

Claims 1–20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanayama, Stuart, and Naidoo.

Throughout this decision, we make reference to the Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed Sep. 17, 2014), the Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed Feb. 19, 2015), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed Jan. 28, 2014) for their respective details.

ISSUE

Does Kanayama disclose or suggest, in response to a detected alarm event, a security sensor immediately transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras which causes the security system cameras to awaken from the standby inactive state into the active video recording mode and collect pre-alarm video?

ANALYSIS

Appellant's argument that Kanayama fails to disclose or suggest "wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to immediately activate the security system cameras by transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras" is not persuasive to show Examiner error in the rejection. *See* App. Br. 6. Appellant contends that Kanayama transmits alarm

messages to the security service manager terminal, rather than the cameras. *Id.*

We do not agree that Kanayama does not teach corresponding functions. We agree with the Examiner's finding that Kanayama discloses that "trespasser sensor 12b is activated around the clock; upon detection of an abnormality, it sends a detection signal to the sensor control section 21 to request that the security camera 12a start operating." Ans. 2, 7; Kanayama ¶ 104. "The sensor control section 21, as it receives the operation start request for the security camera 12a from the trespasser sensor 12b (S211), sends a camera image capture instruction to the security camera 12a (S212). In accordance with the instruction, the security camera 12a starts image capturing and sends captured camera images." Kanayama ¶ 105. We agree with the Examiner that the claims do not require transmission of the event initiating message directly to the security system cameras without transmission to any intermediate devices. Ans. 7.

Appellant's contention that the claim term "immediately" does not allow for delay associated with relaying the initiating message through an intermediate device is also unpersuasive. *See* Reply Br. 3. Appellant has not cited to any portion of the Specification indicating a specific amount of time corresponding to the word "immediately." Appellant has provided no evidence that Kanayama does not function to transmit starting instructions to its cameras "immediately" within the plain and ordinary meaning of the term.

We find that the combination of Kanayama, Stuart, and Naidoo teaches all the elements of claims 1–20. We sustain the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

Kanayama teaches, in response to a detected alarm event, a security sensor immediately transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras which causes the security system cameras to awaken from the standby inactive state into the active video recording mode and collect pre-alarm video.

ORDER

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1–20 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED