



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.
13/509,812	07/27/2012	Daniel Catrein	4015-8125 / P29514-US1	9405
24112	7590	11/28/2016	EXAMINER	
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC 1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300 Cary, NC 27518			GADOMSKI, STEFAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2489	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2016	PAPER

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.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte DANIEL CATREIN, FRANK HARTUNG,
MARKUS KAMPMANN, and THOMAS RUSERT

Appeal 2016-003080
Application 13/509,812
Technology Center 2400

Before BRUCE R. WINSOR, LINZY T. McCARTNEY, and
NATHAN A. ENGELS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a rejection of claims
19–35. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

BACKGROUND

Claim 19 recites the following:

19. A method for synchronizing a plurality of cameras connected via a telecommunication network for capturing a multi-view session controlled by a synchronization module, the method comprising:

receiving disposability information of at least one camera for capturing a session, the disposability information comprising at least one capturing parameter of the corresponding camera;

performing a synchronization procedure for synchronizing the cameras capturing the multi-view session wherein the synchronization procedure comprises:

determining, based on the capturing parameters of the individual cameras including the received capturing parameter, at least one multi-view capturing parameter by choosing a first multi-view capturing parameter that best matches the corresponding capturing parameters of the individual cameras;

selecting cameras suitable for the capturing of the multi view session using the chosen first multi-view capturing parameter;

notifying the selected cameras capturing the multi-view session of the at least one multi-view capturing parameter, including the first multi-view capturing parameter, for the selected cameras to use while capturing the multi-view session.

App. Br. 14.

The Examiner rejected claims 19–35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Lim¹. Final Act. 2–6.

¹ Lim et al. (US 2009/0163185 A1; published June 25, 2009) (“Lim”).

ANALYSIS

Appellants contend Lim does not disclose “choosing a first multi-view capturing parameter that best matches the corresponding capturing parameters of the individual cameras” and “selecting cameras suitable for the capturing of the multi view session using the chosen first multi-view capturing parameter” as recited in claim 19. *See* App. Br. 10–11. According to Appellants, “Lim’s solution . . . is **not** to choose a multi-view capturing parameter by matching the capturing parameters of the individual cameras so that cameras suitable for capturing using that parameter may be selected.” *Id.* at 10.

We find Appellants’ arguments persuasive. The Examiner found Lim discloses the disputed “choosing” and “selecting” limitations because Lim teaches selecting mobile communication devices to acquire multi-view images using device information, the device information including device specification and location information. *See* Ans. 2–3 (citing Lim ¶¶ 49, 67); Adv. Act. 2–3; Final Act. 3 (citing Lim ¶ 31), 13–14 (citing Lim ¶¶ 49, 66). But the cited portions of Lim are silent as to how Lim’s control unit selects and uses the device information to produce the list of mobile communication devices. *See* Lim ¶¶ 31, 49, 66, 67. Accordingly, the cited portions of Lim do not explicitly disclose (1) “choosing” an item of device information that “best matches” the corresponding device information of the individual mobile communication devices; or (2) “selecting” the list of mobile communication devices suitable for capturing the multi view session using the chosen item of device information. *See* Ans. 2–3; Adv. Act. 2–3; Final Act. 3, 13–14.

Appeal 2016-003080
Application 13/509,812

Accordingly, we do not sustain the Examiner's anticipation rejection of claim 19, nor do we sustain the Examiner's anticipation rejection of independent claims 31, 34, and 35, and dependent claims 20–30, 32, and 33, each of which recites a similar limitation. *See* App. Br. 14–19.

DECISION

For the above reasons, we reverse the rejection of claims 19–35.

REVERSED