UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
14/226,008	03/26/2014	Karthik Veeramani	884.Q30US1	9415

45457   7590   01/31/2019
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/Intel
P.O. Box 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
SADIO, INSA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/31/2019	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):

uspto@slwip.com
SLW@blackhillsip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

———————————

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

———————————

Ex parte KARTHIK VEERAMANI, UJWAL PAIDIPATHI,
and AJIT PRAKASH JOSHI

———————————

Appeal 2018-005863
Application 14/226,008
Technology Center 2600

———————————

Before ST. JOHN COURTENAY III, LINZY T. McCARTNEY, and
SCOTT E. BAIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McCARTNEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1–4, 6–15, and 17–25. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

BACKGROUND

The present patent application concerns "a mechanism to enhance [the] user experience of mobile devices through complex inputs from external displays." Specification ¶ 1, filed March 26, 2014. Claims 1, 10, 20, and 22 are independent. Claim 10 illustrates the claimed invention:

> 10.   A method of mapping user movements captured by a capture device external to a computing device, to input events on the computing device, the method comprising:
>
>   executing an application on the computing device, using at least one processor of the computing device;
>
>   establishing a video channel between the computing device and a receiver device external to the computing device;
>
>   transmitting, from the computing device, video data of the application to the receiver device external to the computing device;
>
>   establishing an input channel between the computing device and the receiver device;
>
>   receiving, via the input channel at the computing device from the receiver device, gesture data associated with the application, the gesture data based on movements of a user captured from a capture device, external to the computing device, communicatively coupled to the receiver device;
>
>   mapping the gesture data to an input event on the computing device; and
>
>   providing data simulating the input event to a sensor on the computing device.

Appeal Brief 19–20, filed November 20, 2017 ("App. Br.").

REJECTIONS

Claims	Basis	Reference(s)
1–3, 6–13, and 17–24	§ 103	Yu[1] and Westerman[2]
4, 14, 15, and 25	§ 103	Yu, Westerman, and Saukko[3]

DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejections in light of Appellants' arguments, and for the reasons expressed below, we agree with Appellants that the Examiner erred.

Claim 10 recites "receiving, via the input channel at the computing device from the receiver device, gesture data associated with the application, the gesture data based on movements of a user captured from a capture device, external to the computing device, communicatively coupled to the receiver device." App. Br. 19–20. Claim 10 also recites "mapping the gesture data to an input event on the computing device" and "providing data simulating the input event to a sensor on the computing device." App. Br. 20.

Appellants contend the Examiner's combination of Yu and Westerman does not teach or suggest these steps. App. Br. 11–14; Reply Br. 2–3, filed May 18, 2018 ("Reply Br."). Appellants argue the Examiner ignored that the recited "gesture data" comes from a device "external to the computing device." App. Br. 12; Reply Br. 3. Appellants also contend that Westerman does not teach or suggest the "providing" step because the cited

---

[1] Yu et al. (US 2014/0130073 A1; May 8, 2014).
[2] Westerman et al. (US 2008/0309632 A1; Dec. 18, 2008).
[3] Saukko et al. (US 2014/0043277 A1; Feb. 13, 2014).

parts of Westerman do not discuss providing simulated input event data to a sensor. App. Br. 14; Reply Br. 2.

We find Appellants' arguments persuasive. For the "receiving" step, the Examiner mapped Yu's network server 304 to the recited "computing device" and Yu's receiver device 102 to the recited "receiver device." *See* Final Office Action. 1–7, mailed May 24, 2017 (citing Yu ¶¶ 37, 38, 59, Fig. 4) ("Final Act."); Answer 5–6, mailed March 20, 2018 (citing Yu ¶ 38) ("Ans."). Although the cited parts of Yu disclose that receiver device 102 detects user actions such as gestures, the cited parts of Yu do not teach or suggest that network server 304 receives the detected user actions from receiver device 102. *See* Yu ¶¶ 37, 38, 59, Fig. 4. The Examiner has not provided a persuasive reason that it would have been obvious to modify Yu so that network server 304 receives this data from receiver device 102. *See* Final Act. 1–7; Ans. 5–6.

As for the "mapping" and "providing" steps, the Examiner found Westerman teaches the "mapping" step because Westerman discloses detecting gestures. Final Act. 7 (citing Westerman ¶ 27). The Examiner found Westerman teaches the "providing" step because Westerman determines whether a sensor has detected a touch event, where the "sensor can be viewed as a picture element . . . which can be particularly useful when touch sensor panel . . . is viewed as capturing an 'image' of touch." Westerman ¶ 32; Final Act. 7 (citing Westerman ¶ 32). Even if detecting gestures involves mapping gesture data to an input event as found by the Examiner, the Examiner has not pointed to anything in Westerman that teaches or suggests providing *data simulating that input event to a sensor on the computing device. See* Final Act. 7; Ans. 5–6.

For the above reasons, on this record, we do not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 and its dependent claims. Because the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 20, and 22 suffers from similar deficiencies, we also do not sustain the Examiner's rejection of these claims and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims Rejected	Basis	Reference(s)	Affirmed	Reversed
1–3, 6–13, and 17–24	§ 103	Yu and Westerman		1–3, 6–13, and 17–24
4, 14, 15, and 25	§ 103	Yu, Westerman, and Saukko		4, 14, 15, and 25
Summary				1–4, 6–15, and 17–25

REVERSED