



# 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.
14/502,617	09/30/2014	Momin MIRZA	20141056	9082
25537	7590	03/05/2020	EXAMINER	
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1300 I STREET NW SUITE 500 EAST WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ABAZA, AYMAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2486	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/05/2020	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):

VZPatent25537@verizon.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* MOMIN MIRZA and YUNJI FENGSHI

---

Appeal 2018-008810  
Application 14/502,617  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before CARL W. WHITEHEAD JR., DAVID M. KOHUT and  
ERIC. B. CHEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals from the Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–3, 5–8, 10–12, 14–19, 21–23, and 25–28. Claims 4, 9, 13, 20, and 24 have been canceled. *See* Appeal Br. 16–18, 20 (Claims Appendix). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as “Verizon Communications Inc. and its subsidiary companies.” Appeal Br. 2.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

APPELLANT'S INVENTION

Appellant's invention relates to "a network of cameras providing surveillance and one or more other services in a neighborhood." Spec. ¶ 14. Claim 1 is reproduced, below, with emphasis on disputed limitations.

1. A method comprising:

receiving, for a plurality of candidate cameras, orientation information and location information, describing particular orientations and locations, respectively, of each of the plurality of candidate cameras, wherein the plurality of candidate cameras include surveillance cameras associated with a plurality of users;

***determining, based on the orientation information and the location information, which of the candidate cameras to include in a network of cameras that are subscribed to by a particular user of the plurality of users, the determination including excluding those of the candidate cameras that, based on the orientation and location information, are determined to be facing inside of a house or installed inside a house***, such that the particular user is subscribed to camera data associated with cameras located in a neighborhood of the particular user;

receiving a plurality of images or videos from the plurality of network cameras;

stitching one or more of the received plurality of images, videos, or a combination thereof, to generate a composite image, a composite video, or a combination thereof; and

providing the composite image, the composite video, or a combination thereof to at least one of the plurality of users.

Appeal Br. 16 (Claims Appendix).

## REJECTIONS

1. Claims 1–3, 8, 10–12, 17–19, and 25–28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Li (US 2015/0326833 A1; Nov. 12, 2015), West (US 2012/0092161 A1; Apr. 19, 2012), and Inata (US 2004/0216165 A1; Oct. 28, 2004). Final Act. 3–7.

2. Claims 5–7, 14–16, and 21–23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Li, West, Inata, and Cuoco (US 2015/0189243 A1; July 2, 2015). Final Act. 7–10.

## OPINION

For the reasons below, we are unpersuaded of error in the rejection of independent claim 1. For the same reasons, we are unpersuaded of error in the rejections of claims 2, 3, 5–8, 10–12, 14–19, 21–23, and 25–28, which are not separately argued. Appeal Br. 8 (“[C]laim 1 [is] representative [of all] independent claims.”), 14 (contesting the rejections of the dependent claims solely by reasserting the arguments for claim 1).

Claim 1 is rejected as obvious over Li, West, and Inata. Appellant contends the combination of Li, West, and Inata does not teach or suggest the above-emphasized limitations of reproduced claim 1. *Supra* 2. Before addressing these contentions and limitations, we note the applied teachings of Li, West, and Inata.

Li teaches a neighborhood panorama of surveillance camera images whereby the selection and stitching of images is based on the cameras’ respective locations and orientations. Li ¶¶ 18, 31; Final Act. 3; Ans. 7. West teaches a neighborhood watch whereby authorized participants can view the images of their neighbors’ surveillance cameras. West ¶¶ 36, 63; Final Act. 3–5; Ans. 8–9. Inata teaches a neighborhood surveillance system

whereby a hazard detection of one neighbor's surveillance camera causes the surrounding neighbors' surveillance cameras to provide images, except for unconsented images of home interiors. Inata ¶ 43; Final Act. 2, 5; Ans. 4, 10, 14.

Appellant contends no reference teaches the claimed “determining, based on the orientation information and the location information, which of the candidate cameras to include in a network of cameras that are subscribed to by a particular user of the plurality of users.” Appeal Br. 8–12. Specifically, Appellant contends no reference teaches subscribing of cameras to a particular user based on the cameras' orientations and locations. *Id.*

We are unpersuaded. As the Examiner finds, Li subscribes cameras to a neighborhood based on the cameras' orientations and locations with respect to the neighborhood (particularly with respect to imaging the neighborhood). Li ¶¶ 18, 31; Final Act. 3; Ans. 7. West subscribes a neighborhood watch's cameras to each participating neighbor (particularly by giving a participant access to the cameras' images). West ¶¶ 36, 63; Final Act. 3–5; Ans. 8–9. We find the combination of these features subscribes cameras to a neighborhood based on the cameras' orientations and locations (Li) and, furthermore, to participants of a respective neighborhood watch (West). As claimed, the combination subscribes cameras to a participant of a neighborhood watch (claimed “particular user”) based on the cameras' orientations and locations.

Appellant also contends no reference teaches the claimed “excluding those of the candidate cameras that, based on the orientation and location information, are determined to be facing inside of a house or installed inside

a house.” Appeal Br. 12–14; Reply Br. 2–4. Specifically, Appellant contends no reference teaches determining, based on a camera’s orientation and location, whether the camera is facing or installed inside of a house. *Id.*

We are unpersuaded. As the Examiner finds, the above Li-West combination subscribes cameras to participants of a neighborhood watch based on the cameras’ orientations and locations. *Supra* 4. Inata excludes a camera from neighborhood surveillance if the camera images a home interior. Inata ¶ 43; Final Act. 2, 5; Ans. 4, 10, 14. The combination of these features yields a surveillance system that, based on a camera’s location and orientation, determines the camera’s view and then subscribes the camera to a neighborhood watch if both imaging the neighborhood (Li-West combination) and not imaging a home interior (Inata). As claimed, the combination excludes a camera that, based on its orientation and location, was determined to face the inside of a home.

#### CONCLUSION

We affirm the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1–3, 5–8, 10–12, 14–19, 21–23, and 25–28.

#### DECISION SUMMARY

<b>Claims Rejected</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>Affirmed</b>	<b>Reversed</b>
1–3, 8, 10–12, 17–19, 25–28	103	Li, West, Inata	1–3, 8, 10–12, 17–19, 25–28	
5–7, 14–16, 21–23	103	Li, West, Inata, Cuoco	5–7, 14–16, 21–23	
<b>Overall Outcome</b>			1–3, 5–8, 10–12, 14–19, 21–23, 25–28	

Appeal 2018-008810  
Application 14/502,617

TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

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

AFFIRMED