



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.
14/515,127	10/15/2014	Orhan Bulan	20131817US01/0290.0526	5633
144569	7590	06/23/2020	EXAMINER	
MH2 TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP, LLP (w/CONDUENT) TIMOTHY M. HSIEH 1951 KIDWELL DRIVE SUITE 310 TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			NASRI, MARYAM A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2483	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2020	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):

conduent.PatentDocketing@conduent.com
docketing@mh2law.com
doreen@mh2law.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte ORHAN BULAN, EDGAR A. BERNAL, YAO RONG WANG,
and ROBERT P. LOCE

Appeal 2019-001923
Application 14/515,127
Technology Center 2400

Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, ALLEN R. MacDONALD, and
NABEEL U. KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KHAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a), Appellant¹ appeals from the
Examiner's decision to reject claims 1–3, 5, 9–14, 16, 20–22, 25, and 26.
We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

¹ We use the word Appellant to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42(a). Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Conduent Business Services, LLC. Appeal Br. 3.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method comprising:
 - monitoring a parking region based on video data of a view of the parking region received from a video camera;
 - determining a location of a parking zone within the parking region, wherein the parking zone is associated with at least one of an optimal viewing angle and an optimal zoom ratio;
 - detecting a vehicle that is in motion in the video data;
 - soft tracking the vehicle while the vehicle is in motion;
 - detecting that the vehicle has become stationary;
 - determining, using a processor, a parking event associated with the vehicle in the parking region based on detecting that the vehicle has become stationary after being in motion, wherein the parking event is detected using the location of the parking zone;
 - physically tracking the vehicle by adjusting a view of the video camera based on determining the parking event, wherein the adjusting the view of the video camera comprises adjusting the view to achieve the at least one of the optimal viewing angle and the optimal zoom ratio;
 - capturing an image of a license plate of the vehicle;
 - determining license plate text of the license plate of the vehicle based on the image of the license plate;
 - receiving an automatic parking payment associated with the license plate text;
 - determining a confidence score of the license plate text;
 - determining that the confidence score meets a predetermined threshold;
 - in response to determining that the confidence score meets the predetermined threshold, resuming monitoring of the

Appeal 2019-001923
Application 14/515,127

parking region by physically adjusting the view of the video camera;

in response to detecting the vehicle change from stationary to moving after resuming monitoring of the parking region, soft tracking the vehicle; and

in response to detecting the vehicle leaving the parking zone, physically tracking the vehicle by adjusting a view of the video camera.

Appeal Br. 14–15(Claims Appendix).

REFERENCES

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner is:

Name	Reference	Date
Senior	US 2006/0197839 A1	Sept. 7, 2006
Nerayoff	US 2014/0036076 A1	Feb. 6, 2014
Wang	US 2015/0139506 A1	May 21, 2015

REJECTION

Claims 1–3, 5, 9–14, 16, 20–22, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Senior, Nerayoff, and Wang. Ans. 3–12.

OPINION

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “determining a location of a parking zone within the parking region . . . wherein the parking event is detected using the location of the parking zone.” The Examiner finds Senior teaches or suggests the aforementioned limitation, as Senior discloses an automated method to direct steerable cameras, when a fixed camera detects or identifies an event of interest, and the identified location of the event determines a direction in which one or more steerable cameras are directed. *See* Ans. 4–5, 13 (citing Senior ¶ 12). The Examiner further finds Nerayoff also teaches

Appeal 2019-001923
Application 14/515,127

or suggests detecting a parking event using a location of a parking zone, as Nerayoff discloses a server system including destination cameras, where the destination cameras provide actual parking start and end times by allowing the server system to determine when a vehicle pulls into a destination location and when the vehicle leaves. *See* Ans. 7, 13 (citing Nerayoff ¶ 148).

Appellant argues Senior teaches that locations of interest are detected using events such as the presence of motion, which is opposite of what the claims require (*i.e.*, that events are detected using the location of the parking zone). *See* Appeal Br. 9. This argument is not persuasive. Contrary to Appellant’s argument, Senior does teach identifying a location of an event, and then directing a steerable camera in a direction based on the identified location. *See* Senior ¶ 12. Appellant further argues Nerayoff merely discloses detecting a location using events, similar to Senior. *See* Appeal Br. 10. This argument is not persuasive either. Similar to Senior, Nerayoff discloses identifying a destination location, and using the identified destination location to determine a parking event (*i.e.*, when a vehicle enters the identified destination location and when the vehicle leaves the identified destination location). *See* Nerayoff ¶ 148. Appellant further argues that Nerayoff’s disclosure of destination camera providing actual parking start and end times does not meet the claim limitation “[detecting] a parking event,” recited in claim 1. *See* Reply Br. 3. This argument is also not persuasive as Appellant does not explain why Nerayoff’s detected parking start and end times does not teach or suggest the claimed “[detected] parking event.”

Claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*, “physically tracking the vehicle by adjusting a view of the video camera based on determining the parking

Appeal 2019-001923
Application 14/515,127

event, wherein the adjusting the view of the video camera comprises adjusting the view to achieve the at least one of the optimal viewing angle and the optimal ratio.” The Examiner finds Senior teaches or suggests the aforementioned limitation, as Senior discloses that the method of adjusting a steerable camera involves adjusting an angle and a zoom ratio at which the steerable camera views an event of interest so that the view of the steerable camera is optimized. *See* Ans. 5, 14 (citing Senior ¶¶ 10, 13, 29, 37, 50).

Appellant argues Senior merely discusses optimizing a length of time cameras are directed to a given event, and optimizing a number of events to which the cameras are steered, and fails to disclose optimizing a viewing angle and a zoom ratio. *See* Appeal Br. 10–11; *see also* Reply Br. 3–4. This argument is not persuasive. Contrary to Appellant’s argument, Senior explicitly discloses optimizing a view of a steerable camera, which involves optimizing an angle and a zoom ratio of the steerable camera. *See* Senior ¶¶ 10, 29.

Claim 1 also recites, *inter alia*, “receiving an automatic parking payment associated with the license plate text.” The Examiner further finds Nerayoff teaches or suggests detecting a parking event using a location of a parking zone, as Nerayoff discloses an online payment system that allows an end user to submit a payment for the use of a destination location (*e.g.*, street parking space), where the online payment system: determines when a vehicle pulls into, and out of, a destination location; gathers license plate information from the vehicle; and facilitates an automatic parking payment associated with the license plate information. Ans. 7, 14–15 (citing Nerayoff ¶¶ 21, 25, 223).

Appellant argues Nerayoff fails to disclose an automatic parking payment associated with a license plate, and, at most, Nerayoff discloses

Appeal 2019-001923
Application 14/515,127

using cameras to capture license plate information for enforcement rather than for obtaining payment associated with the license plate. *See* Appeal Br. 11–12; *see also* Reply Br. 4. This argument is also not persuasive. Nerayoff explicitly discloses that the payment system receives a text message or an e-mail from a user including a photo of a license plate, and a credit card associated with an account for the user is charged a usage fee. *See* Nerayoff ¶ 223. Thus, contrary to Appellant’s argument, Nerayoff teaches an automatic parking payment associated with a license plate.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of independent claim 1. The Examiner rejects independent claim 12 on the same basis as claim 1, and therefore we also sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1. We also sustain the rejection of dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 9–11, 13, 15, 16, 20–22, 25, and 26, as they are not separately argued by Appellant.

DECISION SUMMARY

In summary:

Claims Rejected	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis	Affirmed	Reversed
1–3, 5, 9–14, 16, 20–22, 25, 26	103	Senior, Nerayoff, Wang	1–3, 5, 9–14, 16, 20–22, 25, 26	

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