

(51) Int Cl.:
G08B 13/14 (2006.01)

(22) Date of filing: **12.05.2015**

(74) Representative: **Klemm, Rolf**
Patentanwaltskanzlei Rolf Klemm
Rupert-Mayer-Strasse 44
Gbd. 64.07, B 3.58
81379 München (DE)

(54) **SECURITY ALARM DEVICE WITH FUNCTION OF ALARM SIGNAL TRANSMISSION TO THE COMPUTERIZED USER DEVICE**

sensor. According to the invention, process controller has the form of Bluetooth LE microcontroller. At least one capacitance proximity sensor with active shielding and make-break electrodes is used as the safety sensor, which is connected with platen selector and Bluetooth LE microcontroller. Capacitance proximity sensor is combined with control, signaling, indicating unit on the one printed circuit, Bluetooth LE microcontroller and active shield, which has the form of printed circuit track.



**DECLARATION**

Application Number

which under Rule 63 of the European Patent Convention EP 15 02 0073 shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

The Search Division considers that the present application, does not comply with the provisions of the EPC to such an extent that it is not possible to carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art on the basis of all claims

Reason:

1 The subject matter of the present application and of the claims on file lack clarity, Article 84 EPC, to such an extent that a meaningful search is not considered possible. Substantial and formal objections are summarized below.

2 Formally, the means as claimed in claim 1 should have been provided with reference signs for improving their intelligibility, Rule 43(7) EPC.

3 The features introduced with the definite article "the" (the independent current source, the one printed circuit) as if they had an antecedent are unclear because they do not have any such antecedent.

4 Substantially, claim 1 is first generally unclear because it relates to a security alarm system, however it does not recite the nature of the alarm to be considered, what means are responsible for generating an alarm and in which circumstances the generation takes place, and what means among the claimed means are having, individually or in combination, the claimed function of alarm transmission to the computerized user device. The description does not provide enough clear hints either, that would allow to clarify, or give a general meaning to the claimed subject matter. The purpose and general use of the claimed device is therefore unclear.

5 Claim 1 merely recites a series of means. The nature and function of these means, and their interaction, are however either not at all recited or mostly unclear. For details, see below.

5.1 One of the means is called
-/--

CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)

INV.
G08B13/14

Place of search

Munich

Date

28 January 2016

Examiner

Bourdier, Renaud

**DECLARATION**

Application Number

which under Rule 63 of the European Patent Convention EP 15 02 0073 shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

The Search Division considers that the present application, does not comply with the provisions of the EPC to such an extent that it is not possible to carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art on the basis of all claims

Reason:

"control, signaling, indicating unit". The skilled reader has however no idea of what control, what signaling and what indicating this unit is there for. To the control function, the examiner observes that claim 1 also recites a process controller and a Bluetooth LE microcontroller. The allocation of control among these entities is obscure.

5.2 An input port of the control, signaling, indicating unit (referred to as (2) in the description) is said to be "connected with process controller, safety sensor comprising that process controller". It is first unclear whether there is either one item in the application referred to as "process controller" and one item referred to as "safety sensor", or if one item is called "process controller, safety sensor". Should there be an item in the application called "safety sensor", then according to the 4th line of claim 1 the safety sensor comprises the process controller. But then, claim 1 recites at the 5th and 6th lines that the capacity proximity sensor is used as the safety sensor. This would mean that the capacity proximity sensor comprises the process controller, which does not seem to be consistent with the description.

Should there be an item called "process controller" by itself, then what is it? According to page 5, lines 5-7 of the description, the control, signaling, indicating unit 2 is said to be "connected with process controller (only !), which has the form of Bluetooth LE microcontroller 3". For what reason should

-/--

CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)

EPO FORM 1504 (P04F37)

Place of search

Munich

Date

28 January 2016

Examiner

Bourdier, Renaud

**DECLARATION**

Application Number

which under Rule 63 of the European Patent Convention EP 15 02 0073 shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

The Search Division considers that the present application, does not comply with the provisions of the EPC to such an extent that it is not possible to carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art on the basis of all claims

CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)

Reason:

claim 1 then recite a process controller and a Bluetooth LE microcontroller, when one is equal to the other ?

In any case, the purpose of the means designated as "process controller", a vague and indefinite expression unconnected to technical features for clarifying its scope, is also obscure. It follows that the nature of the features cited in this point and the way they interact is fully obscure, and therefore totally unclear, Article 84 EPC.

5.3 The signification of "make-break" electrodes fails to be understood.

5.4 The technical nature of the claimed "platen selector" fails to be understood in the context of claim 1 alone.

5.5 The content and the syntax of the last 3 lines of claim 1 is such that the corresponding features fails to be understood: what is the technical meaning of "combined", especially in view of the also claimed term "connected" ? What printed circuit is it ? Is especially the claimed one printed circuit to be construed as being part of the claimed alarm device ? Are there other parts of the claimed alarm device that are not on the printed circuit ? What is the meaning of the term "one" in the expression "the one printed circuit" ? Are the claimed Bluetooth LE microcontroller and active shield (9th and 10th line of claims) to be understood also as grammatical complement to the expression "combined with", or not ?

It is also submitted that the passage at
-/--

EPO FORM 1504 (P04F37)

Place of search

Munich

Date

28 January 2016

Examiner

Bourdier, Renaud

**DECLARATION**

Application Number

which under Rule 63 of the European Patent Convention EP 15 02 0073 shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

The Search Division considers that the present application, does not comply with the provisions of the EPC to such an extent that it is not possible to carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art on the basis of all claims

CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)

Reason:

lines 11-13 of the description at page 5, "Capacitance proximity sensor 4 has the sensors conductors 7 on the printed circuit which are connected through the commutator 8 to the control, signaling, indicating 2 unit", tentatively elected as providing a vague support, does not seem to be consistent with the content of figure 1 showing no connection between boxes 7,8 or 4 on one hand, and 2 on the other hand.

6 The applicant is also made aware of the fact that only the -very short- abstracts in English language of Ukrainian patent documents with publication numbers UA83534U and UA81947, as cited at pages 2 and 3 of the present application, are available to the examiner.

The other citations (Patent RF N° 86063 and Patent of RF N° 99293) could not be retrieved.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that a search may be carried out during examination following a declaration of no search under Rule 63 EPC, should the problems which led to the declaration being issued be overcome (see EPC Guideline C-IV, 7.2).

1

EPO FORM 1504 (P04F37)

Place of search

Munich

Date

28 January 2016

Examiner

Bourdier, Renaud