

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)**

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/GB2008/050621

International filing date (day/month/year)  
24.07.2008

Priority date (day/month/year)  
24.07.2007

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
INV. G08B13/16 G08B29/18

Applicant  
INFRASONIC PULSE SENSING LIMITED

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**


If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465


Date of completion of this opinion

see form PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

La Gioia, Cosimo

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2418



---

**Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - the international application in the language in which it was filed
  - a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2.  This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - a sequence listing
    - table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - on paper
    - in electronic form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - contained in the international application as filed.
    - filed together with the international application in electronic form.
    - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/GB2008/050621

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	<u>3-8,10,13-17,19-21</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1,2,9,11,12,18</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	<u>3-6</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1,2,7-21</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-21</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

---

**Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application**

---

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

**SECTION V**

A. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: FR-A-2 694 650 (FRIZET CHRISTIAN [FR]) 11 February 1994 (1994-02-11)

D2: US 2006/107298 A1 (FRIAR GARY [US]) 18 May 2006 (2006-05-18)

D3: US 2003/006899 A1 (NAJMI AMIR-HOMAYOON [US] ET AL) 9 January 2003 (2003-01-09)

D4: US-A-5 793 286 (GREENE ROBERT CHARLES [US]) 11 August 1998 (1998-08-11)

B. The present application does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33(2) PCT because the subject-matter of independent claim 1 is not novel, since it is anticipated by document D1; see passages cited in the International Search Report.

In particular, in the system of D1 the comparison with stored digital signatures is carried out by the microcontroller 7.

C. Moreover, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 lacks inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT in view of any of documents D2 and D3; see passages cited in the International Search Report.

D2 and D3 in fact disclose analogous intruder alarm systems working in the sonic range and not in the infrasonic range as the claimed system.

D. Being the features defined in dependent claims 2 and 7 to 21 either features known in the art (from D1, D2, D3 and/or D4) or design measures which one would regard as expected from the skilled person, they are therefore not considered to introduce any new subject-matter or impart any inventive step to any of these claim combinations.

E. On the other hand, the additional features of dependent claim 3, defining specific multiple thresholds, are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the

available prior art.

**SECTION VII**

- A. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses to increase their intelligibility, Rule 6.2(b) PCT.
- B. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1 to D4 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.