

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:	see form PCT/ISA/220
-----	----------------------

## PCT

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

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/IB2006/050789	International filing date (day/month/year) 14.03.2006	Priority date (day/month/year) 25.03.2005
--	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC INV. G08B21/02 G08B23/00 H04N5/44
--

Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.
---

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  Wright, J Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2705
---	--	---



---

**Box No. I 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. 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.
3.  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.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2006/050789

---

**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	1-16
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V.**

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : US 5 541 664 A (CUADRADO ET AL) 30 July 1996 (1996-07-30)

D2 : DE 103 07 474 A1 (MERTEN GMBH & CO. KG) 2 September 2004 (2004-09-02)

D3 : PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN Vol. 2003, no. 12, 5 December 2003 (2003-12-05) & JP 2004 096599 A (SHARP CORP), 25 March 2004 (2004-03-25)

2 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses a set top box sensor arrangement for detecting when a subject is too near to a viewing screen such as a television.

Subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that it is claimed that a tag is used for establishing the distance to the set.

2.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)

The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as:

how to reduce false alarms due to animals or other moving objects near to a distance detection device.

2.2 The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

None of the available prior art suggests using a tag for this purpose. The use of a tag makes the protection personal to the person to be protected and therefore reduces false alarms for example from an animal.

Document D2 discloses a tag used to turn on apparatus or power sources in particular areas, however there is no suggestion to do this when a minimum distance is ensured but rather when a maximum distance is ensured, eg when an authorised person is in a particular area a printer device can be used.

Document D3 discloses a remote control which sends out two different signals from which a screen device can determine how far the apparatus is away from the screen. However, since this signal is only generated when a user changes the settings of the television, for example a channel change, this device can not be considered to be a tag.

Therefore, even considering the teachings of D1 D2 and D3, the skilled person would not arrive at the subject matter of claim 1 of the application without having made an inventive step.

Independent claim 14, if suitably clarified would appear to fulfil the conditions of Art. 33(1) PCT for parallel reasons as are given for claim 1 above. The combination of distance measurement with a tag solves the above stated problem in a non-obvious way, therefore a clarified claim could be considered to involve an inventive step.

Independent claim 16 is new and inventive since none of the known tags, eg that of D2 is used in the system of claim 1, the use is therefore new and not obvious.

**Re Item VIII.**

Claim 14 lacks clarity, Art. 6 PCT.

Claim 14 is directed to a display apparatus, however it refers to secondary entities, eg a tag as if they formed part of the scope of the claim. Had the claim been worded differently, eg by introducing a proper reference to the tag and its reference signal, the claim would have been clear.