

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PPN07063PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/JP2007/059029	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 26 April 2007 (26.04.2007)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 09 May 2006 (09.05.2006)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant Pioneer Corporation			

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																								
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																						

	Date of issuance of this report 10 December 2008 (10.12.2008)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt07.pct@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PPN07063PCT		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2007/059029	International filing date (day/month/year) 26.04.2007	Priority date (day/month/year) 09.05.2006
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant Pioneer Corporation		

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 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/JP	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2007/059029

Box No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	<p>With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the international application in the language in which it was filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).</p>
2.	<p>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:</p> <p>a. type of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a sequence listing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> table(s) related to the sequence listing</p> <p>b. format of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> on paper</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in electronic form</p> <p>c. time of filing/furnishing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> contained in the international application as filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> filed together with the international application in electronic form</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search</p>
3.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) 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.</p>
4.	<p>Additional comments:</p>

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2007/059029

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
- paid additional fees
 - paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
 - paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
 - not paid additional fees
2. This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- complied with
 - not complied with for the following reasons:

The matters common to the inventions of claims 1-23 are "a video signal for each frame in pixel units or block units ...level is calculated," "a calculated value of ...level is binarized," adjacent continuous regions among pixels or blocks having same output values are detected," "regions beyond a predetermined area are extracted as large regions" and "the large region is determined as a shielding object part based on at least one of an area ratio, a shape and a position in the large region.

However, as a result of the search, it became clear that the constitution is not novel, since it is disclosed in [JP 7-65173 A (Oki Electric Industry Co., Ltd.), 10 March 1995, full text, all drawings (Family: none)].

Consequently, since the abovementioned constitution does not make a contribution over the prior art, the common matters are not special technical features in the sense of the second sentence of PCT rule 13.2.

Thus, there is no feature common to all the inventions of claims 1-23.

Since there is no other common matter considered to be a special technical feature in the sense of the second sentence of PCT Rule 13.2, no technical relationship in the sense of PCT Rule 13 can be found between those different inventions.

Therefore, it is evident that the inventions of claims 1-23 do not satisfy the requirement of unity of invention.

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

all parts

the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No. PCT/JP2007/059029
--

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)		<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2-19, 21, 23</td> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1, 20, 22</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">NO</td> </tr> </table>	Claims	2-19, 21, 23	YES	Claims	1, 20, 22	NO	
Claims	2-19, 21, 23	YES							
Claims	1, 20, 22	NO							
Inventive step (IS)		<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2, 5, 6, 8-19, 21, 23</td> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">NO</td> </tr> </table>	Claims	2, 5, 6, 8-19, 21, 23	YES	Claims	1, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22	NO	
Claims	2, 5, 6, 8-19, 21, 23	YES							
Claims	1, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22	NO							
Industrial applicability (IA)		<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1-23</td> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Claims</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">NO</td> </tr> </table>	Claims	1-23	YES	Claims		NO	
Claims	1-23	YES							
Claims		NO							

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 7-65173 A (Oki Electric Industry Co., Ltd.), 10 March 1995, full text, all drawings (Family: none)

Document 2: JP 11-316843 A (Xerox Corp.), 16 November 1999, paragraph [0054]-paragraph [0055] & US 6175650 B1

Document 3: JP 2004-110542 A (Toshiba Corp.), 8 April 2004, paragraph [0034] (Family: none)

The inventions of claims 1, 20 and 22 lack novelty in view of document 1 cited in the ISR. The inventions described in claims 1, 20 and 22 are disclosed in document 1.

The invention of claims 3, 4 and 7 does not involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-3 cited in the ISR. A person skilled in the art could easily adopt the constitution using DCT taught by document 2, and the constitution taught by document 3 wherein an object exists in a preceding frame section and a following frame section in the device and the method in document 1. In addition, labeling processing in claim 4 is merely a well-known technology.

The inventions of claims 2, 5, 6, 8-19, 21 and 23 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2007/059029

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

obvious to a person skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2007/059029

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:

Since claim 2 does not describe "a power ratio" of what value to "a highest frequency component in a vertical direction" is obtained, the disclosure is unclear.

The disclosures "...described in claim 1..." and "...described in claim 8..." in claims 3 and 10 are respectively considered to be "...described in claim 2..." and "...described in claim 9...."

The constitution in claim 1 or 8 referred to by the disclosure "the aforementioned predetermined condition" in claims 6 and 13 is unclear.

Since claims 8, 15, 21 and 23 do not describe a method for calculating a "blur level", a value of said "blur level" is unclear.