

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

# PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: Y.P.LEE, MOCK & PARTNERS  12F Daelim Acrotel 13 Eonju-ro 30-gil Gangnam-gu Seoul 135-971 Republic of Korea
--

Date of mailing (day/month/year) <b>13 July 2015 (13.07.2015)</b>
--

Applicant's or agent's file reference SH-48897-PCT	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
---	--

International application No. <b>PCT/KR2015/004564</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>07 May 2015 (07.05.2015)</b>	Priority date(day/month/year) 07 May 2014 (07.05.2014)
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>G06F 3/048(2006.01)i, G06F 3/01(2006.01)i</b>
---

Applicant <b>SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.</b>
---

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 and 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.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/KR International Application Division Korean Intellectual Property Office 189 Cheongsu-ro, Seo-gu, Daejeon Metropolitan City, 302-701, Republic of Korea Facsimile No. +82-42-472-7140	Date of completion of this opinion  11 July 2015 (11.07.2015)	Authorized officer  LEE, Dong Yun  Telephone No. +82-42-481-8734
---	---	--



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/KR2015/004564

Box No. I Basis of this 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, this opinion has been established on the basis of a sequence listing:
  - a.  forming part of the international application as filed:
    - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
    - on paper or in the form of an image file.
  - b.  furnished together with the international application under PCT Rule 13ter.1(a) for the purposes of international search only in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
  - c.  furnished subsequent to the international filing date for the purposes of international search only:
    - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file (Rule 13ter.1(a)).
    - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13ter.1(b) and Administrative Instructions, Section 713).
4.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that forming part of 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/KR2015/004564**

**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)	Claims	<u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-23</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2006-0255963 A1 (R. DONALD THOMPSON et al.) 16 November 2006

D2: US 2013-0254705 A1 (DAVID J. MOORING et al.) 26 September 2013

2.1 Novelty (PCT Article 33(2)) and Inventive Step (PCT Article 33(3))

The present invention relates to a wearable device and a controlling method.

2.1.1 Claims 1-16

2.1.1.1 Independent Claim 1

D1, which is considered to be the closest prior art to the subject matter of claim 1, discloses a wearable device (see paragraph [0002] in D1) comprising:

a means to connect between the wearable device and a wireless device (see paragraph [0036] in D1); a means to interact by a user with the wireless device from the wearable device (see paragraph [0048] in D1); and a control device configured to update a user interface of the wearable device to reflect the interaction by the user (see paragraphs [0019], [0051] in D1).

Claim 1 differs from D1 in that this claim comprises "a display unit configured to display at least a portion of a graphics user interface that includes a plurality of home screens corresponding to the plurality of electronic devices." However, the aforementioned feature is merely a matter of design option by a person skilled in the art from the features of D1 (a display unit to generate the user interface of the wearable device, wherein the user interface displays lists including each of the available wireless devices; see paragraphs [0001], [0039], [0046] in D1). Accordingly, claim 1 would have been obvious over D1. Therefore, claim 1 is novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

Continued on Supplemental Box

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

**PCT/KR2015/004564**

**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:

1. The term "1. " used in claim 1 is vague and unclear. Therefore, claim 1 does not meet the requirement of PCT Article 6.

(Note: The international search report and the written opinion have been established on the assumption: the term "1." in claim 1 does not exist.)

2. The word "unpared" in claim 18 is considered to be a typographical error for "unpaired". Therefore, claim 18 does not meet the requirement of PCT Article 6.

(Note: The international search report and the written opinion have been established on the assumption: the term "unpared" in claim 18 is regarded as "unpaired".)

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of : Box No. V

2.1.1.2 Dependent Claim 3

The additional feature of claim 3, dependent on claim 1, can be easily derived from the feature of D1 (the user interface may be a series of push buttons, a scroll wheel, a numeric dialing pad, or another type of user interface means; see paragraph [0019] in D1).

Accordingly, claim 3 would have been obvious over D1. Therefore, claim 3 is novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

2.1.1.3 Dependent Claims 2 and 4-16

The additional feature of claim 2, dependent on claim 1, is merely a matter of design option from the combined features of D1 and D2 (the user interface screen may display lists including each of the available wireless devices; see paragraph [0039] in D1; and in response to detecting a universal gesture, a home screen is re-displayed; see paragraph [0059] in D2).

The additional features of claims 4-9, directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are merely matters of design option from the combined features of D1 and D2 (it is determined whether there are any wireless devices within an accepted proximity of the wearable device; see paragraph [0032] in D1; and in response to detecting a universal gesture, a home screen is re-displayed; see paragraph [0059] in D2).

The additional features of claims 10-14, directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are merely matters of design option from the feature of D2 (displaying a series of one or more application icons in response to user swipes so the user may scroll through the application icons and select one to open; see paragraph [0042] in D2).

The additional features of claims 15-16, directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are merely matters of design option from the features of D2 (a wearable computer may analyze and display information measured from sensors, and transmit the information via a communications interface; see paragraph [0030] in D2; and in response to detecting a universal gesture, a home screen is re-displayed; see paragraph [0059] in D2).

Accordingly, claims 2 and 4-16 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D2. Therefore, claims 2 and 4-16 are novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

Continued on The Next Page

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of : Previous Page

2.1.2 Claims 17-22

2.1.2.1 Independent Claim 17

The technical features of claim 17 essentially correspond to those of claim 1 except for the category of invention. Accordingly, the same reasoning as in claim 1 could be applied to claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 would have been obvious over D1 and is novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

2.1.2.2 Dependent Claim 19

The additional feature of claim 19, dependent on claim 17, essentially corresponds to that of claim 3, except for the category of invention. Accordingly, the same reasoning as in claim 3 could be applied to claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 would have been obvious over D1 and is novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

2.1.2.3 Dependent Claims 18 and 20-22

The additional features of claims 18 and 20-21, dependent on claim 17, essentially correspond to those of claims 2, 4, and 10, respectively, except for the category of invention. Accordingly, the same reasoning as in claims 2, 4, and 10 could be applied to claims 18 and 20-21, respectively.

The additional feature of claim 22, dependent on claim 17, is merely a matter of design option from the features of D2 (in response to detecting a universal gesture, a home screen is re-displayed; see paragraph [0059] in D2; and a wearable computer may analyze and display information measured from sensors, and transmit the information via a communications interface; see paragraph [0030] in D2).

Accordingly, claims 18 and 20-22 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D2. Therefore, claims 18 and 20-22 are novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

2.1.3 Claim 23

2.1.3.1 Independent Claim 23

The technical features of claim 23 essentially correspond to those of claim 17 except for the category of invention. Accordingly, the same reasoning as in claim 17 could be applied to

Continued on The Next Page

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of : Previous Page

claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 would have been obvious over D1 and is novel under PCT Article 33(2), but lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3).

2.2 Industrial Applicability (PCT Article 33(4))

Claims 1-23 are industrially applicable under PCT Article 33(4).