

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY


From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: JAECH, Jonathan ONE LLP 4000 MacArthur Boulevard East Tower, Suite 500 Newport Beach, California 92660 USA		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 09 June 2020 (09.06.2020)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference WBE063WO		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/US2019/065095	International filing date (day/month/year) 06 December 2019 (06.12.2019)	Priority date(day/month/year) 07 December 2018 (07.12.2018)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06Q 50/10(2012.01)i, H04N 21/414(2011.01)i, H04N 21/45(2011.01)i			
Applicant WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC.			
<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the opinion</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application</p> <p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>			

Name and mailing address of the ISA/KR International Application Division Korean Intellectual Property Office 189 Cheongsa-ro, Seo-gu, Daejeon, 35208, Republic of Korea Facsimile No. +82-42-481-8578	Date of completion of this opinion 09 June 2020 (09.06.2020)	Authorized officer HEO, Joo Hyung Telephone No. +82-42-481-8150	
---	---	---	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US2019/065095

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 43*bis*.1(b))
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 13*ter*.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 13*ter*.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13*ter*.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/US2019/065095

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 Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

complied with

not complied with for the following reasons:

Group 1, Claims 1-24 related to a computer-implemented method or an apparatus for selecting sensory content based on preference data for a passenger and delivering the sensory content to a vehicle.

Group 2, Claims 25-45 related to a computer-implemented method or an apparatus for automatically producing a video including preferred video clips.

The inventions listed as Groups 1 and 2 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1, because under PCT Rule 13.2 they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reason: they are separate inventions with distinct fields of search.

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. 1-24

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US2019/065095

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>1-24</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>4-5,16-17</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-3,6-15,18-24</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-24</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: KR 10-1654256 B1 (SK TELECOM CO., LTD.) 09 September 2016

D2: KR 10-2013-0047915 A (HONG, KI SEOP) 09 May 2013

D3: KR10-1765151 B1 (SAMSUNG C&T CORPORATION) 04 August 2017

D4: US 9272708 B2 (FORD GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.) 01 March 2016

D5: KR 10-1894573 B1 (PARK, HONG SIK) 04 September 2018

I. Novelty and Inventive Step (PCT Article 33(2) and (3))

1. Claims 1-12

1.1 Claim 1

D1 discloses a method for recommending contents according to vehicle passenger type (see paragraph [0024]), comprising: extracting recommended content information corresponding to passenger type according to a determination result of a passenger type determination unit (see paragraph [0048]); and sending the recommended content information corresponding to the passenger type to a terminal device (see paragraph [0007]).

Claim 1 differs from D1 in that a computer-implemented method comprises the step of selecting, by one or more processors, sensory content for delivery to a passenger in a vehicle based on geographic location data for a passenger of the vehicle. However, the feature is virtually suggested by the disclosure of D1 (providing various services such as entertainment through terminals in a vehicle by utilizing wireless communication technology and Global Positioning System (GPS) technology (see paragraph [0003])).

Accordingly, claim 1 would have been obvious over D1 and lacks an inventive step.

Continued on Supplemental Box

Supplemental Box

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

Continuation of : Box No. V

1.2 Claims 2, 7-8

The additional feature of claim 2 would be easily derived from the disclosure of D1 (receiving passenger information on a vehicle by a passenger information receiver (see claim 3); and extracting recommended content information matching passenger type information from a content information database (see claim 9)).

The additional feature of claim 7 is merely a matter of design option from the disclosure of D1 (sending recommended content information corresponding to passenger type to a terminal device (see paragraph [0007])).

The additional feature of claim 8 is merely a matter of design option from the disclosure of D1 (an passenger information collection device is mounted to each seat provided in a vehicle to collect passenger information seated in the seat (see paragraph [0007])).

Accordingly, claims 2, 7-8 would have been obvious over D1 and lack an inventive step.

1.3 Claim 3

The additional feature of claim 3 is virtually suggested by the disclosure of D2 (a vehicle management module transmits vehicle information on a shared vehicle to a connected customer terminal in real time, and stores and manages the vehicle information (see claim 1)).

Accordingly, claim 3 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D2 and lacks an inventive step.

1.4 Claim 6

The additional feature of claim 6 is virtually suggested by the disclosure of D1 (extracting content that matches a mood (see paragraph [0048])) and the disclosure of D3 (analyzing responses to virtual reality content based on heart rate or pulse, and providing different virtual reality content to each experiencer based on these responses (see paragraph [0038])).

Accordingly, claim 6 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D3 and lacks an inventive step.

1.5 Claims 9-10

Continued on The Next Page

Supplemental Box

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

Continuation of : Previous Page

The additional features of claims 9-10 are merely matters of design option from the disclosure of D4 (a projector (140) is mounted to a ceiling of a vehicle (100) and generally aimed toward a projection screen (145) to project media content onto the projection screen (145) for viewing by one or more passengers of a vehicle (100) (see column 2, lines 49-52; and figures 2A-2B)).

Accordingly, claims 9-10 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D4 and lack an inventive step.

1.6 Claims 11

The additional features of claims 11-12 are merely matters of design option from the disclosure of D5 (generating 3D digital actors having various characteristics such as age, emotion, personality, nationality, and race according to user preferences (see paragraph [0040])).

Accordingly, claims 11-12 would have been obvious over D1 in view of D5 and lack an inventive step.

1.7 Claims 4-5

The additional features of claims 4-5 are not disclosed in any of the documents, nor are they obvious to a person skilled in the art over the documents individually or in combination.

Accordingly, claims 4-5 are novel and involve an inventive step.

2. Claims 13-24

2.1 Claims 13-15, 18-24

Claims 13-15, 18-24 relate to an apparatus for personalizing a vehicle. The technical features of claims 13-15, 18-24 substantially correspond to those of claims 1-3, 6-12, respectively. Accordingly, claims 13-15, 18-24 lack an inventive step for the same reasons applied to claims 1-3, 6-12.

2.2 Claims 16-17

Continued on The Next Page

Supplemental Box

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

Continuation of : Previous Page

The additional features of claims 16-17 are not disclosed in any of the documents, nor are they obvious to a person skilled in the art over the documents individually or in combination.

Accordingly, claims 16-17 are novel and involve an inventive step.

II. Industrial Applicability (PCT Article 33(4))

Claims 1-24 are industrially applicable.