

EXHIBIT 19

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hirabayashi, *et al.* Examiner: Shiue, Dong-Chang
Serial No.: 13/874,535 Confirmation No.: 9744
Filed: May 1, 2013 Art Unit: 2648
Title: MOBILE TERMINAL AND CONTROL METHOD THEREOF

AMENDMENT

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Non-Final Office Action dated April 27, 2018, for which a shortened statutory period of three months, ending July 27, 2018, was set in which to respond, the following remarks are submitted and reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS begin on page 2 of this document.

REMARKS begin on page 9 of this document.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A mobile terminal configured to switch between an unlocked and a locked state in which a predetermined operation is limited, comprising:

a transceiver which performs short-range wireless communications;

a memory which previously stores information about an another mobile terminal; and

a controller which switches the mobile terminal between an unlocked and a locked state based on an authentication input to the mobile terminal;

wherein, when ~~predetermined~~ conditions are met, the controller controls the mobile terminal to transmit information to the another mobile terminal for switching a state of the another mobile terminal from a locked state to an unlocked state ~~to the another mobile terminal;~~

wherein the ~~predetermined~~ conditions include:

first, a state of the mobile terminal is in a locked state, the another mobile terminal is in a locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state;

~~a state of the another mobile terminal is a locked state;~~

~~the another mobile terminal is in communication range of the short range wireless communications of the transceiver;~~

second, after the mobile terminal is in the locked state, the another mobile terminal is in the locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state, performing, via the transceiver, ~~performs~~ the short-range wireless communications with the another mobile

terminal; and

third, after the performing, receiving, by the controller, ~~receives~~ the authentication input for switching the mobile terminal from the locked state to the unlocked state.

2. (Cancelled)

3. (Currently Amended) The mobile terminal according to claim 13, wherein[[:]] the transceiver, based on the authentication input, transmits, to the another mobile terminal, a signal to transit the another mobile terminal to a locked state by performing the short-range wireless communications.

4. (Currently Amended) The mobile terminal according to claim 13, wherein[[:]] before unlocking the another mobile terminal, the mobile terminal requests confirmation from a user.

5. (Currently Amended) The mobile terminal according to claim 13, wherein[[:]] the controller performs short-range wireless communications with the another mobile terminal by the transceiver and sets the mobile terminal to be in an unlocked state when the another mobile terminal is stored in the memory and is in communication range of the short-range wireless communications by the transceiver when the mobile terminal is in a locked state

6. (Cancelled)

7. (Cancelled)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, and 12-25 are pending in this application; claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, and 13-16 are amended; and claims 2, 6, 7, 9, and 11 are canceled. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, for example in paragraphs [0022]-[0031] of the published application, the corresponding figures, and the originally-filed claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being added by the Amendments to the Claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 8, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chin (US 2006/0224882). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1 is hereby amended to recite the feature, "... wherein the conditions include: first, the mobile terminal is in a locked state, the another mobile terminal is in a locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state; second, after the mobile terminal is in the locked state, the another mobile terminal is in the locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state, performing, via the transceiver, the short-range wireless communications with the another mobile terminal; and third, after the performing, receiving, by the controller, the authentication input for switching the mobile terminal from the locked state to the unlocked state..." Independent claims 8 and 15 are also hereby amended to recite similar features. No such configuration is taught or suggested by Chin.

Specifically, these amendments to claims 1, 8, and 15 clearly identify a condition relating to when the controller transmits information to the another mobile terminal. That is, the mobile

terminal communicates (transmits and receives information) with the another mobile terminal **before** the status of the another mobile terminal changes from “lock” to “unlock” by receiving information from the mobile terminal. Further, the amendments to claims 1, 8, and 15 specify the particular order of processing, which is not taught or suggested by Chin.

Chin discloses a method for unlocking a device in which the user first enters a password into a first computing device. *See* Chin [0026]. Specifically, Chin discloses unlocking the “locked” status of a PC (the another terminal) when combining a PDA with the PC. Subsequently, the user couples the first computing device to a second computing device. *See* Chin [0027] and step 330 of Fig. 3. In Chin, the subsequent act of coupling the first computing device (which has already been unlocked) to the second computing device results in the unlocking of the second computing device. *See* Chin [0014] (“A password locked computing device may be unlocked by coupling the locked device to a password unlocked computing device”). However, the locked device (PDA) of Chin **cannot** communicate (transmit and receive information) with the unlocked computing device (PC) because communication between the PDA and the PC is **NOT** established **before** the combining, as required by the present disclosure. As such, Chin fails to teach or suggest, “... wherein the conditions include: first, the mobile terminal is in a locked state, the another mobile terminal is in a locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state; second, after the mobile terminal is in the locked state, the another mobile terminal is in the locked state, and the another mobile terminal is within communication range of the short-range wireless communications of the transceiver while in the locked state, performing, via the transceiver, the short-range wireless communications with the another mobile terminal; and third, after the performing, receiving, by the controller, the

authentication input for switching the mobile terminal from the locked state to the unlocked state...” as recited in claims 1, 8, and 15.

Moreover, the present disclosure teaches that the state of both devices (the mobile terminal and the another mobile terminal) are altered (changed from a locked state to an unlocked state) only once the two devices are in range of each other. On the other hand, Chin only teaches altering the state of the second device once the second device is within range of the first device. The first device of Chin is already unlocked before being coupled with the second device, as shown in Chin Figure 3. Additionally, in Figure 3 of Chin, at 310, Chin states “associate computing devices with password.” “Associate” can not and does not mean “couple.” As taught by Chin, “associate” means “recognizable,” (*See*, Chin at [0020] and [0030]) and not “paired,” “connected,” or “coupled.”

Furthermore, Chin fails to teach or suggest changing the status of the another mobile terminal by the mobile terminal when the another mobile terminal is in a wireless communication area of the mobile terminal. Specifically, claims 1, 8, and 15 include, “the mobile terminal is in a locked state” and “the another mobile terminal is in a locked state” as conditions for when the controller is to transmit information to the another mobile terminal. That is, a status of the another mobile terminal is “lock” when the mobile terminal transmits information to the another mobile terminal. Chin fails to disclose such limitations. Chin requires that a status of the PDA is “unlock” when combining the PDA with the PC in order to unlock a status of the PC. In other words, there is absolutely no disclosure by Chin that any status of the another mobile terminal is changed by the mobile terminal when the another mobile terminal is in a wireless communication area of the mobile terminal.

Furthermore, another feature of the present disclosure is that the mobile terminal

transmits information for changing a status from Lock to Unlock to the another mobile terminal once specified conditions are met in the order specified. In other words, the meeting of specified conditions is a trigger for the transmission of information. This is clear from the amended claim language shown in claims 1, 8, and 15. Chin fails to disclose any such conditions.

As such, Applicant submits claims 1, 8, 15, and the claims dependent thereon are allowable over Chin for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that this rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 12-14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin in view of Smith (US 2013/0183936).

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin and Smith and in view of Gerhardt (US 2012/0280790).

Claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin in view of Friedlaender (US 2011/0195665).

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin in view of Gerhardt.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection(s).

Independent claim 1 recites, “A mobile terminal configured to switch between an unlocked and a locked state in which a predetermined operation is limited, comprising: a transceiver which performs short-range wireless communications; a memory which previously stores information about an another mobile terminal; and a controller which switches the mobile



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/874,535	05/01/2013	Masayuki HIRABAYASHI	072388.0418	9744
21003	7590	04/27/2018	EXAMINER SHIUE, DONG-CHANG	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2648	
			NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE 04/27/2018 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 13/874,535	Applicant(s) HIRABAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner DONG-CHANG SHIUE	Art Unit 2648	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) DONG-CHANG SHIUE. (3) Jonathan D. Cocks.
 (2) Wesley Kim. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 April 2018.

Type: Telephonic Video Conference
 Personal [copy given to: applicant applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed 101 112 102 103 Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chin (US 20060224882).

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The applicant's representative went over the invention and described the elements that would distinguish this invention from others. The predetermined conditions recited in amended claim 1 were particularly described and discussed. Examiners introduced Chin reference (US 20060224882) and indicated that Chin's Figure 3 along with paragraphs [0031-0032] read on the predetermined conditions recited in claim 1. No other agreement was reached..

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/DONG-CHANG SHIUE/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2648

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 13/874,535	Applicant(s) HIRABAYASHI ET AL.	
Examiner DONG-CHANG SHIUE	Art Unit 2648	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status No

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/29/2018.
 A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims*

- 5) Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,10 and 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,10, and 12-25 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

Certified copies:

- a) All b) Some** c) None of the:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

** See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 3) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 13/874,535
Art Unit: 2648

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

The present application is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent provisions.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/29/2018 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On pages 10-11 of Remarks filed on 03/29/2018, Applicant submits that (1) the mobile terminal communicates (transmits and receives information) with the another mobile terminal **before** the status of the another mobile terminal changes from "lock" to "unlock" by receiving information from the mobile terminal. However, the locked device (PDA) of Chin cannot communicate (transmit and receive information) with the unlocked computing device (PC) because communication between the PDA and the PC is NOT established before the combining, as required by the present disclosure. (2) Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to include, "a Lock status of the mobile terminal" and "a Lock status of the another mobile terminal" as conditions for when the controller is to

Application/Control Number: 13/874,535
Art Unit: 2648

Page 3

transmit information to the another mobile terminal. That is, a status of the another mobile terminal is "lock" when the mobile terminal transmits information to the another mobile terminal. Chin fails to disclose such limitations. Chin requires that a status of the PDA is "unlock" when combining the PDA with the PC in order to unlock a status of the PC. In other words, there is absolutely no disclosure by Chin that any status of the another mobile terminal is changed by the mobile terminal when the another mobile terminal is in a wireless communication area of the mobile terminal.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to (1), in the first three limitations recited in Claim 1 (and similarly in Claim 8 and 15), the limitations merely state that a transceiver performing short-range communication, a memory previously storing information, and a controller switching the mobile terminal between an unlocked and a locked state, which are interpreted as the capabilities of the mobile terminal. Chin disclose these capabilities in at least Fig. 1, Abstract, and paragraphs [0016] & [0018]. See citation in 102 Rejections below.

In response to (2), the predetermined conditions are clearly disclosed by Chin in at least Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0031-0032] because the predetermined conditions do not specify a particular order of existence or as a function of time line. Each condition is disclosed in Fig. 3, for instance, both computing devices (or mobile terminals) are locked before unlocking the first computing device in Block 320. Further, in [0032] and Block 350 of Fig. 3, the second computing device is unlocked by the first computing device when the second computing device is in a wireless communication area of the first computing device. See citation in 102 Rejections below.