

The examination is being carried out on the **following application documents**

**Description, Pages**

1, 4-54	as originally filed	
2, 3	filed in electronic form on	04-03-2020

**Claims, Numbers**

1-15	filed in electronic form on	04-06-2021
------	-----------------------------	------------

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/15-15/15	as originally filed
------------	---------------------

- 1 The following issues were discussed during a MS Teams call with the representative:
- 2 **Article 76(1) EPC**
- 2.1 The present application has been filed as a divisional application of the earlier application EP10194359. The claims are based on the description of the earlier application, but fail to include some features:
- 2.2 In the earlier application, the unlocking based on events always includes “**a plurality** of unlock images” (see par. 99), while the claim only has one unlock image (the interactive user interface object). Thus, the claimed subject-matter is not unambiguously derivable.
- 2.3 The applicant noted that the claim is based mainly on the embodiment of fig. 7d, which only shows one button.
- 2.4 The examiner noted that he reads the application as following: paragraphs 91-93, and figures 7a-7d show an embodiment, in which
  - a device is locked,
  - an incoming call is received, and
  - upon unlocking the phone with the slider, virtual buttons for accepting and declining the call gradually appear, and
  - upon completing the unlocking, the buttons can be interacted with.

- 2.4.1 The applicant inquired whether the examiner considered that the claim needs to define the buttons and that the event is an incoming call. The applicant also pointed to fig. 11d, which shows another type of event (message) and to par. 99.
- 2.4.2 The examiner noted, that claim 1 defines a method starting from being locked to going to an unlocked state. He added that par. 91-93 only talk about a call, and more importantly, the buttons also relate to call functions (accepting, declining). Par. 99 relates to a different embodiment, using two sliders. Similarly, fig. 11d also relates to a two slider embodiment, and does not include the concept of gradually showing the user interface.
- 2.4.3 With regard to par. 99, the examiner also noted that, the last step of the claim is not unambiguously derivable ("in response to detecting the gesture that satisfies the predefined condition, transitioning the device from the locked state to an unlocked state and displaying an application interface (708) for the application associated with the event"). Par. 99 notes: "Performing the unlock action using one of the multiple unlock images unlocks the device and displays the **application and/or event** corresponding to the unlock image.", i.e. both an application and event are displayed. The claim leaves the option to only display the application, e.g. a messaging application, without showing the event (incoming message).

### 3 Procedure

- 3.1 The examiner noted that the Article 76(1) EPC objection could be overcome either by amending the claim along par. 93-99, or by amending the claim in accordance with par. 99f. For par. 99f, note should be taken of the granted family member, which defines a similar idea.
- 3.2 A time limit of **3 months** was agreed upon with the applicant.