

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20 and 21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1 and 10 have been amended, claim 19 has been canceled and claims 20 and 21 have been added. Claims 1 and 10 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment

Support for the amendment to the specification can be found in the specification at, for example, original claim 10. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 10 and new claims 20 and 21 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 37, lines 8-27 and page 55, line 23 to page 56, line 2. No new matter is added.

II. Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Colan at the personal interview held April 22, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

III. Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification. As discussed during the April 22, 2009 personal interview, the specification has been amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Objection to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 1-19. As discussed during the April 22, 2009 personal interview, claims 1 and 10 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and claim 19 has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 10-19 under 35 U.S.C. §101. As discussed during the April 22, 2009 personal interview, claim 10 has been amended to obviate the rejection and claim 19 has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0130552 to Duluk et al. ("Duluk"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a storage resource management unit that "secures a storage region of an external storage apparatus so as to allocate the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource when the capacity of the storage resource necessary for allocation is larger than the remaining amount or secures the storage region of the external storage apparatus so as to write data written in a memory which has already been allocated to another module as the storage resource in the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus and allocate the storage region of the external storage apparatus in which the data is written to the other module in place of the memory in which the data had been written and allocates the memory which had been allocated to the other module as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource when the capacity of the storage resource necessary for allocation is larger than the remaining amount" and "the securable memory has a higher access speed than the external storage apparatus."

Independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, "when the capacity of the storage resource necessary for allocation is larger than the remaining amount, securing a storage region of an external storage apparatus so as to allocate the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus

as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource, or securing the storage region of the external storage apparatus so as to write data written in a memory which has been already allocated to another module as the storage resource in the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus and allocate the storage region of the external storage apparatus in which data is written to the other module in place of the memory in which the data had been written and allocating the memory which had been allocated to the other module as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource" and "the securable memory has a higher access speed than the external storage apparatus." The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1 and 10.

As discussed the April 22 personal interview, in the present application, when the remaining amount of a storage resource is limited, a storage region of an external storage apparatus is secured. Therefore, in this scenario, failure of the entire processing of the image processing can be avoided. See page 36, line 24 to page 37, line 7 of the specification. Duluk does not disclose the securing of a storage region of an external storage apparatus. Thus, in Duluk, under the same scenario, the entire processing of an image processing would fail. Accordingly, Duluk fails to disclose or suggest a storage resource management unit that secures a storage region of an external storage apparatus so as to allocate the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource when the capacity of the storage resource necessary for allocation is larger than the remaining amount or secures the storage region of the external storage apparatus so as to write data written in a memory which has already been allocated to another module as the storage resource in the secured storage region of the external storage apparatus and allocate the storage region of the external storage apparatus in which the data is written to the other module in place of the memory in which the data had been written and

allocates the memory which had been allocated to the other module as the storage resource to the module that needs to be allocated with the storage resource when the capacity of the storage resource necessary for allocation is larger than the remaining amount and the securable memory has a higher access speed than the external storage apparatus.

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1 and 10 and for the additional features that they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

VII. New Claims 20 and 21 are Added

New claims 20 and 21 are added. As discussed during the April 22, 2009 personal interview, new claims 20 and 21 are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1 and 10 and for the additional features they recite.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18, 20 and 21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/mkg

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 19, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--