

Mailing Date: 5 July 2008

Notice of Rejection

Patent Application No.: 2003-123456
Drafting Date: 3 July 2008
Applicable Law: Articles 29 main paragraph,
29(2), and 36

This application is rejected for the reasons below. Any amendments and/or arguments must be submitted in writing within 60 days of the mailing date of this rejection.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected as unpatentable for failure to constitute creations involving technical concepts that utilize a law of nature pursuant to Art. 29 main paragraph.

(1) Although the functions of the apparatus of claims 1-3 are described, for example, as "means for making distributable", the functions to be achieved are expressed simply as "means" and are not configured as specific means in which software and hardware resources work together.

(2) The method of claim 4, although described as a computer system operating method, simply describes the functions to be achieved and does not constitute a particular computer system operating method.

The program of claim 5 and the medium of claim 6 do not constitute creations involving technical concepts that utilize a law of nature.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected as indefinite pursuant to Art. 36(2)(ii).

(1) Claims 1-3 are indefinite because, even though they describe a "system" and are thus inventions within the category of "things", they are described functionally; what specific

things have these individual functions cannot be easily ascertained.

(2) The method of claim 4, the program of claim 5, and the medium of claim 6 are indefinite.

(3) Even referring to the specification, it is not clear what sort of thing or method is claimed, or how configured.

3. The written description is inadequate pursuant to Art. 36(4)(i)

Overall, the definitions and configurations are unclear.

Although a system having various functions is schematically described, there is no description of how the software and the hardware are configured to implement those functions.

Accordingly, the detailed description of the invention of the present application is not fully and clearly described so as to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention of claims 1-6.

4. Claims 1-6 are obvious over the cited references pursuant to Art. 29(2).

Cited reference 1 describes a system for distributing content, in which the operator and the content provider check the content and, in the event that publication of the content is allowed, the system allows the content to be published. The system has means for the operator to instruct whether or not to publish, and transmits an e-mail containing a URL for the content to the content provider so that the content provider can check the content according to the URL in the e-mail thus transmitted, and allows revisions by the content provider.

Cited reference 2 describes a system in which, of documents input by a documents creator, those that are authorized by an authorizing agent can be made available for viewing.

Cited reference 3 describes a workflow system in which, when an authorized person does not authorize the details of a

process, the authorized person has the authority to make corrections and to continue processing according to the process thus corrected.

Accordingly, applying the above-described known art to the system of cited reference 1 renders the present invention obvious.

List of cited references:

- (1) JP-2002-XXXXXX-A
- (2) JP-2001-YYYYYY-A
- (3) JP-2002-ZZZZZZ-A

Record of Prior Art Document Search Results:

Searched Fields(s): IPC G06Q10/100-50/00

Prior Art Document: JP-2002-AAAAAA-A

This record of prior art document search results does not constitute a part of the rejection.