REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-33 are pending in the application. In this amendment, claims 9-11 are canceled, claims 1, 12, 32, and 33 are amended, and new claims 34-88 are added. The amendments to claims 1, 32, and 33 include a plurality of limitations of now-canceled claim 9 and the limitations of now-canceled claim 10. New claims 34-85 correspond to pending claims 2 and 4-31. New claims 86-88 correspond to a plurality of limitations of each of claims 1, 32, and 33, respectively, plus a plurality of recitations of now-canceled claim 9 and a plurality of recitations of now-canceled claim 11. Additional support for new claims 86-88 can be found at least at paragraph [0155] of the Specification as filed.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 13-17, 19-23, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)(1) as anticipated by Seo (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2013/0321340). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo and Park (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2015/0061968). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo, Park, and Hayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2015/00220493). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo and Kuscher (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2018/0095611). Applicants wish thank Examiner Duong for indication of allowable subject-matter with respective claims 10-12, 18, 20-21, and 24-31.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Duong for the courtesy and thoughtful treatment extended to Applicants representative during the March 8, 2021 telephonic interview. During the interview, Applicant presented the amendments to claim 1, which the Examiner indicated as allowable. Applicant also presented a new claim incorporating a plurality of recitations of each of claims 1, 9, and 11, about which no agreement was reached.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 13-17, 19-23, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)(1) as anticipated by Seo. This rejection is respectfully overcome.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part (emphasis added):

before receiving a gesture input associated with a respective location on the second display, displaying, on the second display, the one or more controls associated with the content;

while displaying the content, receiving, via the one or more input devices, the gesture input associated with the respective location on the second display;

while receiving the gesture input, deemphasizing the one or more controls on the second display; and

in response to receiving the gesture input, manipulating the content in accordance with the gesture input

Seo fails to disclose all of the above recitations. The above recitations are from allowable claim 10 and/or intervening claim 9. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating, during the telephonic interview, that claim 1, as amended above, is allowable.

Claims 32 and 33 include similar recitations to claim 1 and are therefore patentable over the cited references for similar reasons. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 32, and 33 (and their dependent claims) be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo and Park. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo, Park, and Hayashi. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Seo and Kuscher. These rejections are respectfully overcome.

Claims 6, 7, and 8 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over Seo for the reasons discussed above and the remaining references fail to cure the deficiencies of Seo. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6-7 be withdrawn.

New Claims 86-88. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 86-88 are patentable over the cited references.

For example, new claim 86 requires, in part (emphasis added):

while concurrently displaying the first content on the first display and the second content on the second display, receiving, via the one or more input

devices, a gesture input associated with a respective location on the second display; and

in response to receiving the gesture input:

in accordance with a determination that the gesture input is a single contact gesture input, manipulating the second content on the second display *without manipulating the first content on the first display*; and

in accordance with a determination that the gesture input is a double contact gesture input, manipulating the first content on the first display *without manipulating the second content on the second display*.

New claim 86 includes a plurality of recitations from each of claims 1, 9 (now canceled), and 11 (now canceled). During the interview, Applicant presented a different proposed claim incorporating recitations from claims 1, 9, and 11 and the Examiner indicated that the proposed claim would not be allowable, presenting Fig. 9B of Seo. Fig. 9B of Seo illustrates the user manipulating thumbnails on two displays by providing a touch input to one of the displays. This is not the same as manipulating content on one display without manipulating content on the other display. Thus, Seo does not disclose, teach, or suggest "in accordance with a determination that the gesture input is a single contact gesture input, manipulating the second content on the second display *without manipulating the first content on the first display*" and "in accordance with a determination that the gesture input is a double contact gesture input, manipulating the first content on the first display *without manipulating the second content on the second display*," as required by new claim 86.

The remaining cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of Seo. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 86 is patentable over the cited references. Claims 87 and 88 include similar recitations as claim 86 and are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions asserted by the Examiner, the Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce in other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **602925** referencing Docket No. **106842163100 (P35542US1)**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 15, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Sarah H. Stevens/
Sarah H. Stevens
Registration No. 74,818
KUBOTA & BASOL LLP
445 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2140
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 408-0796