

## Notification of Reason(s) for Rejection

Date of Service: January 24, 2012

Application No.: 2007-042369  
Drafted: January 20, 2012  
Examiner: M. Kawachi 3631 3W00  
Agent: S. Sugimoto et al.  
Applicable Clauses: Secs. 1 and 2 of Art. 29 and Art. 37

This application is to be rejected on the grounds as set forth below. A response to this Office Action should be made within three months from the mailing date of service.

### GROUND(S)

#### <Ground 1>

This application does not meet the requirements as set forth in Art. 37 of the Patent Law for reasons described below.

### REMARKS

(See **List of the documents referred to in the Reasons for Rejection** for a particular reference)

The invention as set forth in Claim 1 does not have special technical features in view of the disclosure of Ref. 1 (for detail, see Grounds 2 and 3 below).

Accordingly, the same or corresponding special technical features cannot be found between the invention as set forth in Claim 1 and the inventions as set forth in Claims 2-17.

However, the unity of invention is not questioned exceptionally for the inventions as set forth in Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-17, pursuant to the Examination Guidelines (cf. "Examination Guidelines for Patent and Utility Model" Part 1, Chapter 2, Section 4.2.)

In summary, the invention as set forth in Claim 1 and the inventions as set forth in Claims 7 and 13 are not of a group of inventions recognized as fulfilling the requirement of unity of invention. Thus, the instant application does not meet the requirements as set forth in Art. 37 of the Patent Law.

Since the instant application violates the provision of Art. 37 of the Patent Law, the inventions as set forth in Claims 7 and 13 have not been examined as to the statutory requirements other than those stipulated under Art. 37.

**<Grounds 2 and 3>**

The invention as set forth in the following claims is deemed to have been anticipated in the following publications and/or the electric communication networks made available to the public in general prior to the effective filing date of this application and is, therefore, deemed unpatentable under Sec. 1, para. 3, of Art. 29 of the Patent Law.

The invention as set forth in the claims specified below is deemed to have been obvious to those skilled in the art from the following published document(s) and/or the electric communication networks made available to the public in general prior to the effective filing date of this application and is, therefore, deemed unpatentable under Sec. 2 of Art. 29 of the Patent Law.

**REMARKS**

**(See List of the documents referred to in the Reasons for Rejection  
for a particular reference)**

(1) Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-16 are rejected on the basis of Grounds 2 and 3 as they are deemed to be either anticipated by or obvious over Ref. 1.

Ref. 1 discloses a control device which comprises a pivot of a brake lever arranged in a position that is not intermediate between the intersection of a direction, according to which an end length of a traction cable extends, with the brake lever, and a first actuation area of the brake lever. The control device is not substantially distinct in terms of structure from the inventions as set forth in Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-16.

(2) Claim 17 is rejected on the basis of Ground 3 as it is deemed to be obvious over Refs. 1 and 2.

See Fig. 2 of Ref. 2.

**List of the documents referred to in the Reasons for Rejection**

Ref. 1: JP Laid-open Patent Publication No. S58-030884

Ref. 2: JP Laid-open Patent Publication No. H05-097088

-----  
Record from Prior Art Reference Search

Field of Search:           IPC   B62L   3/02

Prior Art References:

Microfilm for JP Utility Model Application No. S56-117189 (JP  
Laid-open Utility Model Publication No. S58-003987)

JP Laid-open Patent Publication No. H07-033063

JP Laid-open Patent Publication No. H08-328679

This record from the above search for prior art references does not form any  
part of the ground(s) of rejection.