

REMARKS

Claims 1, 15, 18 -19, 27 and 29 – 33 have been canceled. Claims 2, 4 - 7, 9, 11 - 14, 16 - 17, 20 – 22, 24 - 26, and 28 have been amended. New independent claims 34 and 35 have been added to replace canceled independent claims 1 and 19, respectively.

The Examiner rejected all pending claims as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US 2005/0255912 to Love et al and US 7,938,546 to Blonde et al. The primary reference, Love, does not describe a display source divider that divides a source image into a left and right image in a manner required by the amended claims. More specifically, Love teaches that a single source image is replicated to generate multiple video streams (at paragraph [0050] – [0054] describing Fig. 6. In order to view a single image, at [0053], “at 608, pixel data of all but a designated one of the display regions is obscured such that only the designated display region has a discernable image.”

In contrast, claim 34 requires that the source image be divided in to left and right images which are then processed separately and ultimately displayed separately to a left eye and a right eye independent of each other. More specifically, claim 34 recites in part:

receive data representing a source image,
divide the source image into a left image and a right image,
determine periphery colors for the left image and periphery colors for the right
image,
combine the left image and the determined periphery colors for the left image by
directing the first peripheral light element to display the determined left image periphery
colors only in a peripheral region of the first image,
combine the right image and the determined periphery colors for the right image
by directing the second peripheral light element to display the determined right image
periphery colors only in a peripheral region of the second image, and
project the combined left image only to the first display and the combined right
image only to the second display to create an enhanced viewing experience for the user.

The Applicant therefore believes that neither Love nor Blonde taken singly or in any reasonable combination teaches or even remotely suggests claim 34.

Claim 35 recites essentially the same limitations as claim 34 as is also believed to be allowable. All remaining claims depend from either claim 34 or 35 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

Cupertino Financial Center
10050 North Wolfe Road
Suite 260
Cupertino, CA 95014
T: 408.341.3000
F: 408.703.5445