

Date	August 31, 2004	Court	Tokyo District Court, 47th Civil Division
Case number	2003 (Wa) 18830, etc.		
<p>– A case in which the court found that the facts of infringement of patent rights included in the notice given by the patentee to the business partner of another person with whom the patentee is in a competitive relationship were false facts but such act of giving notice was made as part of a justifiable exercise of rights. Based on these findings, the court held that the illegality will be eliminated and such act does not fall under the act of unfair competition prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act (item (xv) of said paragraph in the current Act).</p>			

Reference: Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act (item (xv) of said paragraph in the current Act)

Number of related rights, etc.: Patent No. 2803236

### Summary of the Judgment

#### 1. Background, etc.

The plaintiff is a manufacturer and distributor of household accounting software (the "Product"), while the defendant holds a patent right ("Patent Right") for icons.

The plaintiff sought a declaratory judgment on the absence of the right to claim an injunction based on the Patent Right by the defendant against the plaintiff alleging that the act of manufacturing and selling, etc. the Product does not constitute infringement of the Patent Right. The plaintiff also claimed a declaratory judgment on the absence of rights and compensation for damages based on an allegation that the defendant's act of giving notice that the plaintiff was infringing the rights including the Patent Right to the company engaged in the sales of personal computers in which the Product is pre-installed or filing a petition for provisional disposition seeking an injunction against the act of selling or otherwise handling computers in which the Product is installed constitutes the act of business defamation as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act (at that time; item (xv) of said paragraph in the current Act; the same applies hereinafter) (principal action).

The defendant claimed against the plaintiff an injunction against the manufacture and sale, etc. of the Product as well as the destruction thereof based on an allegation that the act of manufacturing and selling, etc. the Product constitutes infringement (indirect infringement) of the Patent Right (counterclaim).

#### 2. Summary of the court decision

The court dismissed the counterclaim on the grounds that the act of installing the

Product does not constitute infringement of the Patent Right (the claim for a declaratory judgment on the absence of obligations has been dismissed due to the lack of benefits for issuing a declaratory judgment as long as a counterclaim has been filed). Moreover, the court held as follows with respect to the claim for damages based on the act of business defamation made in the principal action and dismissed such claim.

The plaintiff and the defendant are in a competitive relationship and the contents notified by the defendant are false facts.

However, even so, [i] if the other party to which the notice was given is a person engaged in the sale of computers in which the Product is pre-installed and the patentee's act of giving the notice was conducted as part of a justifiable exercise of the patent right against said other party, it is appropriate to construe that the illegality of giving such notice will be eliminated; and [ii] in contrast, if such act of giving a notice is found to have gone beyond the scope of exercising rights for being extremely inappropriate in terms of its content and manner in light of socially accepted conventions such that, externally, the notice had been given as part of the patentee's exercise of rights but, in reality, it had been given for the purpose of gaining an edge in the market by damaging the competitor's credit, it should be construed that illegality will not be eliminated and such act constitutes the act of unfair competition as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act.

According to the facts, the defendant's acts of giving notices, etc. can be found to have been conducted as part of the patentee's justifiable exercise of rights while it cannot be found that such act of giving the notice has gone beyond the scope of exercising rights for being made for the purpose of gaining an edge in the market by damaging the plaintiff's credit or being extremely inappropriate in terms of its contents and manner in light of socially accepted conventions.

Judgment rendered on August 31, 2004

2003 (Wa) 18830, Case of Seeking Declaratory Judgment on Absence of Right to Claim Injunction Against Infringement of Patent Right, etc.

2003 (Wa) 24798, Case of Counterclaim Seeking Injunction Against Infringement of Patent Right

Date of conclusion of oral argument: May 21, 2004

#### Judgment

Plaintiff in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim): JustSystems Corporation

Defendant in the principal action (plaintiff in the counterclaim): Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.

#### Main text

1. Among the claims made in the principal action by the plaintiff in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim), the claim seeking a declaratory judgment on the absence of the right to claim an injunction shall be dismissed without prejudice while all of the other claims shall be dismissed with prejudice on the merits.
2. All of the claims made in counterclaim by the plaintiff in the counterclaim (defendant in the principal action) shall be dismissed with prejudice on the merits.
3. The court costs shall be divided into two portions for both the principal action and counterclaim, half of which shall be borne by the plaintiff in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim) while the remaining portion shall be borne by the plaintiff in the counterclaim (defendant in the principal action).

#### Facts and reasons

##### No. 1 Claims

##### 1. Claims made in the principal action

(1) The court declares that the defendant (plaintiff in the counterclaim) does not have the right to claim an injunction based on the patent right held for Patent No. 2803236 against the act of manufacturing, assigning, etc. (assigning, leasing, or providing through a telecommunication line) and offering for assignment, etc. the products specified in the attached list of articles by the plaintiff in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim).

(2) The defendant in the principal action (plaintiff in the counterclaim) shall not notify to a third party or spread in writing or orally the fact that the acts of manufacturing, assigning, etc. (assigning, leasing, or providing through a telecommunication line) and offering for assignment, etc. the products specified in the attached list of articles constitute infringement of the patent right held for Patent No. 2803236.

(3) The defendant in the principal action (plaintiff in the counterclaim) shall pay to the plaintiff

in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim) 100,000 yen and money accrued thereon at the rate of 5% per annum for the period from September 2, 2003 (the day immediately following the day of service of complaint), until the date of completion of the payment.

## 2. Claims made in the counterclaim

(1) The defendant in the counterclaim (plaintiff in the principal action) shall not manufacture, assign, etc. (assigning, leasing or providing through a telecommunication line) or offer for assignment, etc. the products specified in the attached list of articles.

(2) The defendant in the counterclaim (plaintiff in the principal action) shall dispose of the products stated in the preceding paragraph.

## No. 2 Outline of the case

### 1. Facts, etc. undisputed by the parties

#### (1) Parties

The plaintiff in the principal action (defendant in the counterclaim; hereinafter simply referred to as the "Plaintiff") is a stock company incorporated for the purpose of the development, sale, etc. of computer systems.

The defendant in the principal action (plaintiff in the counterclaim; hereinafter simply referred to as the "Defendant") is a stock company engaged in the manufacturing, sale, etc. of video and audio equipment, home electrical appliances, information and communication equipment, etc. as a business.

#### (2) The Defendant's patent right

The Defendant has the following patent right (the "Patent Right"; the invention described in Claim 1 shall be referred to as "Invention 1," the invention described in Claim 2 shall be referred to as "Invention 2," and the invention described in Claim 3 shall be referred to as "Invention 3": the three inventions shall be collectively referred to as the "Inventions"; the description concerning the patent in question ("Patent") (Exhibit Ko No. 13; refer to the attached patent gazette) shall be referred to as the "Description").

Patent No. 2803236

Title of the invention: Equipment and method of information processing

Application filing date: October 31, 1989

Application number: Patent Application No. 1989-283583

Publication date: June 20, 1991

Publication Number: Publication of Unexamined Patent Application No. 1991-144719

Registration date: July 17, 1998

#### Claim 1

"An information processing device characterized by having [i] a display means to display on the display screen the first icon, which triggers the execution of the function of displaying the

functional description of an icon, and the second icon, which triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function, [ii] a designation means to designate an icon displayed on the display screen of said display means, and [iii] a control means to display the functional description of the second icon on the display screen of said display means in response to the designation of the second icon subsequent to the designation of the first icon by said designation means.

#### Claim 2

"The information processing device described in Claim 1, which is characterized by the process where, if the designation of the second icon by said designation means does not immediately follow the designation of the first icon, said control means triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function of said second icon. "

#### Claim 3

"An information processing method that is designed to control a device equipped with a data input device and a data display device and that is characterized by the process where the first icon, which triggers the execution of the function of displaying a functional description, and the second icon, which triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function, are displayed on the display screen, and the functional description of said second icon is displayed on the display screen in response to the designation of the second icon subsequent to the designation of the first icon.

#### (3) Decomposition into the constituent features

A. Invention 1 may be decomposed into the following constituent features:

1-A. A display means to display on the display screen the first icon, which triggers the execution of the function of displaying the functional description of an icon, and the second icon, which triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function;

1-B. A designation means to designate an icon displayed on the display screen of said display means;

1-C. A control means to display the functional description of the second icon on the display screen of said display means in response to the designation of the second icon subsequent to the designation of the first icon by said designation means;

1-D. An information processing device characterized by having 1-A. to 1-C. above

B. Invention 2 may be decomposed into the following constituent features:

2-A. The process where, if the designation of the second icon by said designation means does not immediately follow the designation of the first icon, said control means triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function of said second icon;

2-B. The information processing device described in Claim 1 which is characterized by 2-A. above

C. Invention 3 may be decomposed into the following constituent features:

3-A. An information processing method that is designed to control a device equipped with a data input device and data display device;

3-B. The first icon, which triggers the execution of the function of displaying a functional description, and the second icon, which triggers the execution of the predetermined information processing function, are displayed on the display screen;

3-C. The functional description of said second icon is displayed on the display screen in response to the designation of the second icon subsequent to the designation of the first icon;

3-D. An information processing method characterized by 3-A. to 3-C. above

(4) Plaintiff's act

The Plaintiff has been engaged in manufacturing, assigning, etc. (assigning, leasing, or providing through a telecommunication line) or offering for assignment, etc., the product specified in the attached list of articles (hereinafter referred to as the "Product").

Any user who was assigned or otherwise given the Product has installed it in his/her computer and has been using it. On the computer in which the Product has been installed, the help function is carried out and displayed as described in the attached "Display of help function" (among the explanations made in the attached "Display of help function," the "display" button, "property" button and "cancel" button shall hereinafter be collectively referred to as "'display' buttons, etc.").

(5) Defendant's act

The Defendant gave a notice to Sotec Co., Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Sotec"), which was engaged in the sale of computers in which the Product is pre-installed, by a document dated May 31, 2001, to the effect that the abovementioned computers infringe the patent rights including the right pertaining to the Patent.

In addition, the Defendant demanded Sotec to immediately stop selling the computers in which the Product is pre-installed and the computers sold together with the Product and to clarify the unit sales, net sales and stock volumes of the abovementioned computers based on an allegation that such computers infringe the patent rights including the right pertaining to the Patent by content certified mail dated December 27, 2001 (Exhibit Ko 41).

Furthermore, on November 7, 2002, the Defendant filed against Sotec a petition seeking a provisional disposition order for an injunction against the sale, etc. of the computers in which the Product is installed based on the patent right alleging that such computers infringe the patent covering Inventions 1 and 2 (2002 (Yo) 22135; Exhibit Ko 42). On June 4, 2003, the Defendant withdrew the abovementioned petition seeking a provisional disposition order.

(6) On November 7, 2002, the Defendant filed against the Plaintiff a petition seeking a provisional disposition order for an injunction against the sale, etc. of the computers in which

the Product is installed based on the patent right alleging that such computers infringe the patent covering Inventions 1 and 2 (2002 (Yo) 22134), but on June 18, 2003, the Defendant withdrew the abovementioned petition seeking a provisional disposition order.

2. In the principal action, the Plaintiff alleged against the Defendant that the Plaintiff's acts stated in 1.(4) above do not infringe the Patent Right and sought a declaratory judgment to the effect that the Defendant does not have the right to claim an injunction based on the Patent Right against the Plaintiff, while also alleging that the Defendant's acts stated in 1.(5) above constitute the act of business defamation as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act and seeking an injunction and damages based on Articles 3 and 4 of said Act. In the counterclaim, the Defendant alleged against the Plaintiff that the Plaintiff's acts stated in 1.(4) above constitute infringement of the Patent Right and sought an injunction against the manufacture and assignment, etc. of the Product as well as the disposal thereof based on Article 100 of the Patent Act.

### 3. Issues

[Regarding the principal action and counterclaim]

(1) Whether or not the "?" button and "display" buttons, etc. displayed on the computers in which the Product is installed fall under the "icon" as prescribed in the Constituent Features

(2) Whether or not indirect infringement (Article 101, items (ii) and (iv) of the Patent Act) can be found

(3) Whether or not it is obvious that there are grounds for invalidation of the Patent

[Regarding the principal action]

(4) Whether or not the Defendant's acts stated in 1.(5) above constitute the act of business defamation as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act

(5) Occurrence of damages and the amount thereof

(omitted)

### No. 4 Court decision

1. Regarding Issue (1) (fulfillment of constituent features)

(omitted)

(5) Summary

As described above, the "?" button and "display" buttons, etc. displayed on the computers in which the Product is installed do not fall under the "icon" prescribed in the Constituent Features

and thus the Product does not fall within the technical scope of the Inventions. Therefore, the act of manufacturing, etc. said computers does not infringe the Patent Right.

Accordingly, without the need to make determination on other points, the Defendant's claims made in the counterclaim lack legal basis.

2. Regarding Issue (4) (existence or non-existence of business defamation)

(1) The Plaintiff is a stock company incorporated for the purpose of the development, sale, etc. of computer systems. The Defendant is a stock company engaged in the manufacturing, sale, etc. of video and audio equipment, home electrical appliances, information and communication equipment, etc. as a business. According to the evidence (Exhibit Ko 14), the Defendant can also be found to be engaged in the manufacturing and sale of computers and thus, the Plaintiff and the Defendant are in a competitive relationship in the field of computer related business.

The Defendant alleges that the Plaintiff is what is generally called a software manufacturer while the Defendant is what is generally called a hardware manufacturer and thus they are not in a competitive relationship. However, considering that generally many computers are sold with software pre-installed therein and that the Plaintiff had permitted computer manufacturers other than the Defendant, such as Sotec, to pre-install the Product in computers, while the Defendant had been pre-installing software manufactured by software manufacturers other than the Plaintiff in the computer named "Let's note," manufactured and sold by the Defendant (Exhibit Ko 14), the two parties can be found to be in a competitive relationship.

(2) As found in 1. above, the Product does not fall within the technical scope of the Inventions, and thus the contents of the notice stating that Sotec's computers in which the Product is pre-installed infringe the Defendant's Patent Right are false facts.

However, even in such case, if the other party to which the notice was given is a person engaged in the sale of computers in which the Product is pre-installed and the patentee's act of giving the notice was conducted as part of a justifiable exercise of the patent right against said other party, it is appropriate to construe that the illegality of giving such notice will be eliminated. In contrast, if such act of giving a notice is found to have gone beyond the scope of exercising rights for being extremely inappropriate in terms of its contents and manner in light of socially accepted conventions such that, externally, the notice had been given as part of the patentee's exercise of rights but, in reality, it had been given for the purpose of gaining an edge in the market by damaging the competitor's credit, it should be construed that illegality will not be eliminated and such act constitutes the act of unfair competition as prescribed in Article 2, paragraph (1), item (xiv) of the Unfair Competition Prevention Act.

(3) According to the evidence (Exhibits Ko 1, 28, 38 through 43 and 46 through 55 and Exhibits Otsu 4 through 13) and the entire import of the oral argument, the following facts are found.

A. The Defendant sent to the Plaintiff a document dated December 26, 1995, stating that the



Defendant is ready to license a patent other than that covered by the Patent Right since such other patent is relevant to the software manufactured and sold by the Plaintiff (Exhibit Ko 46). Beginning with such document, the Defendant further made similar offers but in response to the Defendant's offer made on February 3, 1998, for entering into a license agreement, the Plaintiff refused to accept the licensing on March 20 of the same year (Exhibit Ko 47).

B. The Defendant further made to the Plaintiff an offer to exchange opinions regarding the Defendant's patent rights and the software manufactured and sold by the Plaintiff by a document dated June 7, 2000, and also made such offer in a telephone call but the Plaintiff did not reply. Therefore, the Defendant once again made an offer to exchange opinions by a document dated February 7, 2001, by attaching the Description and comparative table of the Plaintiff's product and the Defendant's product (Exhibit Ko 48).

In response to this, on February 22 of the same year, the Plaintiff replied that it has no plans to be licensed by the Defendant with respect to its patent rights and cannot respond to the Defendant's offer (Exhibit Ko 49).

C. The Defendant notified Sotec, which was selling computers in which the Product is pre-installed, that Sotec's products are related to the Defendant's patent rights including the right pertaining to the Patent by sending a document dated May 31, 2001 (Exhibit Ko 40).

In response to this, on June 29 of the same year, Sotec requested the Defendant to specifically identify in writing which part of Sotec's products is subject to the Defendant's patents (Exhibit Otsu 4).

D. On July 13 of the same year, the Defendant notified Sotec by attaching a material (Exhibit Ko 50) stating that the computers in which the Product is pre-installed infringe the Patent Right (Exhibit Otsu 5).

In response to this, on August 17 of the same year, Sotec replied that the patent issue is mainly an issue between the Defendant and the Plaintiff and is left to the decision of the Plaintiff, which is the manufacturer of the Product, and thus the Defendant should directly inquire to the Plaintiff (Exhibit Otsu 6).

E. On September 13 of the same year, the Defendant notified Sotec that Sotec's act of selling the computers in which the Product is pre-installed constitutes infringement of the Patent Right (Exhibit Otsu 7).

In response to this, on October 4 of the same year, Sotect replied that, since the Product is manufactured by the Plaintiff and Sotec does not have any technical information, it is facing difficulty in making any responses and that it will stop pre-installing the Product in computers from around late October of the same year (Exhibit Ko 43 and Exhibit Otsu 8).

F. On October 23 of the same year, the Defendant notified the Plaintiff of the following facts: [i] the Defendant has made an offer concerning the Patent Right to Sotec; [ii] Sotec has made a

reply asking the Defendant to directly inquire to the Plaintiff; and [iii] the Defendant is willing to hold meetings with the Plaintiff but will take certain measures if the Plaintiff fails to make any response (Exhibit Ko 51).

In response to this, on October 30 of the same year, the Plaintiff once again replied that it has no plans to be licensed by the Defendant with respect to its patent rights and cannot respond to the Defendant's offer (Exhibit Ko 52).

G. On October 24 of the same year, the Defendant notified Sotec of the following facts: [i] pre-installing of the Product in computers has not been stopped; [ii] Sotec's act of selling computers together with the Product also constitutes infringement of the Patent Right; and [iii] the Defendant has also notified the Plaintiff of the same effect (Exhibit Otsu 9).

On November 7 of the same year, Sotec made the following replies to the Defendant: [i] Sotec has been instructed by the Plaintiff to reply to the Defendant that the act of installing the Product in computers does not infringe the Patent Right; and [ii] in Sotec's opinion, this is a dispute between the Defendant and the Plaintiff and Sotec has no intention to meet the Defendant (Exhibit Otsu 10).

H. The Defendant demanded Sotec to immediately stop selling the computers in which the Product is pre-installed and the computers sold together with the Product and to clarify the unit sales, net sales and stock volumes of the abovementioned computers alleging that such computers infringe the Patent Right by content certified mail dated December 27, 2001 (Exhibit Ko 41). On the same day, the Defendant also sent to the Plaintiff a content certified mail stating the same effect (Exhibit Ko 53).

In response to this, on January 17, 2002, Sotec sent to the Defendant a written reply stating that Sotec is confident that its products do not infringe the Patent Right (Exhibit Ko 54). On the same day, the Plaintiff also sent to the Defendant a written reply stating that the Plaintiff's product does not constitute infringement of the Patent Right (Exhibit Ko 55).

I. On November 7, 2002, the Defendant filed against the Plaintiff a petition (2002 (Yo) 22134) seeking a provisional disposition order for an injunction against the sale of the computers in which the Product is installed due to infringement of patent right based on an allegation that such computers infringe the patent covering Inventions 1 and 2) (Exhibit Ko 1), and on the same day, the Defendant also filed against Sotec a petition (2002 (Yo) 22135) seeking a provisional disposition order (Exhibit Ko 42).

Furthermore, on December 10, 2002, the Defendant filed against the Plaintiff a petition (2002 (Yo) 22145) seeking a provisional disposition order for an injunction against the sale of the computers in which the Product is installed due to infringement of patent right based on an allegation that such computers infringe the patent covering Invention 3 (Exhibit Ko 28), and on the same day, the Defendant also filed against Sotec a petition (2002 (Yo) 22146) seeking a

provisional disposition order.

J. Later, Sotec stopped the sale of computers in which the Product is installed.

The Defendant withdrew all of the petitions seeking a provisional disposition order mentioned above filed against Sotec on June 4, 2003 (Exhibits Otsu 11 and 12), and those filed against the Plaintiff on the 18th of the same month (Exhibits Ko 38 and 39).

K. In FY2000, Sotec was ranked fifth in the industry in terms of market share but had increased its share to 9.1%, a 3.1 point increase compared to the previous year (Exhibit Otsu 13).

(4) According to the facts found in (3) above, if the computers in which the Product is installed infringe the Patent Right, Sotec, which is engaged in the manufacture and sale of the abovementioned computers, is a person in a position equivalent to a direct infringer of the Patent Right, and thus the Defendant's act of giving notices and filing petitions seeking a provisional disposition against Sotec can be found to have been conducted as part of the patentee's exercise of rights. In addition, in light of the following circumstances, the Defendant's acts against Sotec cannot be found to have been made for the purpose of gaining an edge in the market by damaging the Plaintiff's credit or extremely inappropriate in terms of their contents and manner in light of socially accepted conventions nor can it be found that they have gone beyond the scope of exercise of rights: [i] the Defendant has made a response, though in an insufficient manner, to Sotec's request asking the Defendant to specifically identify the infringement ((3)C. and D. above); [ii] the Defendant, who received a reply from Sotec asking the Defendant to inquire to the Plaintiff, has also sent a notice to the Plaintiff ((3)D. and F. above); [iii] with respect to the Defendant's acts of sending a content certified mail and filing a petition seeking a provisional disposition order against Sotec, the Defendant can be considered to have taken legal steps by necessity due to the fact that despite Sotec having once replied that it would stop pre-installing the Product in computers, not only did it fail to stop such pre-installing but it also refused to hold negotiations, alleging that the Product does not infringe the Patent Right ((3)E., G. and H. above); [iv] the Defendant has filed a petition seeking a provisional disposition order not only against Sotec but also against the Plaintiff ((3)I. above); [v] the Defendant's subsequent act of withdrawing said petition seeking a provisional disposition order can be considered to have been made in response to Sotec's act of stopping the sale of computers in which the Product is installed ((3)J. above); [vi] any of the forms or contents of the notices cannot be found to lack social appropriateness; and [vii] Sotec was a booming company at that time and it is difficult to find that the Defendant picked off Mickey Mouse operations ((3)K. above).

While it can be found that the Defendant has been making an offer for entering into a license agreement to the Plaintiff from around 1995 and that the Plaintiff has been continuously refusing such offer ((3)A. and B. above), in light of the facts found above, the Defendant's act

against Sotec cannot be found to have gone beyond the scope of exercise of rights while externally taking the form of being conducted as part of the patentee's exercise of rights.

(5) As found above, the illegality of the Defendant's acts of giving notices and filing a petition seeking a provisional disposition order against Sotec will be eliminated and thus, without the need to make determinations on other points, the claim based on the Unfair Competition Prevention Act that is among the Plaintiff's claims made in the principal action lacks legal basis.

### 3. Regarding the Plaintiff's claim seeking a declaratory judgment

As long as a counterclaim seeking an injunction is filed, the Plaintiff's claim seeking a declaratory judgment on the absence of the right to claim an injunction lacks benefit in filing the principal action for a declaratory judgment and should be dismissed without prejudice for being unlawful (Judgment of the First Petty Bench of the Supreme Court of March 25, 2004; 2001 (O) 734 and 2001 (Ju) 723; Mishu Vol. 58, No. 3 at 753).

### 4. Conclusion

As found above, among the Plaintiff's claims made in the principal action, the claim seeking a declaratory judgment shall be dismissed without prejudice for being unlawful while the other claims shall be dismissed with prejudice on the merits for lacking legal basis and all of the claims made in the counterclaim by the Defendant shall be dismissed with prejudice on the merits for lacking legal basis, and therefore, the judgment shall be rendered in the form of the main text.

Tokyo District Court, 47 Civil Division

Presiding judge: TAKABE Makiko

Judge: SHOJI Tamotsu

Judge: SETO Sayaka

List of articles

Product name

"Jasutohōmu 2 Kakeibo Pakku (Justhome 2 household account pack)"