



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/618,555	12/29/2006	Forwood C. Wiser	EDG-PT1247	5989
3624	7590	09/08/2009	EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			PHAM, MINH CHAU THI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 25 depends on canceled claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (7,445,654 B2), in view of Hurst (6,984,259 B2).

Wong discloses a filter apparatus for electronic components (104) comprising an enclosure (104) having vents (106) open to air outside the enclosure (104) (see Fig. 6), an air cleaner comprising an inlet port (612), an outlet port (610) and at least one filter (608), electronic components located within the enclosure (104), wherein the outside air flows through the inlet port (612), through the at least one filter (608) and through the outlet port (610) to create filtered air (col. 5, lines 49-60), wherein the filtered air cools the electronic components and then exits the enclosure (104) through the vents (106) (see Fig. 6). Wong further discloses the air flow is driven by a fan (604) and the air cleaner located outside the enclosure (see Fig. 6). Wong also discloses at least one filter comprising a gaseous contaminant filter (608), at least one filter comprising a fine particle filter (see col. 5, lines 58-60), at least one filter being an electrostatic filter (see col. 5, line 59), and at least one filter removing VOC's from the air stream (col. 1, lines 38-

Art Unit: 1797

50). Claims 12-24 differ from the disclosure of Wong in that the air cleaner is a polarized active media air cleaner. Hurst discloses a filter media (1) being polarized by locating between two electrodes (see col. 2, line 61 through col. 3, line 7). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a polarized active media air cleaner as taught by Hurst in the filter apparatus of Wong to produce an electrostatic filter element since it is well known in the art that electrostatic filter would effectively capture particles such as dust from the air stream passing through.

Claims 26, 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (7,445,654 B2), in view of Hurst (6,984,259 B2), as applied *supra*.

Claims 26, 28, 29 and 31 call for a filter apparatus for providing cooled air to a plurality of electronic components. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple electronic components instead of only one since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.*

Claims 25, 27 and 30 call for the plurality of electronic components comprising gaming machines. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the plurality of electronic components of Wong as gaming machines or any other electronic devices as desired since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is

Art Unit: 1797

intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed on August 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited reference "Kalous discloses directing air flow through its filtering apparatus and duct work away from the electronic components, and fails to suggest a polarized media air cleaner and air flow path that cools the electronic components", as in newly amended claims.

The Examiner now drops both Kalous and Latham references and newly introduces Wong (7,445,654 B2) as the primary reference under the 103(a) rejection of claims 12-29 to show:

Wong discloses a filter apparatus for electronic components (104) comprising an enclosure (104) having vents (106) open to air outside the enclosure (104) (see Fig. 6), an air cleaner comprising an inlet port (612), an outlet port (610) and at least one filter (608), electronic components located within the enclosure (104), wherein the outside air flows through the inlet port (612), through the at least one filter (608) and through the outlet port (610) to create filtered air (col. 5, lines 49-60), wherein the filtered air cools the electronic components and then exits the enclosure (104) through the vents (106) (see Fig. 6), as claimed. Wong further discloses the air flow is driven by a fan (604) and the air cleaner located outside the enclosure (see Fig. 6), as claimed. Wong also

Art Unit: 1797

discloses at least one filter comprising a gaseous contaminant filter (608), at least one filter comprising a fine particle filter (see col. 5, lines 58-60), at least one filter being electrostatic filter (see col. 5, line 59), and at least one filter removing VOC's from the air stream (col. 1, lines 38-50), as claimed.

Claims 12-24 differ from the disclosure of Wong in that the air cleaner is a polarized active media air cleaner. The Examiner newly introduces Hurst (6,984,259 B2) as the secondary reference in combination with the primary reference Wong under the 103(a) rejection of claims 12-24 to show: Hurst discloses a filter media (1) being polarized by locating between two electrodes (see col. 2, line 61 through col. 3, line 7), as claimed. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a polarized active media air cleaner as taught by Hurst in the filtration apparatus of Wong to produce an electrostatic filter element since it is well known in the art that electrostatic filter would effectively capture particles such as dust from the air stream passing through.

Claims 26, 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (7,445,654 B2), in view of Hurst (6,984,259 B2), as applied supra.

Claims 26, 28, 29 and 31 call for a filter apparatus for providing cooled air to a plurality of electronic components. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple electronic components instead of only one since it has been held that mere duplication of the

Art Unit: 1797

essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Claims 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (7,445,654 B2), in view of Hurst (6,984,259 B2), as applied supra.

Claims 25, 27 and 30 call for the plurality of electronic components comprising gaming machines. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the plurality of electronic components of Wong as gaming machines or any other electronic devices as desired since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-31 have been thoroughly considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as discussed above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1797

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-CHAU T. PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-1163. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon/Tues/Thur/Fri 7:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DUANE SMITH/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1797

Application/Control Number: 11/618,555
Art Unit: 1797

Page 8

/Minh-Chau T. Pham/
Examiner, Art Unit 1797
September 1, 2009