

REMARKS

The action rejected the claims as obvious over a combination of US 7,445,654 to Wong in view of US 6,984,259 to Hurst.

The action states that Hurst teaches the claimed polarized active media filter. Hurst's filter 1 is directed at preventing "larger airborne particles" from obscuring the UV lamp 2. Col. 3, line 9. Hurst's secondary goal is to "not interfere[e] significantly with the flow of air" and thus Hurst's filter and system is not directed at filtering finer particles. Col. 3, lines 10-11.¹

This is different than what is now claimed, namely "wherein the polarized active media air cleaner comprises at least two electrodes with a voltage differential therebetween and the at least one filter is located in an electrostatic field created by the at least two electrodes; wherein the polarized active media air cleaner filters sub-micron particles, tars, and VOCs" as recited in all 3 independent claims and supported at at least application publication paragraph [0004].

¹ As an aside, Hurst's system does not make design sense. The UV light in most active filtration systems is used to destroy contaminants in the active filter—the filter is not in the system to keep the UV light clean. Thus, Hurst's setup is both strange and seemingly misses the point of cleaning the air.

Wong's dual filter system does not cure this defect because Wong's passive filters, like Hurst's active one, is not directed at the ultrafine particles. This is a critical point because the action is right to say that Wong filters "dust"²—but the claims as amended are directed at ultrafine particles such as VOCs that are far smaller than "dust." Furthermore, although the action relies on Wong for teaching a "cooling" of the electronics as recited in the claims, Wong does not teach or suggest any such thing. Wong is only directed at is keeping tape drives free of larger gas and molecular contaminants.

A further failing in Hurst and Wong is that they fail to address and recognize the need to clean air for both electronics *and* ambient air. This dual benefit of the claimed filters and apparatuses is critical in environments like casinos where there is a need to filter high-contaminant air for both electronic-preservation and breathability.

The action commented that claims 26, 27, 29, and 30 were merely duplicative of claim 17 but this is not the case. The apparatus in claims 26 and 29 is particularly suited to banks of electronics equipment and large spaces where larger quantities of air need to be filtered. The advantage of the apparatuses in these claims is that less ducting and filters are necessary than might be necessary in claim 17's apparatus.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Should the examiner believe however that additional amendments to the

² Dust is something that might block a UV lamp when accumulated and would typically be a particle larger than 3 microns. The ultrafines like cigarette tars are in the 0.01-0.1 micron range.

Applicant: Forwood Wiser
Application No.: 11/618,555

claims may be required to secure allowance of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-noted number to facilitate further prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Forwood Wiser

By /Stephen B. Schott/
Stephen B. Schott
Registration No. 51,294
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

SBS/jal