

**REMARKS**

The action rejected the claims as obvious over a combination of US 7,445,654 to Wong in view of US 7,150,780 to Krichtafovitch.

Wong's passive filters are not directed at the ultrafine particles. This is a critical point because the action is right to say that Wong filters "dust"—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.

Krichtafovitch teaches pre-charging particles for collection on oppositely charged plates. This pre-charging, however, is a disadvantage for air circulation near electronics because these large charged particles tend to conglomerate into larger particles that, when they pass the collection plates, will more likely wreak havoc on electronic equipment. Moreover, Krichtafovitch's filter produces ozone, which would then harmfully move directly into its electronic components. The claimed polarized active media filter "comprising tow dielectric layers between two outer layers of conductive material" avoids this drawback.

A further failing in the cited references 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 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