

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview Scheduled For April 5, 2012

The undersigned thanks the examiner for the interview scheduled on April 5. The undersigned requests that the examiner not issue an office action until at least after that interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 12-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,445,654 to Wong over Canadian Patent 1,272,453 to Joannou. Claims 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,445,654 to Wong over Canadian Patent 1,272,453 to Joannou as applied supra. Finally, claims 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,445,654 to Wong over Canadian Patent 1,272,453 to Joannou as applied supra.

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." The action points to Col. 5 lines 55-60 for a teaching of ultrafine filtration but that portion of Wong says that the Wong filter filters "dust" not ultrafines. The action also cites Col. 1, lines 40-45 for a teaching of ultrafine filtration as well but this portion of Wong does not teach ultrafine filtration either.

It merely teaches using an adsorber for attracting chemical gases, which is not what is recited dielectric filter.

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. None of the cited references teach cooling.

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.

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this

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

application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submit that the present application, including the claims is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Forwood Wiser

By /Stephen B. Schott/
Stephen B. Schott
Registration No. 51,294

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

SBS/lat
Enclosure