

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated January 7, 2009.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of informalities. The disclosure has been corrected in order to overcome the objection.

Further, the Examiner has objected to claims 2-6 because of informalities. Claims 1-6 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 7-11 in order to overcome the objection.

Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lan et al (US 6,938,676). Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-6 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 7-11 which are rewritten from original claims 2-6 in order to overcome the rejection.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claim clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leong C. Lei, #50402/

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402