# **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This application has been reconsidered carefully in light of the Office Action. A careful reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

This response is timely filed as it is accompanied by an appropriate Petition for Extension of Time for Filing of Response under Rule 1.136(a) and the associated fee.

This response is also accompanied with a check and/or authorization to charge deposit account for any additional claim fee due as a result of this Amendment because either the number of independent claims exceeds the number of independent claims for which fees have previously been paid, the total number of claims exceeds the total number of claims for which fees have previously been paid, or both.

#### Amendment to the Claims

By the above,

- 1. claims 7 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and
- 2. claims 16-20 have been added to more fully and completely claim the disclosed subject matter.

Newly added claims 16 and 19 generally parallel originally filed claim 2 but are now dependent on claims 7 and 9, respectively. Similarly, newly added claims 17, 18 and 20 generally parallel originally filed claim 4, 6 and 3 but with claims 17 and 18 now dependent on claim 7 and claims 20 and now dependent on claim 9.

No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

# Allowable Subject Matter

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Fleming for the allowance of claims 13-15 and the indication that claims 7-11would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. [NOTE: As claim 15 is dependent on claim 13 and claim 15 is identified on the Office Action Summary as allowed, it appears that page 3 of the Office Action inadvertently did not identify claim 15 as allowed.]

By the above, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claim 7 and associated dependent claim 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is solicited.

Also by the above, claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Thus, claim 9 and associated dependent claims 10 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is solicited.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2006/0043716 to Quioc et al. ("Quioc") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2010/0307775 to Robbins et al. ("Robbins").

The Office Action asserts that "Quioc teaches the claimed invention except for a perforated side wall." The Office Action further asserts that Robbins teaches a device comprising gas generating devices having perforated side walls and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing of Quioc to have perforated side walls to provide proper gas flow for relatively consistent gas production throughout, presumably throughout the gas generant material.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

While the Office Action asserts that Quioc teaches the claimed invention except for a perforated side wall, the claimed invention further differs from Quioc in at least several significant aspects.

For example, claim 1 requires that the gas generator include a second chamber which includes "at least one container wherein at least a portion of the quantity of gas generant material is contained." While the Office Action asserts

that Quioc discloses "the second chamber 70 includes at least one container 22 wherein at least a portion of the quantity of gas generant material is contained", item 22 of Quioc is identified as a longitudinally extending ignition tube. (See paragraph [0023].) This ignition tube is disclosed as serving to facilitate dispersal of ignition products. Such an ignition tube does not serve as a container for gas generant material.

Claim 1 further requires the container have a perforated side wall and oppositely disposed first and second end walls, with the first end wall perforated and disposed adjacent the first chamber to allow communication of at least a portion of the ignition products therethrough and into contact with gas generant material therein contained to ignite the gas generant material to produce a product gas. Such a perforated first end wall is not addressed by the outstanding Office Action claim rejection. A perforated first end wall disposed adjacent the first chamber, as claimed, is neither shown nor suggested by Quioc and Robbins, alone or in combination.

Claim 1 further requires that the second end wall, oppositely disposed of the first end wall, also be perforated to allow gas flow communication of the product gas therethrough. Such a perforated second end wall is not addressed by the outstanding Office Action claim rejection. A perforated second end wall oppositely disposed the first end wall and perforated to allow gas flow

communication of the product gas therethrough, is neither shown nor suggested by Quioc and Robbins, alone or in combination.

It is further noted that while the Office Action states that in Quioc "the second chamber 70 includes a plurality of the containers", no reference identification for the "plurality of container" is provided. On review, Quioc appears to only disclose a single container within the "chamber 70."

For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1-6 and 12 are believed to be patentable over Quioc and Robbins, alone or in combination and notification to that effect is solicited.

## **Newly Added Claims**

Claims 16-20 have been added. Newly claims 16-18 are dependent on claim 7 and newly added claims 19 and 20 are dependent on claim 9. As claims 7 and 9 are as discussed above believed to be allowable, so too newly added claims 16-20 are also believed allowable and notification to that effect is solicited.

#### Conclusion

Applicants intend to fully responsive to the Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed or resolved in this response, the undersigned attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick C. Kottis

Registration No. 31,974

Pauley Petersen & Erickson 2800 West Higgins Road; Suite 365 Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169 TEL (847) 490-1400 FAX (847) 490-1403