

Address only
 "The Commissioner of Patents,
 Washington, D. C."
 and not any official by name

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE
 WASHINGTON

All communications respecting this
 application should give the serial number,
 date of filing, and name of
 the applicant

March 21, 1939

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in
 charge of this application.

... 11-6623

Rowley P. Coe
 Commissioner of Patents

Applicant: William F. Friedman
 et al

Ser. No. 36,868
 Filed Aug. 19, 1935
 For Electrical Switching
 Mechanism

Robert V. Laughlin &
 Charles A. Rowe
 c/o Chief of the Air Corps
 Munitions Bldg.
 Washington, D.C.

MAILED

MAR 21 1939

In response to amendment of October 15, 1938.

Claims 6 through 14 and 16 through 23 remain in this
 application.

Claim 12 is again rejected as misdescriptive in setting
 forth means "to effect random permutations of the circuit connec-
 tions". As pointed out in the last Office action the circuits
 are always closed in the same order or sequence. The change
 speed drives, interchangeable cams, and differential gearing
 merely change the time interval between contacts and the time
 is
 each circuit/closed and not the order of closing.

Claims 13 and 18 through 23 are rejected on Boardman
 for the reasons of record. Boardman shows all the structure
 recited in these claims. The friction drives in Boardman pro-
 vide for the continuously slipping action claimed. Applicant
 relies on the inherent slipping action in the friction drives to
 support the claims and as a basis for the amendment to page 3
 (October 15, 1938). The same inherent slipping action is present
 in Boardman. Obviously the manual adjustment in Boardman provides
 means for continuously and irregularly varying the rate of move-
 ment of the contact drums.

Claim 23 is further rejected as not based on the dis-
 closure. As pointed out in the last Office action no disclosure
 is found for the limitation that the contacts are "spaced at
 irregular intervals". The first three lines, page 4 of the speci-
 fication, suggested by applicant as a basis for this claim, merely

describes the connection of the contacts to the "commutator" rings. It is not gathered from this that the contacts are spaced at irregular intervals with respect to each other.

Claims 6 through 11, 14, 16 and 17 appear allowable as now advised.

This action is final.

Examiner