In response to amendment of February 1, 1937.

Reference added:

Boardman 1,600,753 Sept. 21, 1926 200-92uxP3

This case now contains claims 6 through 23.

Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19 and 23 are rejected as misdescriptive in setting forth the relatively movable bodies or contact drum and contact arm as "independently" movable. Both are driven by the same motor and operate at the same time, hence are not moved independently.

Claim 7 is further rejected as indefinite in the last line. There is no antecedent for "gearing".

Claims 8 and 9, depending from claim 7, are rejected therewith.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 14 and 16 are rejected as inaccurate in setting forth means "to vary the circuit connections in a random order" (claims 10 and 16); "to effect random permutations of the circuit connections" (claim 12); "for varying the relation between said contacts in a random order" (claims 13 and 14). Contact is made and broken in a definite order or sequence and always in the same order. The variation is in the speeds of the movable elements and not in the sequence.

Claim 13 is further rejected as not patentably distinguishing from the structure of Boardman, supra. Boardman shows an adjustable friction drive for a control drum.

Claim 15 is rejected as indefinite in lines 3 and 4, "having its contact elements electrically connected in irregular..."
order". To what are the contact elements connected?

Claim 15 is further rejected as functional. There is no structure providing for the periodic operation set forth in the last line.

Claim 18 is rejected as fully met by Boardman, supra.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected as reading on the structure of Boardman, Fig. 4. The reference shows two contact elements driven by friction drives and independently variable.

21 and 22 are rejected as directly readable on either Boardman, supra, or Savoy or Jurhomme et al both of record.
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