THE COMMISSIONER OF PATE

Washington 25, D. C.

REF ID: A67634

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE
WASHINGTON

PAPER No.

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

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

RIT: AD DED F. AUNL ED

Henry B. Stauffer Army Security Agency The Pentagon Bldg. Washington 25, J.C.

16-27315-7

Division.

23 - Room 3624

Applicant

William F. Friedman

Ser No. Filed

551,172

For

Aug. 25, 1944 Authenticating Device

Responsive to amendment filed Oct. 23, 1949.

Claims 2 and 3 are again rejected as presenting no patentable distinction over the 1937 patent to Friedman. This patent discloses a conventional current source, cryptographic switches and rotors in Figure 7 which provide a plurality of variable electrical paths, end sontacts at 171 and 331, another switch at 10 for selecting a contact such as 28 at one end of the series, a signalling device in the form of a register at 13 associated at 14 with each of the contacts at the top end of the series, and loaks shown in Figure 5 for varying the significance of the energization of the signaling device 13. If the operator desired to use the parented apparatus only as an authenticator as applicant loes; he would need to use only a portion of the ten keys 11. Also, he could disconnect of incapacitate some of the on connections. This is all that applicant appears to have done in this respect because all plugs and jacks and 99" are dvailable in the present device if one desired to make use of them. Therefore, the selection of anly some of the contacts in the patent by using only part of the available contacts 11 of the switch 10 would not amount to patentable invention. In the absence of any structure recited in the claims which is spacific to applicant's particular apparatus, the claims are clearly anticipated by the Friedman patent.

Claim 5 is rejected on the 1937 patent to Friedman in view of the 1938 patent to Friedman. The use of a two position switch to cause current to flow in separate lines according to the position of the switch is such common practice as not to be considered inventive. Also, such an idea is shown at 11 in the 1938 patent and 67 in the 1937 patent.

In line 7 of claim 2, the word --- the --- should appear before "contacts".

Claim 5 is objected to as containing no antecedent basis for "another switch" in line 5 and for "said rotor stepping device" in lin4 9.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 stand rejected. Claim 6 appears allowable.

The above rejected 4s hereby unde FINAL.

with reference to any further action that may be taken in this case attention is directed to new Rules 116 and 191-195 pow in force.

