

Div. 53 Room 6897
 Address only
 "The Commissioner of Patents,
 Washington, D. C."
 and not any official by name

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE
 WASHINGTON

Paper No. 2
 All communications respecting this
 application should give the serial number,
 date of filing, and name of
 the applicant

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

TODD, A.

Commissioner of Patents.

Applicant: William F. Friedman

Edgar T. Snodgrass &
 Charles A. Rowe
 c/o The Chief of the Air Corps.
 Munitions Bldg.
 Washington, D. C.

Ser. No. 300,212
 Filed Oct. 19, 1939
 For CRYPTOGRAPHIC DIVISION

This application has been examined.

REFERENCES:

Nicoletti	1,311,457	July 29, 1919	35-2	
Grassi	1,667,780	May 1, 1928	"	
Gentet	1,956,384	Apr. 21, 1934	"	
(British) Nicholson	12,005	App. 1909, acc. 1910	35-2	(1 sh.; 6 pa.)
(British) Lussac	23,204	App. 1912 acc. 1913	"	(1 sh.; 3 ")
Mitchell	832,871	Oct. 9, 1906	"-31	
Badanes	1,977,842	Oct. 23, 1934	"-32	
Hoddy	1,385,096	July 19, 1921	"-33	
Wood	1,471,437	Oct. 23, 1923	"-73	
Williamson	1,826,034	Oct. 6, 1931	"	

For reasons given below all claims are rejected.

Claim 1 is rejected as obviously unpatentable over any of the patents from Class 35-2. Gentet showing grooves i. e. channels and the others bases holding the strips by means the full equivalent of a grooved base.

Claims 2-7 are rejected on the ground of lack of invention to name the line indicators of the cryptographic devices slidable in view of the slidable indicators of Mitchell.

Claim 7 is further rejected as patentably indefinite in line 5. "means to permit" Jones, Jones and Herzner 1926 U. S. D. 100.

Claims 15-19 in "slidable to permit" are indefinite following the reasoning of the Jones decision for it seems obvious that alignment can be made whether the member 6 moves or not provided it does nothing to prevent the slides moving.

The art shows that the line indicator can be stationary on the base without adversely affecting the slidability of the letter bearing members. These claims are therefore rejected.

The claims are grouped as follows:

- I. Generic claims 1-7.
- II. Specific to figure 6 claims 8, 11-15.
- III. Specific to figure 6 having equal size members and equal number of grooves. claim 9.
- IV. Specific to figure 6 having unequal size members and unequal number of grooves. claim 10.
- V. Specific to figure 2. claims 16-19.

Since the generic claims are rejected division and election are required under Rule 41 on the basis of the grouping. In the first place division and election should be made between claims 8 and 11-15 on the one hand and claims 9, 10, 16-19 on the other.

Again division and election are required under Rule 41 between claims 10 on the one hand and 16-19 on the other since claims 8 and 11-15 generic to claims 10 and 16-19 have been rejected.

Art pertinent to foldable devices and holders within holders is cited. The holders of Williamson are of different sizes. These patents were found on cursory search.

Examiner.