

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

IN RE: Application of *
 WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN *
 Serial Number *
 107,244 *
 Filed *
 23 October 1936 *
 For *
 CRYPTOGRAPHS *

* * * * *

Division 53

*Filed
30 April 1947*

AMENDMENT

TO: The Honorable Commissioner of Patents
 Washington 25, D. C.

Sir:

This is in response to Patent Office action of 2 May 1944.

The case is being prosecuted under the three-year rule.

Please amend the application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 3, line 8 - Cancel "electrically".

Claim 9, line 2 - Cancel "electrically".

Claim 10, line 8 - Cancel the amendment of 24 August 1937
 and insert - and substantially aperiodic - .

Claim 15, line 3 - After "positions" insert - responsive to
 movements of a similar plurality of camming
 members - .

Please add the following claims:

16. The method of controlling the angular displacements of a plurality of rotatable commutators or the like by means of a similar plurality of rotatable camming members which includes the step of simultaneously rotating said camming members step by step through individually different angular distances.

17. The method of controlling the angular displacements of a plurality of rotatable commutators in response to a plurality of camming members which includes the step of combining the effects of at least two camming members and utilizing such combined effects to control such displacements.

REMARKS

Although the Patent Office action of 2 May 1944 was said to be a final rejection, it is respectfully submitted that no true issue has been reached and, therefore, that the final rejection was premature.

It appears that proper protection of the invention herein requires one or more method claims. Claim 15 has, therefore, been amended, and in its present condition it is believed to avoid the rejection based on functionality.

New Claims 16 and 17 also are method claims, No. 16 being directed to the step of controlling the commutators according to the preferred embodiment of the invention and Claim 17 being directed to the modification of Figure 2. The claims appear to be patentably distinct from the cited references.

The amendment to Claim 3 eliminates the Examiner's objection of indefiniteness based on the "electrical" association of certain elements. The further rejection on allowable Claim 4 is queried since Claim 4 reads specifically upon Figure 2, whereas Claim 3 is not limited to a structure involving plural sets of camming elements.

The amendments to Claims 9 and 10 are relatively minor and are believed to be self-explanatory in view of the Examiner's objections to these claims.

Continued prosecution under the three-year rule is desired.

Withdrawal of the final rejection and reconsideration of the application are requested.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN, Applicant

By

His Attorney