

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Applicant: W. F. Friedman
 Serial No: 107,244
 Filed: October 23, 1936
 For: Cryptographs

Div. 53

AMENDMENT

Hon. Commissioner of Patents,
 Washington, D. C.

Sir:

In response to office action of March 26, 1941, please amend as follows:

Cancel Claim 1.

Claim 2, line 5, after "members" insert varying in size
 line 6, after "members" insert step by step
 line 7, after "keyboard" cancel the remainder of the
 claim and insert electrical contact devices ar-
ranged to be engaged by the cams on said members,
and means controlled by the closing of an electri-
cal circuit by said contact devices to cause step
by step displacements of the commutators.

Claim 3, line 5, before "means" insert pawl and ratchet
 line 6, after "members" insert step by step

Claim 4, line 8, cancel "coordinating said sets of" and insert
engageable by the cams of the

Claim 14, lines 13 and 18, cancel "depending on" and insert
responsive to

R E M A R K S

A reconsideration of the claims as amended is requested, as these
 claims are now considered to be in proper form and free from anticipation

by the references of record. Claims 2, 3 and 4 specifically set forth the step by step movements of the cam bearing members to produce step by step movements of the commutators. It will be noted that the claims call for a plurality or a set of cam-bearing members. The patent to Damm, of record, shows a single chain with cams 24a and 24b thereon. Damm does not disclose a plurality of cam-bearing members and accordingly would be incapable of producing the same result as that produced by applicant's device.

12
A reconsideration of claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 12 and 13 is requested as these claims set forth the step by step movements of the cam bearing members and the commutators and specify a plurality of cam bearing members and the commutators and specify a plurality of cam bearing members. It is not understood why the examiner considers these claims as functional as they set forth sufficient structure to accomplish the desired result. If the examiner persists in his grounds of rejection, it is requested that he explain his reasons in more detail.

Claim 14, as amended, is believed to overcome the examiner's objection and to be now allowable.

In view of the above differentiations and the inadequacy of the Damm patent, which shows a single chain, and not a plurality of cam bearing members, a favorable action is requested.

While a "use" is ordinarily not patentable, the claim 15 is directed to a method, i. e., a series of steps: A series of steps warrants a method claim, Smith v. Snow 294 U.S. 1.

Claim 15 has been retained in the case as the prosecution will be continued under the three-year rule.

Respectfully submitted,

William D. Hall,
Attorney for Applicant.