IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

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

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
class 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

REMARKS

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.

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 ob-
jection 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 di-
rected to a method, i. e., a series of steps: A series of steps warrants

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.