

Address only
The Commissioner of Patents,
and not any official by name

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE
RICHMOND 20, VIRGINIA

FEB 3 - 1945

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.

Commissioner of Patents

Applicant: William F. Friedman

GPO 16-27315-3

William D. Hall
c/o Chief Signal Officer
Pentagon Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Ser. No. 551,172
Filed Aug. 25, 1944
For AUTHENTICATING DEVICE

References:

Hebern	1,683,072	Sept. 4, 1928	35-4
Scherbius	1,584,660	May 11, 1926	"
Korn	1,938,028	Dec. 5, 1933	"
Morris	1,953,829	Apr. 3, 1934	"
Friedman	2,090,416	May 18, 1937	"
Friedman	2,139,676	Dec. 13, 1938	"

An illustration of the mechanical set-up of the device is required, provided of course new matter is not introduced. Mere electrical diagrams are not considered sufficient. The claims are all rejected as based on an inadequate disclosure.

Claim 2 is rejected as failing to define the invention properly in the "means" of lines 7 and 8. In these lines "significance of energization" is not understood. If this means that the user may think of "9" for example as meaning one thing at one occasion of use, as for example a date and at another an amount of money this is of no patentable consequence, since like the same number used on an ordinary typewriter or hand written it can mean whatever the user wants it to mean. A "means for varying the significance" is a statement of function or purpose and whatever "varying the signification" may mean the structure is not sufficiently set out in the purpose disclosed. The claim is therefore further rejected.

Claim 5 is rejected as indefinite in line 2 "or the like" and is therefore rejected.

Claims 1-5 all set out a series of switches and then another switch. Just what essential difference there is between any of the switches of a series and another switch is not seen. The

Serial No. 551,172

-2-

claims are rejected on Hebern in which the last switch in the cascade is "another switch" and the preceding switches are the "series".

The claims are all directed to a device of the character described and this is described as being an authenticator. In what respect an authenticator differs from an ordinary cryptographic means such as Hebern's is not stated and since Hebern's device could be used for such a purpose the claims are again rejected as failing to define properly and as unpatentable over Hebern, and also as unpatentable over any of the other devices cited.

Examiner.