THE THE UNITED STATES PATER OFFICE

Div. 46, Room 5731 Webruary 1, 1937.

Hon. Commissioner of Patents,

Sir:

Responsive to Patent Office Action dated Sugust 21, 1935.

It is desired to smend certain of the claims as follows:

Claim 7, lines 5 and 6, cancel " cearing for driving " and substitute - - variable driving units for operating - -

Claim 8, last line change " goaring " to - - units - -

Claim 10, line 4, insert - - variable - - before " friction "

Claim 13, line 3, after " means " insert - - comprising slipping drive elements - -

Claim 14, line 3, efter " including " insert - - slip-disk drive elements and - -

Claim 15, line 2 cancel " and " Same claim, line 3 after "rings " insert - - and - - Line 4, cancel " random" and substitute - - irregular - -

Claim 17, line 4 after " independently " insert - - and variably - -

Cleim 18, line 3 after " merns " insert - - including slipping friction drive elopents - -

Claim FO, line 4, before " driving " insort - - slip-disk - -

Claim 21, line 3 cancel " random " and substitute - - any - -

Claim 22, line 3 cancel " rendom " and substitute - - fortuitous - -

Claim 23, line 2 before "provided "insert - - each -
Line 3, at the end of the line after "other "insert - - and electrically

interrelated - - Line 5, after "devices "insert - - whereby the contacts

cre coused - -

RETARES

does not disclose true random operation, it is contended that true random operation is a feature of the present system and this contention is based upon the fact that the frictional drives here employed introduce: a true variable factor, which crises from the slippage inherent in a drive of this character, and particularly so, by reason of the irregular movement of drive disks 14 and 14' which are caused to slide over the faces of the driven elements 16 and 16' by the action of the com elements. This slippage factor will be more apparent when it is noted that the drive disks are caused to slide in an irregular manner toward and away from the fulcrum points or axes of the respective driven elements 16 and 16'. The slippage is further augmented by the fact that the system contemplates rotation of the two components in opposite senses. It follows that an operation which at

all times depends upon an unpredictable variable is properly to be regarded as a true random and fortuitous operation.

That part of the operation described on page 3 of the specification, comprised in the last five lines, is believed to fully support the foregoing argument; and the intendment to introduce the wrighter relied upon is believed to be a clear implication from the language employed when it is considered that the inherent element of variability constitutes an essential feature of the mechanism as illustrated and upon which the asserted theory of random operation is predicated. The words "frictional effect " and " constantly varying speeds " give emphasis to this contention.

Again it will be noted that the two driven gears 2 and 2°, with which drive gear 1 meshes, are provided with different numbers of teeth (see lines 8 and 9,) page 3of the specification). This constitutes a differential gearing arrangement. It is believed that this differential arrangement will contribute or tend to contribute to the slippage effect of each friction drive, thus providing an added element of veriability, which is further accentuated by the fact that an opposite rotational movement is here involved.

Admitting for the purposes of the present argument the regionicity, however remote, would result from the use of cam elements, nevertheless, each of the plipping frictional drives introduces into an otherwise
complex sequence of operations true wrisble factors which render calculation
of any period impossible. In a system of complex operations such as here
disclosed and in which constants and variables are combined, the resultant
must be wrisble and unpredictable. Thus, true random operation must of

REF ID:A67729 (

nacessity characterize a mechanism so constituted.

while it may be true that only adjacent contacts can be operated in succession, when the claim is considered in its entirety and the combination as now recited including the amendment introducing the word " variable ". It is thought that the whole operation is clearly random and fortuitous, so that the concluding line is not inconsistent with the phrase " in a random order " . In this connection, claims 7 and the dependent claims 8 and 9 have all been amended to overcome the ground mainly relied upon for their rejection.

It is thought that claim 15 as now smended, is clear of any of the citations; and the same applies to claim 18 as now smended.

As to the query involving claim 14, lire 3, it is obvious that the Examiner's question relates to claim 15 since the word " its " occurs in the third line of the latter claim. The antecedent of the word "its " in claim 15 is answered by the phrase " one of said components " . However, this claim 15 has been amended to clarify the meaning and is believed to be in order.

Claim 14 as amended is also thought to be clear of the art and now properly recites a true random operation in the light of the foregoing ergument.

As to the question involving the word " differentially " as found in claims 19 and 20 and the same is generally true of other claims

such as 23 where the same word occurs, it is sufficient to state that
the term differentially is aptly used in view of the fact that the
gearing system 2, 2' and 1 effects a differential operation. In
claim 23 the time variation may be said to depend upon the differential
operation and is quite consistent with the use of the word " differentially "
in said claim. This claim 23 has been amended to evercome the "maximer's
objection on the ground of indefiniteness.

the references have been considered, but more of the three citations discloses a structure of the character called for by the claims in the form in which they are not presented. In particular, nothing in the nature of a variable or slipping drive of friction type is found in any one of these patents either slone or in any combination approximating the present invention. No detailed discussion of these patents is deemed necessary and it is sufficient to point out that those claims positively rojected on the cited art have been smended to avoid the same.

revorable reconsideration is courtequally requested in the light of the foregoing.

Mempactfully submitted,

Um. P. Friedman, et al.,

Øy:

Attorney