

BROWDY AND NEIMARK

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PATENT AND TRADEMARK CAUSES

SUITE 300

419 SEVENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

TELEPHONE (202)-628-5197

February 5, 1992

TELECOPIER FACSIMILE
(GROUPS I, II, & III)
(202) 737-3528
(202) 393-1012

TELEX: 248633

SENIOR COUNSEL
ALVIN BROWDY

PATENT AGENTS
SHMUEL LIVNAT, PH.D.
JOHN E. TARCZA
C. KEVIN TOWNSEND

SHERIDAN NEIMARK
ROGER L. BROWDY

ANNE M. KORNBAU
NORMAN J. LATKER
JEROME J. NORRIS*

(*NOT ADMITTED IN D.C.)

OF COUNSEL
IVER P. COOPER
A. FRED STAROBIN

Cabinet Madeuf
3, Avenue Bugeaud
75116 Paris, FRANCE

Re: KOEHL, J. - USSN 07/691,663
RAPID INTERCHANGEABILITY DEVICE ON EARTHMOVER
APPARATUSES AND ON VIBRATORS UNDER APPARATUS...
Your Ref: JC/MN CF 88/73; Our Ref: KOEHL=2A

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the Examiner's
January 24, 1992 Final Official Action on the above-identified
application.

Unfortunately, as you will note, the Examiner continues
to object to a number of formal matters. He has further rejected
the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by
Erickson (W.O. 83/03629).

Given the finality of the Examiner's action, we are
left with the following options:

- 1) File a response for purpose of putting the claims
in better condition for appeal (this could include a
telephone interview with the Examiner to ascertain what
might be allowable);
- 2) Refile the application again as a continuation
with new claims (if necessary) to distinguish the
invention from Erickson; or
- 3) Abandon the invention in the U.S.A.

If you wish to pursue option 1), we believe that most
of the formal matters can be resolved. However, the Examiner's
continuing objection to the term "fixation points" and the issues
related to that term is a matter on which we will need your
instructions.

Further, your instructions on distinguishing the
Erickson patent are important. We would remind you that the
finality of the Examiner's rejection precludes amending the

Cabinet Madeuf
February 5, 1992
Page 2

claims as a matter of right in any response filed. (The Examiner can refuse their entry as raising new issues.)

If you wish to proceed, we recommend pursuing option 1) above, as the same work involved in pursuing a response would have to be undertaken to produce a preliminary amendment to accompany a continuation application under option 2) above.

A shortened statutory period for response has been set to expire in three months, i.e. the last day of the term will be April 24, 1992, unless the term is extended upon petition and payment of an appropriate late fee. As is usual in the case of final rejections, we recommend that if you wish to proceed to file a response for purposes of appeal, the response should be filed within only two months, namely by March 24, 1992. In order to give us sufficient time to prepare and file a response, we would appreciate receiving your instructions by

March 10, 1992.

We are enclosing a copy of the Erickson patent to facilitate your review.

Also enclosed is our debit memorandum for services.

Sincerely,

Norman J. Latker

NJL:hrh
Enclosures
koehl.ltr