

BROWDY AND NEIMARK
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PATENT AND TRADEMARK CAUSES

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

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

SUITE 300
419 SEVENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004
TELEPHONE (202)-628-5197

TELEX 248633

SENIOR COUNSEL
ALVIN BROWDY

PATENT AGENTS
JOHN E. TARCZA
G. KEVIN TOWNSEND

July 31, 1992

International

VIA TELEFACSIMILE

Rau, Schneck & Hübner
Königstrasse 2
D-8500 Nürnberg 1
GERMANY

Re: STADELMANN USSN 07/762,976
FRICTIONAL DAMPER
Your Ref: R/H/Fu
Our Ref: STADELMANN=1

Dear Dr. Rau:

Jan. 13, 1993

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the Examiner's ~~July 22, 1992~~ Final Office Action, on the above-identified application.

As you will note, we have ~~not made much progress other~~ ^{No} ~~than forcing the Examiner to utilize a different combination of~~ ^{written} ~~the previously cited prior art in support of his rejection.~~ Further, he has abandoned his double patenting rejection, thereby making use of the terminal disclaimer provided unnecessary.

Your options in response to this Final Action are the usual ones:

- 1) A response including, if appropriate, amendment of the claims to place the application in better condition for refiling or appeal;
- 2) an appeal of the finally rejected claims; or
- 3) abandonment.

As is usual in applications under Final Rejection, we recommend, if you choose to proceed with a response (especially if it amends the claims), filing early to permit negotiation with the Examiner, without incurring any late fees prior to the October 22, 1992 due date for the response.

Accordingly, please give us your instructions in good time.

other than overcoming his formal objections under 35 USC 112.