TABLE OF PATENTS CONSTRUED.

Acoustics	Application			Ex parte Carlock	8 O. G. 191
Addressing Machine	"			Ex parte Dotey	12 O. G. 841
Advertising Device	"			Ex parte Gould	4 O. G. 611
" "	"			Gould v. Commissioner	1 McArthur 410, 5 O. G. 121
Agricultural Fork Machine	"			Ex parte Richardson	16 O. G. 261
Amalgamators	James Brodie		5 July 1864	Brodie v. Ophir Mining Co.	5 Saw. 608, 4 Fish. 137
"	Belknap			Coolidge v. McCone	2 Saw. 571, 5 O. G. 458, 1 Ban & Ard. 78
"	Zenas Wheeler			Birdsall v. Coolidge	93 U. S. 64
Annealing Boxes	McNish		21 Apr. 1874	McNish v. Everson	2 Fed. Rep. 899
Ant Guards	Application			Ex parte Strong	17 O. G. 446
" "	Interference			Cruikshank v. Strong	17 O. G. 511
Anvils	Application			Ex parte Dusch	16 O. G. 543
Anvil or Swage Block	Joseph D. Cawood		9 Sep. 1856	Ill. Cent. R. R. Co. v. Turrill	94 U. S. 695, 12 O. G. 709, 5 Biss. 344
" "	"		"	Turrill v. Ill. Cent. R. R. Co.	3 Biss. 72
" "	"		"	" "	3 Biss. 66, 3 Fish. 330
" "	"		"	Turrill v. Railroad Co.	1 Wall. 491
Apple Parers	James Sargent et al.		4 Oct. 1853	Sargent v. Carter	1 Fish. 277
" "	"		"	Sargent v. Larned	2 Curt. 340
" "	"		"	Sargent v. Seagrave	2 Curt. 553
Artificial Alizarine	Charles Graebe et al.	Ri 4231	4 Apr. 1871	Anilin Fabrik v. Cochrane	16 Blatch. 155
" "	"	"	"	Anilin Fabrik v. Cummins	4 Ban & Ard. 489
" "	"	"	"	Anilin Fab. v. Hamilton Man. Co.	13 O. G. 273, 3 Ban & Ard. 235
" "	"	"	"	Anilin Fabrik v. Higgin	15 Blatch. 290, 14 O. G. 414, 3 Ban & Ard. 462
" Gums and Palates	John A. Cummings		7 Jun. 1864	Smith v. Goodyear D. V. Co.	93 U. S. 486, 11 O. G. 246, 1 Holmes 354, 5 O. G. 585, 1 Ban & Ard. 201
" " "	"		"	Dental Vulc. Co. v. Wetherbee	2 Cliff. 555, 3 Fish. 87
" " "				Gardner v. Goodyear D. V. Co.	3 O. G. 295, 6 Fish. 329
" " "	Goodyear Dental Vul. Co.	Ri 1904	21 Mar. 1865	Cell. Man. Co. v. Goody. D. V. Co.	13 Blatch. 375, 10 O. G. 41, 2 Ban & Ard. 334
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Davis	102 U. S. 222, 19 O. G. 543, 3 Ban & Ard. 115
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Gardner	3 Cliff. 408, 4 Fish. 224
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Osgood	13 O. G. 325, 2 Ban & Ard. 529
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Pretere	15 Blatch. 274, 14 O. G. 346, 3 Ban & Ard. 471
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co v. Root	6 O. G. 154, 1 Ban & Ard. 384
" " "	"	"	"	Goody. D. V. Co. v. Van Antwerp	9 O. G. 497, 2 Ban & Ard. 252
" " "	"	"	"	Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Willis	1 Flippin 385, 7 O. G. 41, 1 Ban & Ard. 568
" " "	"	"	"	Knowles v. Peck	42 Conn. 386
				Sullings v. Goodyear D. V. Co.	36 Mich. 313
Artificial Teeth	John Allen		23 Dec. 1851	Allen v. Hunter	6 McLean 303
Art. Teeth, Hard Rub. Plates for	John A. Cummings			Goodyear D. V. Co. v. Davis	12 O. G. 560
Artificial Writing Slate	John Street		21 Nov. 1843	Street v. Silver	Brightly 96
Asphaltum, Burning	Application			Ex parte Stevens	1 O. G. 225
Augers, Hollow	J. H. Smith	56459	17 July 1866	Ex parte Smith	16 O. G. 1233
" Bits, &c.	Millers Falls Co.	Ri	29 Nov. 1870	Millers Falls Co. v. Ives	14 Blatch. 169, 14 O. G. 203, 2 Ban & Ard. 574
Auger Lip Dies	Richard M. Watrous et al.		Aug. 1871	De Witt v. Nobles Manuf. Co.	12 N. Y. Supr. 301, 66 N. Y. 459
" " Machine	Richard P. Bruff	Ri 5624	21 Oct. 1873	Bruff v. Ives	14 Blatch. 198, 11 O. G. 924, 2 Ban & Ard. 595
" Swaging Machine	Russell Jennings		31 July 1866	Jennings v. Pierce	15 Blatch. 42, 3 Ban & Ard. 361
" Twisting "	W. L. Aldrich et al.	67395		Ex parte Aldrich & Eames	9 O. G. 407
Automatic Measurer	Tapley et al.	Ri 9204	18 May 1880	Stand. Meas'g M. Co. v. Tongue	15 Fed. Rep. 390
	Etheridge	194662	28 Aug. 1877		

Axes	Application				Ex parte Young	8 O. G. 643
Axle Bodies, Attach. for Car	Interference				Smith v. Hopkins	3 O. G. 347
" Boxes, Railway	John W. Lightner	Ex		19 Nov. 1862	Lightner v. Brooks	2 Cliff. 287
" " "	"			"	Lightner v. Kimball	1 Lowell 211
" " "	"				Lightner v. Railroad Co.	1 Lowell 338
" Bearings, Locomotive	Matthew		22439		Matthews v. Penna. R. R. Co.	8 Fed. Rep. 45
Bag Fasteners	Redden	Ri	7735	12 Jun. 1877	McKenna v. Redden	16 O. G. 458
Bakers	Williston				Dobson v. Campbell	1 Sum. 319, 1 Robb 681
" and Roasters	Application				Ex parte Wachs	6 O. G. 907
Bail Ears	Alfred Miller			14 Apr. 1874	Miller v. Miles	11 O. G. 197
Bale Checks	Application				Ex parte Leavitt	3 O. G. 212
" Ties	Frederick Cook		19940	2 Mar. 1858	Am. Cotton Tie Co. v. Simmons	22 O. G. 1976, 13 O. G. 967, 3 Ban & Ard. 320
	James J. McComb	Ri	5333	25 Mar. 1873		
	"		31252	29 Jan. 1861		
" "	Frederick Cook		19940	2 Mar. 1872	Cook v. Ernest	1 Woods 195, 2 O. G. 89, 5 Fish. 396
" "	James J. McComb	Ri	5333	25 Mar. 1873	Am. Cotton Tie Co. v. Bullard	17 Blatch. 160, 17 O. G. 389
" "	"		31252	29 Jan. 1875		
" "	"	"		"	Am. Cotton Tie Co. v. McCready	17 Blatch. 291, 17 O. G. 565
" "	Charles G. Johnson	Ri	44896	7 May 1872	Johnson v. Beard	8 O. G. 435, 2 Ban & Ard. 50
" "	"			23 Oct. 1866	Johnson v. Fassman	1 Woods 138, 2 O. G. 94, 5 Fish. 471
" "	James McClintock	Ri	5504	13 May 1873	Ex parte McClintock	17 O. G. 267
" "	Frederick Cook			2 Mar. 1858	McComb v. Beard	10 Blatch. 350, 3 O. G. 33, 6 Fish. 254
	"			"	McComb v. Brodie	1 Woods 153, 2 O. G. 117, 5 Fish. 384
Barrel Head-linings	George A. Reed			12 Mar. 1873	Reed v. Reed	12 Blatch. 336, 8 O. G. 193, 1 Ban & Ard. 515
" Machinery	James E. Green				Green v. Willard I. B. Co.	1 Mo. App. 202
Base Ball Coverings	James H. Osgood	Ri	7046	11 Apr. 1876	Mahn v. Harwood	14 O. G. 859, 3 Ban & Ard. 515
Batting and Wadding Folder	Interference				Stearns v. Prescot	13 O. G. 121
Bedsteads	Lindley				Boyd v. McAlpin	3 McLean 427, 2 Robb 277
"					Boyd v. Brown	3 McLean 295, 2 Robb 203
Bedstead Castors	Obadiah R. Herbert			14 July 1824	Herbert v. Adams	4 Mason 15, 1 Robb 505
" Fastenings	Philos Blake et al.			30 Jun. 1838	Blake v. Sperry	2 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 251
" Frames	John L. Haven et al.	Ri		14 Jun. 1870	Haven v. Brown	6 Fish. 413
" "	John M. Farnham	Ri	7704	29 May 1877	Whittlesey v. Ames	13 Fed. Rep. 893
" "	"	"		"	W. W. Mattress Co. v. Palmer	5 Fed. Rep. 312
" "	"	"		"	W. W. Mattress Co. v. Simmons	20 O. G. 955, 7 Fed. Rep. 723
" "	John N. Farnham	"		"	Whittlesey v. Ames	18 O. G. 357, 9 Biss. 225
" "	"	"		"	W. W. Mat. Co. v. W. Web Bed Co.	1 Fed. Rep. 222
" "	"	"		"	" "	8 Fed. Rep. 87
" " &c.	John N. Farnham			30 Nov. 1869	W. W. Mat. Co. v. Whittlesey	8 Biss. 23
	Herman Stube			5 Nov. 1861		
Beer Coolers					Turrell v. Cammerer	3 Fish. 462
" "	Application				Ex parte Sturges	1 O. G. 204
" Making	"		215679	20 May 1874	New Process Ferm'n Co. v. Baltz	10 Fed. Rep. 289
Bellows Sides, &c.	"				Ex parte Jones	1 O. G. 329
Belt Gearing	"				Ex parte McCloskey	9 O. G. 299
Belt Lacing	"				Ex parte Cook	12 O. G. 1077
Bill Head and Check Design	"				Ex parte Proudfit	10 O. G. 585
Billiard Cue	Hugh W. Collender		22492	4 Jan. 1859	Ex parte Collender	2 O. G. 727
" Cushions	"			19 Mar. 1858	Collender v. Crane	4 Cliff. 393, 10 O. G. 467, 3 Ban & Ard. 412
" "	"	"		"	Collender v. Griffith	11 Blatch. 212, 3 O. G. 689
" "	"	Ri	2511	19 Mar. 1867	Collender v. Bailey	13 O. G. 277, 3 Ban & Ard. 217
" "	Levi Decker	Ri		9 Mar. 1869	Decker v. Griffith	13 Blatch. 187, 8 O. G. 944, 2 Ban & Ard. 178
" "	"	"		"	Decker v. Grote	10 Blatch. 331, 3 O. G. 65, 6 Fish. 143
" "	"	"		"	Decker v. N.Y. Belt. & Pack. Co.	3 O. G. 441, 6 Fish. 374

Billiard Table	Application				Ex parte Collender	2 O. G. 360
" "	H. W. Collender	Ri		1 Jun. 1875	Collender v. Griffith	18 Blatch. 110, 18 O. G. 241, 2 Fed. Rep. 206
" "	Interference				" "	3 O. G. 91
" " Design for	"				" "	3 O. G. 267
Bird Cages	Maxheimer		162400	20 Apr. 1875	Maxheimer v. Meyer	20 O. G. 1162, 9 Fed. Rep. 460
"	"		218758	19 Aug. 1879	" "	
Bit Stock	Meyer et al.	Ri	8594	25 Feb. 1879	Meyer v. Maxheimer	20 O. G. 1162, 9 Fed. Rep. 99
" "	Charles H. Amidon			4 Jan. 1868	Millers Falls Co. v. Ives	14 Blatch. 169, 14 O. G. 203, 2 Ban & Ard. 574
" Holding Device	Millers Falls Co.	Ri	6350	23 Mar. 1875	Millers Falls Co. v. Backus	17 O. G. 852
Blanks for Thill Shackles	W. H. Barber			24 May 1864	Ex parte Millers Falls Co.	1 O. G. 47
Blind and Slat Cutting Machine	James B. Clark		66130	25 Jun. 1867	Clark v. Beecher Manuf. Co.	7 Fed. Rep. 816
Blotting Pads	Application				Ex parte Sherman	7 O. G. 1054
Blowers	"				Ex parte Gerson	11 O. G. 244
"	P. H. Roots			25 Sept. 1860	Ex parte Roots	6 O. G. 391
"	P. H. & F. M. Roots			27 July 1869	Roots v. Hyndman	4 O. G. 29, 6 Fish. 439
"	"	Ri	3570	"	Hyndman v. Roots	97 U. S. 224, 13 O. G. 868
"	Harger				Percival v. Harger	40 Iowa 286
Boats, Canal	"				Rawson v. Harger	48 Iowa 269
" "	Application				Ex parte Frick	1 O. G. 574
" "	McCrary	Ri	5630		McCrary v. Penn. Canal Co.	5 Fed. Rep. 367
" "	Application				Ex parte McColgan	6 O. G. 327
" Torpedo	"				Ex parte McCully	6 O. G. 153
" "	"				Ex parte Jopling	8 O. G. 1032
" "	Interference				Lay v. Ballard	3 O. G. 687
Bobbins	"				Lay v. Wiard	9 O. G. 349
" "	Application				Ex parte Richardson	2 O. G. 3
"	Oliver Pearl		102587	3 May 1876	Ex parte Pearl & Sawyer	5 O. G. 695
" and Spindles	Jacob H. Sawyer			14 Apr. 1871	" "	
" "	Oliver Pearl et al.	Ri	6036	1 Sept. 1874	Pearl v. Ocean Mills	11 O. G. 2, 2 Ban & Ard. 469
Bolting Reels	George Draper	Ri	6016	18 Aug. 1874	Draper v. Potomska Mills	13 O. G. 276, 3 Ban & Ard. 214
Bolts	Application				Ex parte Holcombe	16 O. G. 48.
Bond and Coupon Register	William J. Clark	Ri	6291	16 Feb. 1875	Clark v. Kennedy Mfg. Co.	14 Blatch. 79, 11 O. G. 68, 2 Ban & Ard. 479
Bonnets	Francis Munson		67419	2 Apr. 1867	Munson v. New York	8 Blatch. 237, 8 Fed. Rep. 338
"	Mary J. Osborn	Ri		27 Mar. 1860	Doubleday v. Bracheo	2 Fish. 560
"	"			"	Doubleday v. Sherman	6 Blatch. 513
"	"			"	"	3 Fish. 369
"	Frank. Sibley et al.			9 Oct. 1860	"	3 Fish. 371
"	"			"	"	8 Blatch. 45, 4 Fish. 253
" and Hats	David Scrymgeour			5 Dec. 1871	Kendall v. Scrymgeour	2 O. G. 705
"	S. A. Blake			24 Dec. 1861	Baldwin v. Schultz	9 Blatch. 494, 2 O. G. 315, 5 Fish. 75
" Fabric for	Henry Loewenberg			28 Feb. 1865	"	
	L. Kendall & R. H. Trested			9 Feb. 1869	"	9 Blatch. 494, 2 O. G. 315, 5 Fish. 75
Bonnet Frames	Whitten E. Kidd			13 Apr. 1858	Kidd v. Spence	4 Fish. 37
Book Marker	Application				Ex parte Murdoch	16 O. G. 957
Books, Metallic Stitch for	"				Ex parte Averill	8 O. G. 400
Bookbinding		Ri	8195		Wire B. S. M. Co. v. Stevenson	11 Fed. Rep. 155
" Paste for	Joseph Woodward			10 July 1866	Woodward v. Dinsmore	4 Fish. 163
Boots and Shoes	Application				Ex parte Ballou	5 O. G. 29
" "	"				Ex parte Underwood	4 O. G. 449
" "	Alex. F. Evory & A. Heston		59375	6 Nov. 1866	Evory v. Burt	15 Fed. Rep. 112
" "	"		"	"	Evory v. Candee	17 Blatch. 200, 2 Fed. Rep. 512
" "	"		"	"	"	5 Ban & Ard. 67
" "	"		"	"	"	5 Ban & Ard. 435
" "	John Bedford			1808	Bedford v. Hunt	1 Mason 302, 1 Robb 118

Boots and Shoes		Lyman R. Blake	Ri 9043	13 Jan. 1880	Mackay v. Jackman	23 O. G. 85, 1st Fed. Rep. 615
" "		"	29562	14 Aug. 1860		
" "					Stevens v. Pritchard	4 Cliff. 417, 3 O. G. 505, 2 Ban & Ard. 390
" "		Two patents not named			White v. Lee	3 Fed. Rep. 222
" "		Lee	Ri 8536		"	4 Fed. Rep. 916
" "		Lyman R. Blake	Ri 9043	13 Jan. 1880	McKay v. Dibert	19 O. G. 1351, 5 Fed. Rep. 587
" "		"	29562	14 Aug. 1860		
" "		"	"	"	McKay v. McKnight	5 Fed. Rep. 593
" "		"	"	"	McKay v. Scott S. S. Machine Co.	20 O. G. 372
" "		Gordon McKay	Ri	28 Mar. 1876	McKay v. Stowe	17 Fed. Rep. 516
		Louis Godder		13 May 1875		
" "		J. Wesley Dodge	150305	28 Feb. 1874	Fifield v. Whittemore	17 Fed. Rep. 513
" "		P. Kelly			Kelly v. Porter	8 Saw. 482
		Elias S. Ingalls		8 May 1860		
" "	Machinery for	B. Q. Budding		8 Aug. 1863	Dodge v. Fearey	20 O. G. 1590, 8 Fed. Rep. 329
		" "		3 May 1864		
" "		Henry Dunham	184281	18 Aug. 1874	Dunham v. Kimball	17 Fed. Rep. 810
" "		N. J. Simonds et al.		10 Feb. 1874	Emery v. Cavanaugh	17 Fed. Rep. 242
" "	" "	Smith	259597	13 June 1882	Smith v. Halkyard	16 Fed. Rep. 414, 23 O. G. 1853
		"	232561	21 Sept. 1880		
" "	India Rubber	Leopold Cohn	Ri		Cohn v. Rubber Co	15 O. G. 829, 3 Ban & Ard. 568
" "	" "	Christopher Meyer et al.	Ri	17 Nov. 1874	Meyer v. Goodyear I. G. M'f'g Co.	22 O. G. 861, 11 Fed. Rep. 891
" "	Moccasin	P. Kelleker & J. Randlett	Ri 6098	27 Oct. 1874	Kelleher v. Darling	4 Cliff. 424, 14 O. G. 673, 3 Ban & Ard. 438
" "	Boot Trees	Reuben S. Lewis		2 Mar. 1858	Howe v. Newton	2 Fish. 531
" "	"	Charles T. Eames		27 May 1856	Eames v. Cook	2 Fish. 146
" "	"	"		"	Eames v. Godfrey	1 Wall. 78
" "	"	"		"	Godfrey v. Eames	1 Wall. 317
" "	"	George W. Badger	170462	30 Nov. 1875	Cox v. Ramsdell	4 Ban & Ard. 326
" "	Heels	Application			Ex parte Barsaloux	9 O. G. 883
" "	"	"			Ex parte Pennie	17 O. G. 330
" "	" Machine for	Interference			Baldwin v. Bigelow	7 O. G. 1011
" "	" Compressing	Bigelow			Walker v. Brooks	125 Mass. 241
" "	Lasts	Levi J. Mabie and others		16 Sept. 1862	Mabie v. Haskell	2 Cliff. 507
		F. D. Ballou et al.	156405	3 Nov. 1874		
		Geo. W. Copeland	181772	5 Sept. 1876		
" "	Lasting Machine	"	182561	26 Sept. 1876	Glidden v. Copeland	15 O. G. 920
		George W. Copeland et al.	197607	27 Nov. 1877		
		"	Ri 8138	26 Mar. 1878		
" "	Shoe Tips	American Shoe Tip Co.	Ri 3070	4 Aug. 1868	Amer. Shoe Co. v. Nat'l Shoe Co.	11 O. G. 740, 2 Ban & Ard. 551
" "	"	Hugh White	Ri 8536	7 Jan. 1879	White v. Lee	14 Fed. Rep. 789
" "	"	John A. Stockwell	Ri 6123	4 Nov. 1874	Berry v. Stockwell	9 O. G. 404
" "	"	Interference			Hussey v. Van Wagenen	10 O. G. 942
" "	"	Shuter et al.			Shuter v. Davis	16 Fed. Rep. 561
" "	" Raw Hide	Interference			Towers v. Pease	13 O. G. 176
" "	Soles	Chas. H. Dedrick		18 June 1872	Adamson v. Dedrick	2 O. G. 523
" "	Sole Cutter	Joseph H. Walker	49572	22 Aug. 1865	Walker v. Rawson	4 Ban & Ard. 128
" "	"	"			Maynadier v. Tenney	2 Ban & Ard. 615
" "	"	Richard Richards		16 Dec. 1844	Foster v. Moore	1 Curt. 279
" "	"	Application			Ex parte Lanstrom	17 O. G. 744
" "	Stiffeners	Louis Cote	Ri 7356	24 Oct. 1876	Cote v. Moffitt	8 Fed. Rep. 152
" "	"	John R. Moffitt	178809	20 June 1878	Moffitt v. Rogers	8 Fed. Rep. 147
" "	"	"	127090	21 May 1872	"	4 Ban & Ard. 225
" "	"	"		8 Dec. 1874	"	23 O. G. 270
" "	"	"	178869	20 June 1876	Moffitt v. Cavanagh	17 Fed. Rep. 336
		"	209826	12 Nov. 1878		

Boots and Shoes, Stiffeners	Jesse W. Hatch	Ri 6319	20 Apr. 1875	Hatch v. Moffitt	15 Fed. Rep. 252
" " " Metallic	"	Ri 6388	20 Apr. 1875		
" " Pegging Machine	Joseph Barsaloux et al.	128843	9 July 1872	Ex parte Barsaloux	14 O. G. 233
	Alpheus C. Gallahue	Ri 3117	22 Jun. 1869	Ex parte Gallahue	3 O. G. 319
" " " "	"	Ri	6 July 1869		
	"	Ri 3117	22 Jun. 1869	Gallahue v. Butterfield	10 Blatch. 232, 2 O. G. 645, 6 Fish. 203
	"		26 Aug. 1862		
" " " "	Stephen K. Baldwin		16 July 1842	Baldwin v. Sibley	1 Cliff. 150
" " " "	Interference			Shaw v. Keith	9 O. G. 641
" " Screw Pegs	Joseph M. Estabrook	85374	29 Dec. 1868	Estabrook v. Dunbar	10 O. G. 909, 2 Ban & Ard. 427
" " Screw Thread Wire	Albert Van Wagenen	161842	6 Apr. 1875	McKnight v. Van Wagenen	9 O. G. 1161
" " Welt Former	Benjamin W. Lyon	49349	8 Aug. 1865	Merriam v. Smith	11 Fed. Rep. 588
" " Lacing Hook Mach.	Stephen N. Smith	259597	13 Jun. 1882	Smith v. Halkyard	23 O. G. 1833
" " " Stock	"	232561	21 Sep. 1880		
Boring Machines	Interference			Ritchel v. DeSanno	10 O. G. 941
" "	"			DeSanno v. Richtel	9 O. G. 792
" "	Nicholas Wyckoff et al.	Ex	25 Sep. 1869	Farrington v. Commissioners	4 Fish. 216
" "	"			Farrington v. Gregory	4 Fish. 221
" "	George W. Badger	170080	14 Dec. 1875	Cox v. Ramsdell	4 Ban & Ard. 326
	John L. Mason	19786	30 Mar. 1858		
	"	22129	23 Nov. 1858	Consol. Fruit Jar Co. v. Whitney	2 Ban & Ard. 375
Bottles and Bottle Moulds	"	22186	30 Nov. 1858		
	"	22129	25 Nov. 1858		
	"	22186	"	Ex parte Mason	2 O. G. 644
" Salt	George B. Richardson	71643	3 Dec. 1867	Star Salt Caster Co. v. Alden	10 Fed. Rep. 555
" "	"	"	"	Star Salt Caster Co. v. Crossman	4 Ban & Ard. 506
" "	"	"	"	"	4 Cliff. 568, 3 Ban & Ard. 281
" Stoppers	E. D. Moyer	48300	29 Jun. 1865	Hicks v. Moller	6 O. G. 805, 4 Ban & Ard. 434
" "	John Matthews	Ri 2386	30 Oct. 1866	Matthews v. Schoenberger	18 Blatch. 354, 18 O. G. 1464, 4 Fed. Rep. 634
" "	J. N. McIntyre	44864	11 Oct. 1864		
" "	"	"	"	Matthews v. Chambers	19 O. G. 789, 6 Fed. Rep. 874
" "	Karl Hutter	Ri	5 Jan. 1877	Putnam v. Hollender	11 Fed. Rep. 75
" "	"	"	"	"	19 O. G. 1423, 6 Fed. Rep. 882
" "	"	"	"	Putnam v. Van Hofe	19 O. G. 1352, 6 Fed. Rep. 897
" "	Henry W. Putnam	Ri 9002	23 Dec. 1879	Putnam v. Hutchinson	12 Fed. Rep. 127
" "	"	"	"	"	12 Fed. Rep. 131
" "	"	"	"	Putnam v. Tinkham	4 Fed. Rep. 411
" "	"	Ri	19 Jan. 1864	Putnam v. Lomax	9 Fed. Rep. 448
" " Fastenings	Application			Ex parte Putnam	3 O. G. 240
" " "	Henry W. Putnam	Ri 1606	24 Jan. 1864	Putnam v. Hickey	3 Biss. 157, 5 Fish. 334
" " "	"	"	"	Putnam v. Sudhoff	1 Ban & Ard. 198
" " "	"	"	"	Putnam v. Weatherbee	1 Holmes 497, 8 O. G. 320, 2 Ban & Ard. 78
" " "	"	"	"	Putnam v. Yerrington	9 O. G. 689, 2 Ban & Ard. 237
Boxes, Manufacturing	John Sperry	40507		Sperry v. Ribbane	3 Ban & Ard. 260
" Paper	Application			Ex parte Dunn	16 O. G. 1004
" "	Charles T. Palmer	132368	21 Oct. 1872	Patterson v. Stapler	7 Fed. Rep. 210
" Packing, for Perfumery	Application			Ex parte Young	6 O. G. 361
" Fastening, for Metal	Charles Parker			Parker v. Remhoff	17 Blatch. 206, 14 O. G. 601
Box Nailing Machine	Ferdinand Rochow	179135	27 Jun. 1876	Swift v. Rochow	17 O. G. 450
" " "	George Wicke		16 Jun. 1863	Wicke v. Kleinknecht	7 O. G. 1038, 1 Ban & Ard. 608
" " "	"		"	Wicke v. Ortrun	19 O. G. 867
Bracelets	Interference			Engleman v. Vester	16 O. G. 96
"	John Barclay	Ri	6 Dec. 1870	Barclay v. Thayer	12 Blatch. 107, 6 O. G. 2, 1 Ban & Ard. 267
" Ornamenting		Ri 10239	14 Nov. 1882	Boyce v. Fifield	18 Fed. Rep. 262

Brass Kettle Machine	Anson G. Phelps et al.			Jan. 1856	Phelps v. Brown	4 Blatch. 362, 1 Fish. 479
" " "	Waterbury Brass Co.	Ri		14 May 187	Waterbury Brass Co. v. Miller	9 Blatch. 77, 5 Fish. 48
" " "	Hiram W. Hayden			16 Dec. 1851	Waterb'y Brass Co. v. N Y. B. Co.	3 Fish. 43
Brewing Malt Liquors	Adolph Hammer				Hammer v. Barnes	26 How. Pr. 174
Brick Machines	Cyrus Chambers, Jr.			6 Oct. 1863	Chambers v. Smith	5 Fish. 12, 7 Phila. 575
" "	Alfred Hall			3 Sept. 1842	Hall v. Wiles	2 Blatch. 194
" "					Howe v. Richards	102 Mass. 64
" "	Philip H. Kells	Ri	8127	19 Mar. 1878	Kells v. McKenzie	20 O. G. 1663, 9 Fed. Rep. 284
	"	Ri	8867			
Bricks or Tiles, Making					Wood v. Underhill	5 How. 1, 2 Robb 588
Bridges	Theodore Burr			3 Apr. 1817	McCay v. Burr	6 Penn. 147
"	Zenas King	Ri		30 July 1867	King v. Hammond	4 Fish. 488
"	Squire Whipple				Whipple v. Hutchinson	4 Blatch. 190
"	Wm. B. Laird, Jr.			27 Jan. 1874	Hammond v. Laird	7 O. G. 170
"	Dubois			23 Sept. 1862	Railroad Co. v. Dubois	12 Wall. 47
"	Howe			3 Aug. 1840	Railroad Co. v. Trimble	10 Wall. 367
"	Jonathan L. Jones		30577	6 Nov. 1860	Westlake v. Cartter	4 O. G. 636, 6 Fish. 519
"	J. H. Linville & J. A. Piper			14 Jan. 1862	Keystone Bridge Co. v. Phoenix Iron Co.	95 U. S. 274, 12 O. G. 930, 1 O. G. 471, 5 Fish. 468, 9 Phila. 374
	"			31 Oct. 1865		
Bridges, Columns Braces, &c.	Samuel J. Reese			17 Jun. 1862	Reeves v. Keystone Bridge Co.	1 O. G. 466, 3 Fish. 456, 9 Phila 368
" " "	"			"	" "	9 O. G. 885, 2 Ban & Ard. 256
Bridge Gate	Application				Ex parte Stempel	16 O. G. 316
Bridge Piers				23 Sept. 1862	Dubois v. P. W. & Balto. R. R. Co.	5 Fish. 208
Bristle Machine	Nathan F. Spafford			20 Feb. 1866	Wilkins v. Spafford	3 Ban & Ard. 274
	"			17 Apr. 1866		
	"			30 Oct. 1866		
Broilers	Interference				Page v. Bowers	1 O. G. 521
"	David E. Roe	Ri	4651	21 Nov. 1871	Ex parte Rowe	5 O. G. 397
Bronzing Iron	Hiram Tucker	Ri	2355	11 Sept. 1866	Tucker v. Burditt	5 Fed. Rep. 808
Bronzed Iron	"	Ri	2356	"	"	
" "	"		"	"		4 Ban & Ard. 569
" "	"		"	"	Tucker v. Corbin	5 Ban & Ard. 287
" "	"		"	"	Tucker v. Dana	7 Fed. Rep. 213
" "	"		"	"	Tucker v. Sargent	20 O. G. 1522, 9 Fed. Rep. 299
" "	"		"	"	Tucker v. Tucker Manuf. Co	4 Cliff. 397, 10 O. G. 464, 2 Ban & Ard. 401
Brooms				10 May 1870	Gillespie v. Cummings	3 Saw. 259, 1 Ban & Ard. 587
				2 Aug. 1870		
" Packing	Application				Ex parte Toll	4 O. G. 500
" "	"				Ex parte Tyne	17 O. G. 56
Broom Machine	Spencer Rowe			1 Dec. 1857	Pitcher v. United States	1 N. & H. 7
Brushes	Application				Ex parte Andrews	15 O. G. 1056
"	"				Ex parte Dinkelbihler	16 O. G. 810
"	Interference				Lovejoy v. Hill	17 O. G. 331
"	William A. Megraw		160933	16 Mar. 1875	Megraw v. Carroll	5 Ban & Ard. 324
" Head	Francis J. McLaughlin			11 Jan. 1870	Murphy v. Eastham	1 Holmes 113, 2 O. G. 61, 5 Fish. 306
" "	"			"	Murphy v. Kissling	1 Holmes 432, 7 O. G. 302, 1 Ban & Ard. 324
" and Mop Holder	Application				Ex parte Edward	9 O. G. 794
Buckets					Edwards v. Richards	Wright (Ohio) 596
" Bail Ears for	Double Pointed Tack Co.			10 Feb. 1874	Double Pointed Tack Co. v. T. R. Manuf. Co.	18 O. G. 683, 3 Fed. Rep. 26
Buckles	George W. McGill		209701	5 Nov. 1878	Holmes v. Osborn	7 Fed. Rep. 671
"	A. H. Cole			10 Oct. 1855	Sargent Manuf. Co. v. Woodruff	5 Biss. 444
"	J. W. Mashmeyer			13 Apr. 1873		
"	Lucius C. Chase	Ri	1483	26 May 1863	Chase v. Sabin	1 Holmes 395, 6 O. G. 728, 1 Ban & Ard. 397

Buckles	Robert Loercher	Ri 8829	29 July 1879	Walters v. Crandal	22 O. G. 261, 11 Fed. Rep. 868
"	Calvin Hersome	157395	1 Dec. 1874	Emerson v. Howe	8 Fed. Rep. 327
Buckle Fastenings	R. Meyer	Ri 7129		Schuessler v. Davis	13 O. G. 1011
" "	Chas. Schuessler	"	23 May 1876	Metal Stamping Co. v. Crandall	18 O. G. 1531
" "	"	"	"	Loercher v. Crandal	21 O. G. 863, 11 Fed. Rep. 872
Buckle Lever Machine	Leonard A. Sprague	228136	25 May 1880	Sprague v. Smith & G. Man. Co.	12 Fed. Rep. 721
	"	231199	17 Aug. 1880		
Bungs	Rafael Pentlarge	Ri 5937	30 Jun. 1874	Ex parte Pentlarge & Beeston	17 Blatch. 306, 4 Ban & Ard. 607
"	"	"	"	Pentlarge v. Beeston	14 Blatch. 352, 3 Ban & Ard. 142
"	"	"	"	"	15 Blatch. 347, 4 Ban & Ard. 23
"	"	"	"	"	18 Blatch. 38, 1 Fed. Rep. 862
"				Geier v. Goettinger	17 O. G. 563, 1 Ban & Ard. 553
" Cutter	Josiah Kirby	72505	24 Dec. 1867	Kirby v. Armstrong	19 O. G. 661, 5 Fed. Rep. 801
" "	"	"	"	Kirby Bung Manuf. Co. v. White	1 McCrary 155, 17 O. G. 974, 1 Fed. Rep. 604
Burglar Alarms	Interference			Guest v. Finch	10 O. G. 165
Burning Fluid	Tyler			Tyler v. Boston	7 Wall. 327
Burnishers	Application			Ex parte Frampton	1 O. G. 381
Bushings for Faucet Holes	Wm. C. McKean et al.	Ri 8483	12 Nov. 1878	New York B. & B. Co. v. Hoffman	20 O. G. 1450, 9 Fed. Rep. 199
Butter Machines	Application			Ex parte Walton	10 O. G. 165
Buttons	Wade	228233	Jun. 1880	Wade v. Metcalf	16 Fed. Rep. 130
"	Clark M. Platt		10 July 1866	Platt v. Manufacturing Co.	9 Blatch. 342, 1 O. G. 524, 5 Fish. 265
"	Charles L. Potter		13 Dec. 1870	Potter v. Thayer	1 Holmes 293, 5 O. G. 32, 6 Fish. 603
"	G. W. Robinson			Goodyear v. Matthews	1 Paine 300, 1 Robb 50
" Design for	Alonzo Booth		24 July 1847	Booth v. Garolly	1 Blatch. 247
" and Button Holes, Mock	Application			Ex parte Butterfield	2 O. G. 88
" " Metallic	"			Ex parte Greely	6 Fish. 575
Button Hole Cutter	"			Ex parte Doolittle	2 O. G. 275
" Machine				Singer M. Co. v. Union B. & E. Co.	1 Holmes 253, 6 Fish. 480
Buttoners, Shoe	Goldthwait			Brooks v. Moorehouse	13 O. G. 499, 3 Ban & Ard. 229
Candle Making Machine	John Stainthorp		6 Mar. 1855	Stainthorp v. Humiston	2 Fish. 311
" "	"		"	Stainthorp v. Elkington	1 Fish. 349
" "	"		"	Stainthorp v. Humiston	1 Fish. 475
" "	"	Ex	6 Mar. 1869	Thayer v. Wales	5 Fish. 448
" "	"		"	"	9 Blatch. 170, 5 Fish. 130
Cannon, Manufacture of	Daniel Treadwell		4 Feb. 1862	Treadwell v. Parrott	5 Blatch. 369, 3 Fish. 124
Cans	Herman Miller	Ri 7682	15 May 1877	Combined Can Co. v. Lloyd	21 O. G. 713, 11 Fed. Rep. 153
"	Moritz Pinner	Ri 1804	1 Nov. 1864	De Florez v. Raynolds	14 Blatch. 505, 3 Ban & Ard. 293
"	"	"	"	"	17 Blatch. 436, 17 O. G. 503, 8 Fed. Rep. 434
"	"	"	"	"	16 Blatch. 397
" Fruit	W. W. Lyman	22436	28 Dec. 1858	Ex parte Lyman	2 O. G. 705
" "	William Serviss		24 Mar. 1868	Serviss v. Stockstill	30 Ohio St. 418
" Paint	Peter Brown		29 Nov. 1859	Brown v. Hall	6 Blatch. 401, 3 Fish. 531
" "	John W. Masury	24748	12 July 1859	Ex parte Masury	4 O. G. 1
" "	"	"	"	Masury v. Anderson	11 Blatch. 162, 4 O. G. 55, 6 Fish. 457
" "	"	"	"	Masury v. Tiernann	8 Blatch. 426, 4 Fish. 524
" Sheet Metal	Interferences			Perkins v. Compton	13 O. G. 43
" "	Field	186084	9 Jan. 1877	Green & Field	16 O. G. 587
" Tin	Banker & Carpenter	43571	28 Jun. 1864	Banker v. Bostwick	18 O. G. 61, 3 Fed. Rep. 517
Can Opener	Application			Ex parte Cutting	11 O. G. 110
Can, Tin, Machine	Christian Barry		3 Dec. 1867	Barry v. Gugenheim	1 O. G. 382, 5 Fish. 452
" " (Closing Seams)	Edward T. Correll	Ri 4777	5 Mar. 1872	Covell v. Pratt	18 Blatch. 126, 18 O. G. 301, 2 Fed. Rep. 359
Caoutchouc, Curing	Henry D. Ayling		10 May 1864	Ayling v. Hull	2 Cliff. 494
" Treating	L. Otto P. Meyer		20 Dec. 1853	Poppenhusen v. Falke	2 Fish. 213
	"		4 Apr. 1854		

Caoutchouc, Treating	L. Otto P. Meyer			4 Apr. 1854	Poppenhusen v. Falke	4 Blatch. 493, 2 Fish. 181
" "	"			"	Poppenhusen v. Gutta Percha Co.	4 Blatch. 184, 2 Fish. 74
" "	"			"	"	2 Fish. 62
" "	"			"	Poppenhusen v. N. Y. G. P. Co.	4 Blatch. 253
" Cutting Machine	Liveras Hull			23 Jan. 1863	Bost. E. F. Co. v. Rub. Thread Co.	1 Holmes 372, 5 O. G. 696, 1 Ban & Ard. 222
" "	Boston Elastic Fabric Co.		5903	2 Jun. 1874	"	9 O. G. 745, 2 Ban & Ard. 268
Caps	Marcus Marks	Ri	7808	24 July 1874	Marks v. Corn	11 Fed. Rep. 900
"	"		"	"	Marks v. Fox	18 Blatch. 502, 6 Fed. Rep. 727
Capstans	John S. McMillin		52730	20 Feb. 1866	McMillin v. Barclay	4 Brews. 275, 5 Fish. 189
"	"		63917	16 Apr. 1867	"	
Carbon Roux	Application		"	"	McMillin v. Rees	17 O. G. 1222, 1 Fed. Rep. 722
Carbons for Electric Lights	Chas. E. Brush			23 Oct. 1877	Ex parte Harrison	10 O. G. 373
Carburetting Air	Application				Farmer v. Brush	17 O. G. 150
" "	J. F. Barker et al.		93268	3 Aug. 1869	Ex parte Gilbert	16 O. G. 763
" "	"		"	"	G. & B. Manuf. Co. v. Bussing	12 Blatch. 426, 8 O. G. 104
" "	"		"	"	G. & B. Manuf. Co. v. Turrell	12 Blatch. 141, 8 O. G. 2, 1 Ban & Ard. 315
Carding Engines	Jeptha Dyson			20 Feb. 1849	G. & B. Manuf. Co. v. Walworth	9 O. G. 746, 2 Ban & Ard. 271
" Machines	Interference				Dyson v. Danforth	4 Fish. 133
" "	"				Stone v. Greaves	17 O. G. 200
Cards, Business	Application				"	17 O. G. 397
" " Design	"				Ex parte Lavess	9 O. G. 921
" Show	"				Ex parte Underwood	1 O. G. 551
" "	Joseph Lehnbeuter et al.		8814	30 Nov. 1875	Ex parte Leggett	2 O. G. 199
" "	Jacob Steiger				Lehnbeuter v. Holthaus	105 U. S. 94, 21 O. G. 1783
" "	E. C. Pratt, Bro. & Co.		7914	8 Dec. 1874	Steiger v. Heidelberger	18 Blatch. 426, 18 O. G. 1463, 4 Fed. Rep. 455
" " Tablets	Application				Pratt v. Rosenfield	18 Blatch. 234, 3 Fed. Rep. 335
Carpet Design	Bigelow Carpet Co.		10778		Ex parte Brownlie	3 O. G. 212
"	"		10870		Bigelow Carpet Co. v. Dobson	21 O. G. 1200, 10 Fed. Rep. 385
" Lining	Joel F. Fales	Ri		14 Mar. 1871	Fales v. Wentworth	1 Holmes 96, 2 O. G. 58, 5 Fish 302
" Beating Machine	Geo. W. Chipman	Ri		12 July 1870	"	
Car Brakes	D. Holmes et al.	Ri	1397	13 May 1862	Ex parte Holmes & Spaulding	4 O. G. 581
"	Nehemiah Hodge	Ex		16 Sept. 1863	Hodge v. Hudson River R. R. Co.	6 Blatch. 165
"	"			"	Hodge v. Missouri Railroad	1 Dillon 104, 4 Fish. 161
"	"			"	Hodge v. Railroad Co.	6 Blatch. 85, 3 Fish. 410
"	"	Ex		2 Oct. 1863	Wood v. Railroad Co.	2 Biss. 62, 3 Fish. 464
"	Francis A. Stevens			25 Nov. 1851	Emigh v. B. & O. R. R. Co.	19 O. G. 935, 6 Fed. Rep. 283
"	"			"	Emigh v. Chamberlain	1 Biss. 367, 2 Fish. 192
"	"			"	Emigh v. Chicago B. & Q. R. R. Co.	1 Biss. 400, 2 Fish. 387
"	Henry Tanner			6 July 1852	Sayles v. Railroad Co.	1 Biss. 468, 2 Fish. 523
"	"			"	Sayles v. Dubuque & S. C. R. R. Co.	5 Dill. 561, 3 Ban & Ard. 219
"	"			"	Railroad Co. v. Sayles	97 U. S. 554, 15 O. G. 243, 3 Biss. 52, 4 Fish 584
"	"			"	Root v. Railway Co.	105 U. S. 189, 21 O. G. 1112, 11 Fed. Rep. 349
"	"	Ri		6 July 1866	Kendree v. Sayles	98 U. S. 546
"	"			"	Sayles v. Louisville C. R. Co.	9 Fed. Rep. 512
"	"			"	Sayles v. Richmond F. P. R. R. Co.	3 Hughes 172, 16 O. G. 943, 4 Ban & Ard. 239
"	Asahal G. Bachelder et al.				Mowry v. Railroad Co.	10 Blatch. 89, 5 Fish. 587
"	Daniel W. Vaughan				Vaughan v. Railroad Co.	1 Flippin 621, 11 O. G. 789, 2 Ban & Ard. 537
"	"				Vaughan v. Cent. Pacific R. R. Co.	4 Saw. 280, 3 Ban & Ard. 27
" Air	Geo. Westinghouse, Jr.	Ri	5504	29 July 1873	Westinghouse v. G. & L. Brake Co.	9 O. G. 538, 2 Ban & Ard. 55
" Hydraulic	"	Ri	5506	"	"	
Car Brake Shoes	Interference				McBride v. Henderson	7 O. G. 300
" "	James Bing		40156	6 Oct. 1863	Nat. C. B. S. Co. v. L. S. & M. S. R. R. Co	9 Biss. 505, 18 O. G. 1173, 4 Fed. Rep. 219
" "	"		"	"	Nat. C. B. S. Co. v. Det. L. & N. R. R. Co	4 Fed. Rep. 224

Car Brake Shoes	William H. Dunham et al.				Dunham v. Ind. & St. L. R. R. Co.	7 Biss. 223, 2 Ban & Ard. 327
" " "	Joseph Wood	45106	15 Nov.	1864	Nat.C.B.S.Co. v. Bost.& A.R.E.Co.	23 O. G. 1034, 15 Fed. Rep. 462
Cars, Railway	Isaac Knight	Ri	28 Apr.	1836	Knight v. Railroad Co.	Taney 106, 3 Fish. 1
" "	Cooper		Oct.	1839	Cooper v. Mattheys	8 Law Rep. 413, 5 Penn. L. J. 38
" "	Richard Imlay	Ri	21 Sep.	1851	Imlay v. Railroad Co.	4 Blatch. 227, 1 Fish. 340
" "	Ross Winans		30 July	1831	Winans v. Boston & Prov.R.E.Co.	2 Story 412, 2 Robb 136
" "	"	Ex	1 Oct.	1848	Winans v. Eaton	1 Fish. 181
" "	"		"		Winans v. N.Y.& Harlem R.E.Co.	4 Fish. 1
" "	"		31 Oct.	1834	Winans v. N. Y. & Erie R. R. Co.	21 How. 88, 1 Fish. 213
" "	"		"		Winans v. Schen. & Troy R.R.Co.	2 Blatch. 279
" " Hand	Henry L. Brown	Ri	11 Feb.	1873	Brown v. Hinkley	3 O. G. 384, 6 Fish. 370
" " Coal	Ross Winans		26 Jun.	1847	Winans v. Denmead	15 How. 330, 4 Am. L. J. 498
" " Oil Tank	James & Amos Densmore	Ri 2281	29 May	1866	Densmore v. Schofield	4 Fish. 148
" " "	"	"	"		"	102 U. S. 375, 19 O. G. 289
" " Refreshment	Application				Ex parte Smith	2 O. G. 674
" " Sleeping		Ri 6648			P. & P. Car Co. v. B. & O. R. E. Co.	12 O. G. 224, 5 Fed. Rep. 72
Cars, Horse, Street	Application				Ex parte Stephenson	5 O. G. 363
" " "	A. C. Goodell		18 Aug.	1874	Stephenson v. Goodell	9 O. G. 1195
" " "	John Stephenson	167585	7 Sep.	1875	Stephen. v. Brook. C. T. R.R.Co.	19 Blatch. 473
	John O. Hara	142810	16 Sep.	1873		
	John Stephenson	161656	30 Mar.	1865		
" " "	Samuel H. Little				Little v. Stephenson	3 O. G. 379
" " "	"				Hart v. Little	7 O. G. 962
Cars, Propelling	William H. Payne				Ex parte Hallidie	12 O. G. 1077
Car Springs	Application				Ex parte Schoen	16 O. G. 1003
" "	Interference				Ex parte Eames	3 O. G. 180
" "	Perry G. Gardner		28 Sep.	1858	Ex parte Gardner	2 O. G. 359
" "	James C. Pickles et al.	Ri 6321	9 Mar.	1875	Miller v. Pickering	16 Fed. Rep. 540
Carriage Axles	Application				Ex parte Lones	4 O. G. 582
" "	William Jones	Ri	10 Nov.	1874	Jones v. Field	12 Blatch. 495, 2 Ban & Ard. 39
" " and Hubs	Willis E. Miller et al.	Ri 8719	20 May	1879	Ives v. Hartford S. & A. Co.	11 Fed. Rep. 510
" " "	"	200214	12 Feb.	1878		
" Bodies and Seats	"		"		"	22 O. G. 1037
" Doors	Theodore Comstock et al.	Ri 4780	5 Mar.	1872	Comstock v. Sandusky Seat Co.	13 O. G. 230, 3 Ban & Ard. 188
" Tops	Frederick Wood		6 Mar.	1866	Wood v. Wells	6 Fish. 382
" Step Covers	Charles H. Davis	Ri 6974	7 Mar.	1876	Crandal v. Watters	21 O. G. 945, 9 Fed. Rep. 659
" Springs	John W. Gosling	Ri 5644	4 Nov.	1873	Gosling v. Roberts	22 O. G. 1785
" "	Interference				Ware v. Bullock	7 O. G. 39
" "	"				Gardner v. Dudley	17 O. G. 801
" "	Thomas H. Wood	Ri 6018	18 Aug.	1874	Brewster v. Parry	14 Fed. Rep. 694
" Wheels	Bussell				Midkiff v. Burgess	15 Ind. 210.
" "	James D. Sarven		9 Jun.	1871	Sarven v. Hall	9 Blatch. 524, 1 O. G. 437, 5 Fish. 415
Carriages, Children's	"		"		"	11 Blatch. 295, 4 O. G. 606, 6 Fish. 495
" "	Application				Ex parte Schoeninger	15 O. G. 384
" "		79534			Tibbals v. Daly	11 Fed. Rep. 903
" "	William C. Crandall	Ri 4223	3 Jan.	1871	Crandall v. Dare	11 Fed. Rep. 902
" "	"	"	"		Crandall v. Richardson	19 O. G. 1628, 8 Fed. Rep. 808
" "	Calvin E. Fosburgh	Ri 8074	5 Feb.	1878	Dare v. Boylston	18 Blatch. 548, 19 O. G. 725, 6 Fed. Rep. 493
" "	Henry M. Richardson	Ri	3 Nov.	1874	Hazelip v. Richardson	10 O. G. 746
Cartridges	Bein		11 Feb.	1868	Richardson v. Noyes	10 O. G. 507, 2 Ban & Ard. 398
"	Henry M. Richardson		7 Oct.	1873		
"	Application				Ex parte Gardner	17 O. G. 626
"	"				Ex parte Noyes	8 O. G. 818
"	Interference				Ex parte White & Farmer	5 O. G. 358
"	Ethan Allen	Ri 1948	9 May	1865	Union Met.Cart.Co v.U.S.Cart.Co	11 O. G. 1113, 2 Ban & Ard. 591

Cartri ges	Ethan Allen	Ri 1948	9 May 1865	U. Met'c Cart. Co. v. U. S. Cart. Co.	7 Fed. Rep. 344
"	"		" "	" "	8 Fed. Rep. 446
"	John C. Howe		16 Aug. 1864	Forehand v. Porter	15 Fed. Rep. 256
"	George W. Morse	15996	28 Oct. 1856	Ex parte Morse	6 O. G. 296
Cast-iron Cemetery Tomb	"	20214	11 May 1858	"	1 O. G. 489
	Henry R. Flinchbaugh			Miller v. Young	33 Ill. 354
Caustic Alkalies	George Thompson	Ri 2569	16 Apr. 1867	Penn Salt M'f'g Co. v. Thomas	5 Fish. 148, 8 Phila. 144
" "	"	Ri 2570	16 Apr. 1867		
" "	"	Ri 2571	16 Apr. 1867		
Chains for Necklaces	"		" "	Penn Salt M'f'g Co. v. Gugenheim	3 Fish. 423
" "	"	Ri	21 Oct. 1870	Thompson v. Mendelsohn	8 Phila. 166, 5 Fish. 187
" "	Lewis J. Mulford et al.	Ri 5774	24 Feb. 1874	Mulford v. Pearce	13 Blatch. 173, 9 O. G. 204, 2 Ban & Ard. 190
	"		" "	"	14 Blatch. 141, 11 O. G. 711, 2 Ban & Ard. 512
Chain Links	"		" "	Pearce v. Mulford	11 O. G. 741, 2 Ban & Ard. 542; 102 U. S. 112, 18 O. G. 1223, 14 Blatch. 141
Chain Stretcher	Robert F. Simmons et al.	193543		Simmons v. Blackington	3 Ban & Ard. 481
Chairs	Charles Hall		30 Aug. 1864	Hall v. Bird	6 Blatch. 438, 3 Fish. 595
" Convertible	Application			Ex parte Chamberlain	6 O. G. 544
" Dental	"			Ex parte Lee	15 O. G. 512
" Folding	Interference			Waring v. Wilkerson	15 O. G. 246
" Rocking	Alexander W. Stewart	Ri 6376	6 Oct. 1874	Stewart v. Maloney	5 Fed. Rep. 302, 4 Ban & Ard. 84
" "	Samuel Bean		30 Mar. 1840	Bean v. Smallwood	2 Story 408, 2 Robb 122
" "	C. O. & N. Collignon	96778	16 Nov. 1869	Collignon v. Hayes	20 O. G. 447, 8 Fed. Rep. 912
" Tilting	Charles Singer	92379	6 July 1869	Singer R. C. Co. v. Tobey F. Co.	23 O. G. 93, 14 Fed. Rep. 38
" Seats	Streit	Ri	13 Jan. 1880	Streit v. Lauter	11 Fed. Rep. 309
" "	Interference			Rice v. Winchester	3 O. G. 348.
Cheese	George Gardner et al.	Ri	4 July 1876	Gardner v. Herz	16 Blatch. 303, 16 O. G. 1093
" Hoops	"	Ri 9094	24 Feb. 1880	"	22 O. G. 683, 12 Fed. Rep. 491
" "	Hubbell	Ri 6117	3 Nov. 1874	Hubbell v. De Land	22 O. G. 1883
" "	Lennox W. Tyler	Ri 8832	5 Aug. 1879	Tyler v. Galloway	22 O. G. 1294, 13 Fed. Rep. 477
" Press	"		" "	"	22 O. G. 3072, 12 Fed. Rep. 567
" and Provision Safes	"		" "	Tyler v. Welch	18 Blatch. 209, 17 O. G. 1508, 3 Fed. Rep. 196
" " "	George B. Boomer et al.		1 Nov. 1870	Boomer v. Power Co.	13 Blatch. 107, 2 Ban & Ard. 107
Chewing Gum	Frank Northrop			Northrop & Adams	2 Ban & Ard. 567
Churns	"			"	12 O. G. 430
"	Thomas Adams	111798	14 Feb. 1871	Adams v. Loft	4 Ban & Ard. 495
"	David Gates			Rose v. Hurley	39 Ind. 77
"				Bishop v. Small	63 Me. 12
" Power				Dunbar v. Marden	13 N. H. 311
" "	Application			Ex parte Ackert	1 O. G. 253
Cider Mill			9 May 1865	Nash v. Lull	102 Mass 60
" "	Constant H. Wicks		9 April 1837	Head v. Stevens	19 Wend. 411
" "	"		" "	Stevens v. Head	9 Vt. 174
	JohnClark		6 Feb. 1877	Clark P. H. Co. v. Ferguson	17 Fed. Rep. 79
Cigar Moulds	T. C. Miller	Ri 6662	28 Sept. 1875	M. & P. Manuf. Co. v. Du Brul	12 O. G. 351, 2 Ban & Ard. 618
Clamps			23 May 1854	Myers v. Duker	1 Ban & Ard. 535
Clapboard Joints and Sidings	Baker	Ri 3268	19 Jan. 1869	Everett v. Thatcher	16 O. G. 1046, 3 Ban & Ard. 435
" Machine	Robert Eastman et al.	Ri	3 Mar. 1835	Eastman v. Bodfish	1 Story 528, 2 Robb 72
Clipping "	James W. Geurnsey		26 Jan. 1874	Harlow v. Geurnsey	7 O. G. 513
Clocks	Application			Ex parte Jerome	3 O. G. 64
"	Interference			Connor v. Williams	15 O. G. 386
"	S. Emerson Root	Ri	3 Aug. 1875	Root v. Welch Manuf. Co	17 O. G. 849
"	"		" "	Root v. E. N. Welch Manuf. Co.	17 Blatch. 478, 4 Fed. Rep. 423
"	Silas B. Terry		1 Dec. 1868	Terry Clock Co. v. N. Haven C. Co.	17 O. G. 908, 3 Ban & Ard. 332

Clocks	Silas B. Terry			1 Dec. 1868	Terry Clock Co. v. N. Haven C. Co.	17 O. G. 909, 4 Ban & Ard. 121
" Movements	Arthur E. Hotchkiss	Ri	10062	14 Mar. 1883	Parker & Whipple Co. v. Yale C. Co.	25 O. G. 290
Cloth Cutting Machine	Warth	Ri	5186	10 Dec. 1872	Warth v. Browning	17 O. G. 624
"	"		124180	27 Feb. 1872		
Clothes Pin Slitting Machine	Allen				Buss v. Putney	38 N. H. 44
" Dryers	Application				Ex parte Jenks	14 O. G. 747
" Wringers	Interference				Young v. VanDusen	16 O. G. 95
" "	John Allender	Ri		11 Jan. 1859	Bailey W. M. Co. v. Adams	3 Ban & Ard. 96, 23 I. R. R. 344
" "	Application				Ex parte Baker	4 O. G. 156
" "	Metro'n Wrin'g Mach. Co.	Ri		7 Jan. 1873	Metropolitan W. M. Co. v. Young	14 Blatch. 46, 2 Ban & Ard. 460
" "	"	Ri	2829	31 Dec. 1867	Metropolitan Co. v. Tool Co.	1 Holmes 161
" "	Sylvanus Walker	Ri	2829	31 Dec. 1867	Washing Machine Co. v. Tool Co.	20 Wall. 342, 1 Holmes 161
" "	S. A. Bailey et al.	Ri		18 Apr. 1865	Washing Machine Co. v. Lincoln	4 Fish. 379
" " Rubber Rollers for	James B. Forsyth	Ri			Forsyth v. Clapp	1 Holmes 278, 4 O. G. 527, 6 Fish. 523
Clover Machine	Application				Ex parte Birdsall	1 O. G. 465
" "	John C. Birdsall		20249	18 May 1858	Perrigo v. Spaulding	13 Blatch. 389, 2 Ban & Ard. 348
" "	"			"	Birdsall v. Perrigo	5 Blatch. 251
" "		Ri	1299	8 Apr. 1862	Birdsall v. Hagerst'n Manuf. Co.	1 Hughes 59, 11 O. G. 420, 2 Ban & Ard. 519
" "		"		"	"	1 Hughes 64, 11 O. G. 641
" "		"		"	"	6 O. G. 604, 1 Ban & Ard. 426
" "		"		"	Birdsall v. McDonald	6 O. G. 682, 1 Ban & Ard. 165
	David Herr				Swazey v. Herr	11 Penn. 278
Coal Breaker	Battin				Battin v. Kear	2 Phila. 301
" " and Screener	Batten				Batten v. Silliman	3 Wall. Jr. 124
" Burner	Dennis Littlefield	Ri			Little v. Hall	18 How. 165
" Scuttles	Frederick Habeman et al	Ri		18 May 1869	Habeman v. Whitman	5 Ban & Ard. 530
" "	Whitnum		150921	12 May 1874	Whitnum v. Seaman	4 Fed. Rep. 436
" "	"			"	"	17 O. G. 626
Coffee, Liquid Essence	Application				Ex parte Weida	6 O. G. 681
" Cleaning and Polishing	Wm. & Sam'l Thompson		111403	31 Jan. 1871	N. Y. Coffee Polish'g Co. v. Wilson	2 Fed. Rep. 904
" Urns	Application				Arnold v. Wilcox	7 O. G. 558
Coffins	John G. Forbes et al.	Ri		6 Mar. 1860	Forbes v. Barstow Stove Co.	2 Cliff. 379
" " Burial Cases "	J. B. & R. L. Blackman		177741	23 May 1876	Blackman v. Morray	13 O. G. 175
" Handles	Application				Ex parte Ray	7 O. G. 40
" Lids	Merrill & Horner			26 May 1863	Adams v. Burke	17 Wall. 453
" "	"			"	"	4 Fish. 392
" "	"			"	"	1 Holmes 40
" "	"			"	"	1 O. G. 283
Collars and Cuffs	Wm. E. Lockwood	Ri	5259	28 Jan. 1873	Ex parte Lockwood	3 O. G. 439
" "	"			24 Jan. 1873	Union Paper Col. Co. v. Leland	1 Holmes 427, 7 O. G. 221, 1 Ban & Ard. 491
"	Walter Hunt	Ri	5109	22 Oct. 1872	Union Paper Col. Co. v. White	7 O. G. 698, 2 Ban & Ard. 60
Collars and Cuffs	Solomon S. Gray	Ri	1646	29 Mar. 1864	Union Paper Col. Co. v. Van-Dusen	10 Blatch. 109, 2 O. G. 361, 5 Fish. 597
	Wm. E. Lockwood	Ri	1828	29 Nov. 1864		
	"	Ri	1867	7 Feb. 1865		
	"	Ri	1926	4 Apr. 1865		
	Union Paper Collar Co.	Ri	2306	10 July 1866		
	James A. Woodbury	Ri	2309	10 July 1866		
	"		56737	31 July 1866		
	Wm. E. Lockwood	Ri	1930	6 Jun. 1865		
	"	Ri	1931	6 Jun. 1865		
"	"	"		"	"	
"	"	"		"	"	
"	Chas. Spafford et al.				Collar Co. v. VanDusen	23 Wall. 530, 7 O. G. 919
"	James H. Hoffman	Ri		25 July 1865	Merserole v. Union Collar Co.	6 Blatch. 356, 3 Fish. 483
					Goldsmith v. American P. C. Co.	18 Blatch. 82, 18 O. G. 192
					Hoffman v. Aronson	8 Blatch. 324, 4 Fish. 456

Collars and Cuffs	Washington Wilson	Ri 8169	9 Apr. 1878	Wilson v. Coon	18 Blatch. 532, 19 O. G. 482, 6 Fed. Rep. 611
" "	Walter Hunt	Ri	25 July 1854	Union Paper Collar Co. v. White	7 O. G. 698
" Cutting	George K. Snow	132547	Oct. 1872	Snow v. Taylor	14 O. G. 861
Combs	William Pauley		17 Dec. 1867	India Rubber Co. v. Phelps	8 Blatch. 85, 4 Fish. 315
Combmaking Machine	Phineas Pratt		1799	Bull v. Pratt	1 Conn. 342
" "	Tryon			Tryon v. White	Pet. C. C. 96, 1 Robb 64
Composition Roofing Machine	Interference			Barker v. Woodruff	1 O. G. 256
Concrete Stone	"			Ransome v. Norris	2 O. G. 295
Conical Tent	H. H. Sibley		22 Apr. 1856	U. S. v. Burns	12 Wall. 246
Connecting Blind Slats	James G. Wilson	199948	5 Feb. 1878	Whitman v. James	5 Ban & Ard. 575
Cooling Rooms	Azel S. Lyman	Ri 5786	10 Mar. 1874	Lyman V. & R. Co. v. Chamberlain	10 O. G. 583, 2 Ban & Ard. 433
" "	"	Ri "	"	Lyman V. & R. Co. v. Lalor	12 Blatch. 303, 6 O. G. 642, 1 Ban & Ard. 403
Copper for Boilers	Andrew O. Neil		16 Oct. 1877	Cotter v. New Haven C. Co.	23 O. G. 740, 13 Fed. Rep. 234
" Tubes	Application			Ex parte Essex	9 O. G. 497
Copyright (Book)				Backus v. Gould	7 How. 798
" "				Baker v. Selden	101 U. S. 99, 17 O. G. 1029
" "				Baker v. Taylor	2 Blatch. 82
" "				Banks v. McDivitt	13 Blatch. 163, 8 O. G. 860
" "				Bartlette v. Crittenden	4 McLean 300
" "				"	5 McLean 82
" "				Black v. Wilson	19 O. G. 130
" "				Bullinger v. Mackey	14 Blatch. 355
" "				"	15 Blatch. 550
" "				Carter v. Bailey	64 Me. 458
" "				Cates v. Bales	78 Ind. 285
" "				Centen'l Catalogue Co. v. Porter	2 W. N. 601
" "				Chase v. Sanborn	4 Cliff. 306, 6 O. G. 932
" "				Comm. v. Desilver	3 Phila. 31
" "				Cooper v. Gunn	4 B. Mon. 592
" "				Cowen v. Banks	24 How. Pr. 72
" "				Dwight v. Appleton	1 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 195
" "				Emerson v. Davies	3 Story 768
" "				Ewer v. Coxe	4 Wash. C. C. 487
" "				Flint v. Jones	1 W. N. 334
" "				Folsom v. Marsh	2 Story 100
" "				Gould v. Banks	8 Wend. 562
" "				Gray v. Russell	1 Story 11
" "				Greene v. Bishop	1 Cliff. 186
" "				Haworth v. Nystrom	8 W. N. 204
" "				Hubbard v. Thompson	14 Fed. Rep. 689
" "				Lawrence v. Cupples	9 O. G. 254
" "				Lawrence v. Dana	4 Cliff. 1, 7 O. G. 81, 2 A. L. T. (N. S.) 402
" "				Little v. Gould	2 Blatch. 165
" "				"	2 Blatch. 382
" "				Merrill v. Tice	104 U. S. 557
" "				Miller v. McElroy	2 Penn. L. J. 305
" "				Monk v. Harper	3 Ed. Ch. 109
" "				Myers v. Callaghan	5 Fed. Rep. 728
" "				Nichols v. Ruggles	3 Day 145
" "				Osgood v. Allen	1 Holmes 185, 3 O. G. 124
" "				Paige v. Banks	13 Wall. 608, 7 Blatch. 152
" "				Pierpont v. Fowle	2 W. & M. 23
" "				Pulte v. Derby	5 McLean 328
" "				Rogers v. Jewett	22 Law Rep. 339

Rosenbach v. Dreyfuss	17 O. G. 1153, 2 Fed. Rep. 217
Scribner v. Stoddart	19 A. L. Reg. 433
Story v. Derby	4 McLean 160
Story v. Holcombe	4 McLean 306
Stowe v. Thomas	2 Wall. Jr. 547
Struve v. Schwedler	4 Blatch. 23
Webb v. Powers	2 W. & M. 497
Wheaton v. Peters	8 Pet. 591
Willis v. Tibbals	33 N. Y. Sup. 220
Atwill v. Ferrett	2 Blatch. 39
Benn v. Leclercq	30 Leg. Int. 185
Boucicault v. Fox	5 Blatch. 87
Boucicault v. Hart	13 Blatch. 47
Boucicault v. Wood	2 Biss. 34, 16 A. L. Reg. 539
Crowe v. Aiken	2 Biss. 208, 4 A. L. Rev. 450.
Daly v. Palmer	6 Blatch. 256
Jones v. Thorne	1 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 408
Keene v. Clarke	5 Robb 38
Keene v. Kimball	82 Mass. 545, 23 Law Rep. 339
Keene v. Wheatley	9 Phila. 157, 9 A. L. Reg. 331
Mackaye v. Mallory	22 O. G. 945, 12 Fed. Rep. 328
Martinetti v. Maguire	1 Deady 216, 1 Abb. C. C. 356
Palmer v. De Witt	36 How. Pr. 222, 40 How. Pr. 293, 47 N. Y. 532, 2 Sween. 530, 5 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 130
Roberts v. Myers	23 Law Rep. 396, 17 Leg. Int. 405
Shook v. Rankin	6 Biss. 477
Denis v. Leclerc	1 Orleans T. R. 297
Eyre v. Higbee	22 How. Pr. 198, 35 Barb. 502
Folsom v. Marsh	2 Story 100
Grigsby v. Breckinridge	2 Bush. 480
Hoyt v. Mackenzie	3 Barb. Ch. 320
Tefft v. Marsh	1 W. Va. 38
Wetmore v. Scoville	3 Edw. Ch. 515
Woolsey v. Judd	4 Duer 379
Blunt v. Pelten	2 Paine 393
Chapman v. Ferry	12 Fed. Rep. 693
Farmer v. Calvert Pub. Co.	1 Flippin 228, 5 A. L. T. 168
King v. Force	2 C[illegible] C. C. 208
Parkinson v. Lasalle	3 S[illegible]
Perris v. Hexamer	99 [illegible]74
Rees v. Peltzer	75 [illegible]45
Smith v. Johnson	4 Blatch. 252
Stephens v. Cady	14 How. 528
Sterrick v. Pugsley	1 Flippin 350
Stevens v. Cady	2 Curt. 200
"	14 How. 528
Stevens v. Gladding	2 Curt. 608
"	17 How. 447
Ferrett v. Atwell	1 Blatch. 151
Jollie v. Jacques	1 Blatch. 618
Reed v. Carusi	Taney 72
Thomas v. Lennon	14 Fed. Rep. 849
Binns v. Woodruff	4 Wash. 48
Clayton v. Stone	2 Paine 382

Copyright (Book)	
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
Copyright (Dramatic)	
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
Copyright (Letters)	
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
Copyright (Map or Chart)	
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
"	"
Copyright (Musical)	
"	"
"	"
"	"
Copyright (Prints, &c.)	
"	"

Copyright (Prints &c.)				Drury v. Ewing	1 Bond 540
" "				Ehret v. Pierce	18 Blatch. 302, 10 Fed. Rep. 553
" "				Heine v. Appleton	4 Blatch. 125
" "				Johnson v. Donaldson	18 Blatch. 287, 3 Fed. Rep. 22
" "				Marsh v. Warren	14 Blatch. 263, 14 O. G 678
" "				Parton v. Prang	3 Cliff. 537, 2 O. G. 619, 6 A. L. T. 105
" "				Richardson v. Miller	12 O. G. 3
" "				Rossiter v. Hill	5 Blatch. 362
" "				Schreiber v. Sharpless	6 Fed. Rep. 175
" "				Sheldon v. Houghton	5 Blatch. 285
" "				Wood v. Abbott	5 Blatch. 325
				Yuengling v. Schile	12 Fed. Rep. 97
Cords for Wrapping Thread	Hugo Sutro	Ri 6751	16 Nov. 1865	Sutro v. Moll	8 Fed. Rep. 909
Corn Planter	Application			Ex parte Cardwell	15 O. G. 293
" "	James W. Atkinson	225318	9 Mar. 1880	Runstetter v. Atkinson	23 O. G. 940
	George W. Brown	Ri 1036	11 Sept. 1860		
	"	Ri 1037	"		
	"	Ri 1038	"		
	"	Ri 1039	"		
	"	Ri 1040	"		
	"	Ri 1091	11 Dec. 1860	Corn Planter Patent Case (Brown v. Guild)	23 Wall. 181, 6 O. G. 392, 7 O. G. 739
	"	Ri 1092	"		
	"	Ri 1093	"		
	"	Ri 1094	"		
	"	Ri 1095	"		
" "	Samuel Harpester	68070	27 Aug. 1870	Ex parte Hunt	13 O. G. 771
" "	"	"	"	"	15 O. G. 831
" "	Interference			Bering v. Haworth	14 O. G. 117
Corn Sheller	William B. Durrall	38002	24 Mar. 1863	Durrall v. Rumsey	13 O. G. 123
" "	Henry A. Adams		15 Oct. 1872	Adams v. Jolliet Manuf. Co.	12 O. G. 91, 3 Ban & Ard. 1
" " and Grinder	George M. Weaver			McDowell v. Meredith	4 Whart. 311
	Interference			Thomson v. Gutman	16 O. G. 857
Corsets	Moritz Cohn	137893	15 Apr. 1853	Cohn v. U. S. Corset Co.	12 Blatch. 225, 6 O. G. 259, 1 Ban & Ard. 340
"	"	"	"	"	93 U. S. 366, 11 O. G. 457
"	H. A. Lyman	Ri 6100	27 Oct. 1874	Thomson v. Jacobs	12 O. G. 890
"	Sarah A. Moody	Ri 2165		Moody v. Taber	1 Holmes 325, 5 O. G. 273, 1 Ban & Ard. 41
"	DeVer Warner	Ri 8114	5 Mar. 1878	DeVer Warner v. Bassett	7 Fed. Rep. 408
	"		4 Dec. 1877		
" Skirt Supporter	Lavinia H. Foy	45296	29 Nov. 1864	Foy v. Hunter	9 O. G. 542
" and Bustle Combined	"	Ri 4831	26 Mar. 1872		
	"	54723	1 May 1866	"	9 O. G. 542
Corset Clasp	Hardy	Ri 7729		Hardy v. Marble	10 Fed. Rep. 752
" "	Phillipp Lippmann	143359	30 Sept. 1873	Seligman v. Day	14 Blatch. 72, 2 Ban & Ard. 467
" Springs	Francis L. Barnes, Exec.	Ri	31 Aug. 1869	Barnes v Straus	9 Blatch. 553, 2 O. G. 63, 5 Fish. 531
" "	"	Ri 5816	7 Jan. 1873	Egbert v. Lippmann	104 U. S. 333, 21 O. G. 75, 15 Blatch. 295, 14 O. G. 822, 3 Ban & Ard. 468
" "	Catherine Judson	Ri 7729	12 Jun. 1877	Judson v. Bradford	16 O. G. 171, 3 Ban & Ard. 559
Cotton Cleaner	Francis A. Calvert		25 Nov. 1841	Nesmith v. Calvert	1 W. & M. 334, 2 Robb 311
" "	Isaac Hayden		1 Dec. 1857	Suffolk Co. v. Hayden	3 Wall. 315, 4 Fish. 86
	"		11 Sept. 1860		
" Gin	Eleazer Carver	Ri	16 Nov. 1839	Carver v. Braintree Manuf. Co.	2 Story 432, 2 Robb 141
" "	"	"	"	Carver v. Hyde	16 Pet. 513
" "	Milton D. Whipple		28 Oct. 1840	Ely v. Monson & B. Manuf. Co.	4 Fish. 64
" "	J. N. Beadle & G. W. Payne		27 Apr. 1858	Ex parte Beadle	1 O. G. 434

Cotton Gin	Stephen R. Parkhurst	Ri		12 Feb. 1861	Morris v. Lowell Manuf. Co.	3 Fish. 67
" "	"			1 May 1845	Kinsman v. Parkhurst	18 How 289, 1 Blatch. 488
" "	Peter C. Sawyer	Ri	6169		Sawyer v. Miller	12 Fed. Rep. 725
" "	"				Massey v. Sawyer	8 O. G. 557
" "	Application				Ex parte Oglesby	3 O. G. 211
" Opener	Whitehead v. Atherton			23 July 1873	Craig v. Whitehead	7 O. G. 219
" Speeder	Paul Moody			3 Apr. 1819	Moody v. Fiske	2 Mason 112, 1 Robb 312
" "	"			19 May 1843	Davoll v. Brown	1 W. & M. 53, 2 Robb 303
" Spinner	"			17 Jan. 1849	Boston Manuf. Co. v. Fiske	2 Mason 119, 1 Robb 320
" Press	Rhodom M. Brooks			23 July 1872	Wicks v. Stevens	2 Woods 310, 2 Ban & Ard. 318
" "	"			11 Apr. 1868		
" "	U. T. & C. E. Stuart				Gates v. Fraser	9 Bradw. 624
" "	Phylos B. Tyler	Ri		1 May 1847	Tyler v. Hyde	2 Blatch. 308
" Preparing	Langdon				Langdon v. DeGroot	1 Paine 203, 1 Robb 433
Coupling	Application				Ex parte Stone	4 O. G. 54
" Pole	Blaney E. Sampson		21026	27 July 1858	Proctor v. Brill	1 Fed. Rep. 415
" Thill	Application				Ex parte Farrow	2 O. G. 57
Cracker Finisher	E. Treadwell				Watson v. Bladen	4 Wash. C. C. 580, 1 Robb 510
Cradle, Design for Horological	Alexander Edmunds			2 Feb. 1853	Edmunds v. Hildreth	16 Ill. 214
" " "	"				Edmunds v. Myers	16 Ill. 207
" " "	"				Myers v. Turner	17 Ill. 179
Crimping Machine	Chauncey D. Crosby et al.			2 Dec. 1862	Elm City Co. v. Wooster	4 O. G. 83, 6 Fish. 452
Crucibles	Arthur Pickering	Ri	6166	8 Dec. 1864	Pickering v. McCullough	3 Ban & Ard. 279
"	"	"		"		104 U. S. 310, 21 O. G. 73, 13 O. G. 818
					Pickering v. Phillips	4 Cliff. 383, 10 O. G. 420, 2 Ban & Ard. 417
Cultivator					Ex parte Adams	3 O. G. 151
"	Jacob Behel			23 Feb. 1875	Palm v. Behel	10 O. G. 701
"	Paul Dennis	Ri		4 Aug. 1863	Eddy v. Dennis	95 U. S. 560, 4 Fish. 423
"	James Dundas	Ri		16 Oct. 1866	Sayles v. Hapgood	2 Biss. 189, 3 Fish. 632
"	Julius Gerber	Ri	3932	26 Apr. 1870	Calkins v. Bertrand	8 Fed. Rep. 755
"	"	"		"	"	6 Biss. 494, 9 O. G. 795, 2 Ban & Ard. 215
"	Nathan Ida			18 Apr. 1846	Tracy v. Torrey	2 Blatch. 275
"	Application				Ex parte Knowlton	15 O. G. 343
"	Hiram H. Marsh				Marsh v. Commissioner	3 Biss. 321, 2 O. G. 310, 5 Fish. 610
"	Application				Marsh v. Sayles	5 Fish. 610, 7 A. L. Rev. 355
"	Interference				Lynch v. Dryden	3 O. G. 407
"	Thomas McQuinston	Ri		16 May 1871	Turnbull v. Plow Co.	6 Biss. 225, 7 O. G. 173, 1 Ban & Ard. 544
"	"	"		"	"	9 Biss. 331, 23 O. G. 91, 14 Fed. Rep. 108
"	James H. Pattee et al.	Ri		6 Feb. 1877	} Pattee v. Moline Plow Co.	22 O. G. 173, 9 Fed. Rep. 821
"	"	Ri		12 Jun. 1877		
"	J. P. Pillsbury	Ri		26 Aug. 1853		
"	James H. Pattee et al.	Ri		6 Oct. 1874		
"	T. Poling			13 Aug. 1872		
"	Rowell et al.	Ri		31 Mar. 1868	Rowell v. Lindsay	19 O. G. 1565, 6 Fed. Rep. 280
"	M. G. Slemmons	Ri	3514	9 Oct. 1869	Ex parte Slemmons	5 O. G. 604
"	Daniel S. Stafford	Ri	31133	15 Jan. 1861	Ex parte Stafford	1 McArthur 375, 5 O. G. 235
"	"	"		"	Ex parte Conklin & Stafford	2 O. G. 543
"	Paul Dennis	Ri	1515	4 Aug. 1863	Eddy v. Dennis	95 U. S. 560, 4 Fish. 423
Curing Pulmonary Diseases	Application				Ex parte Temple	12 O. G. 595
Curtain Fixtures	Application				Ex parte Law	12 O. G. 940
" "	Interference				Lake v. Kempster	10 O. G. 1187
" "	Benjamin Bray			5 Aug. 1851	Bray v. Hartshorn	1 Cliff. 538
" "	Stewart Hartshorn	Ri	2,56	25 Aug. 1856	Hartshorn v. Almy	1 Holmes 493, 8 O. G. 91, 2 Ban & Ard. 46
" "	"	"		"	Hartshorn v. Shoreey	9 O. G. 595, 2 Ban & Ard. 253

Curtain Fixtures	Stewart Hartshorn	Ri 275	27 Aug. 1867	Hartshorn v. Tripp	7 Blatch. 120
" "		Ri 692			
		Ri 718			
		1838086		Knapp v. Shaw	15 Fed. Rep. 115
		1544005			
Cuspadores	Eugene A. Heath	1197052	10 Oct. 1851	Ingersoll v. Jewett	16 Blatch. 378
"	"	"	"	Ingersoll v. Musgrave	14 Blatch. 541, 3 Ban & Ard. 301
"	"	"	"	Ingersoll v. Turner	2 Ban & Ard. 89, 7 Fed. Rep. 859
"	"	"	"	U. S. Stamping Co. v. Jewett	18 Blatch. 469, 18 O. G. 1529, 7 Fed. Rep. 869
"	"	"	"	U. S. Stamping Co. v. King	4 Ban & Ard. 469 17 Blatch. 55, 17 O. G. 1389, 7 Fed. Rep. 860
"	Lorm Ingersoll			Ingersoll v. Musgrove	13 O. G. 966
Cutlery	Joseph W. Gardner		1859	Russell v. Lathrop	122 Mass. 300
" Cleaning	Martin H. Armstrong		4 Jan. 1842	Armstrong v. Halenback	3 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 43
Cylinder Polisher	George Cowing		14 Apr. 1863	Cowing v. Rumsey	8 Blatch. 36, 1 Fish. 275
Decorating Tin Plates	Julien Rousset et al.	Ri 7556	13 Mar. 1857	Flower v. Rayner	19 O. G. 124, 5 Fed. Rep. 793
Dental Engines	Application			Ex parte Starr	15 O. G. 1053
" Plates, etc.	McClelland		Dec. 1869	Smith v. McClelland	11 Bush. 523
	"		Dec. 1869		
Design Patent	Interference			Bennage v. Phillips	9 O. G. 1159
" for Reel	Emma C. Wooster		30 Oct. 1863	Wooster v. Crane	5 Blatch. 282, 2 Fish. 583
Desks	Application			Ex parte Diffenderfer	2 O. G. 57
"	Interference			Mallett v. Cogger	16 O. G. 45
"		115282		Nat. School Fur. Co. v. Paton	16 Blatch. 563, 4 Ban & Ard. 432
Dies for Chord Bar Heads	Frederick J. Smith	101529	5 Apr. 1870	Smith v. American Bridge Co.	8 Biss. 312, 3 Ban & Ard. 565
" King Bolt Heads	Robert R. Miller	Ri 8631	6 May 1879	Atwater M. Co. v. Beecher M. Co.	8 Fed. Rep. 608
" Wrench Heads	Candee et al.		2 Feb. 1869	Chapman & Candee	2 O. G. 245
" Swaging Mattocks, etc.	Christian Konold		3 Sep. 1867	Konold v. Klein	3 Ban & Ard. 226
Die Holders for Screw Presses	John McWilliams	Ri	23 Mar. 1880	McWilliams Man. Co. v. Blundell	22 O. G. 177, 11 Fed. Rep. 419
Dissolving Xylodine	Daniel Spill	97454	30 Nov. 1869	Spill v. Celluloid Manf. Co.	18 Blatch. 190, 17 O. G. 1148, 2 Fed. Rep. 507,
" "	"	101175	22 Mar. 1870	"	10 Fed. Rep. 200
Distillery Slops Dryer	Application			Ex parte Junker	11 O. G. 110
Ditching Machine	Peter Engenbell			Hunter v. McLaughlin	43 Ind. 38
Dough Rolling Machine	William R. Nevins	Ri	9 May 1848	Nevins v. Johnson	3 Blatch. 80
Door Bells	Interference			Munger v. Cornell	1 O. G. 491
Door Bolts	William H. Hart		4 July 1865	Stanley Works v. Sargent	8 Blatch. 344, 4 Fish. 43
" Fastenings	Samuel P. Kittle		7 Jan. 1853	Kittle v. Merriam	2 Curt. 475
" Knobs	John E. Hotchkiss et al.		29 July 1841	Hotchkiss v. Greenwood	11 How. 248, 2 Robb 730, 1 McLean 550
" Latch Plates	Frank Corbin		13 May 1873	Bradford v. Corbin	6 O. G. 223
" Plates	Morris			Louden v. Birt	1 Ind. 566
Dredges				Brady v. Atlantic Works	1 Cliff. 108, 10 O. G. 702, 2 Ban & Ard. 436
"				"	15 O. G. 965, 3 Ban & Ard. 577
"	Augustus T. Morris et al.		8 May 1866	Morris v. Shelbourne	8 Blatch. 266, 4 Fish. 377
	"		5 Jan. 1869		
Drilling and Screw-Cutting Mac.		Ri	19 Feb. 1867	Bates v. Coe	98 U. S. 31, 15 O. G. 337
Drills, Grain	Application			Berlew v. Berlew	16 O. G. 457
" "	Interference			Martin v. Bogle	12 O. G. 625
" "	"			Hoosier Drill Co. v. Ingels	15 O. G. 1013
" "	Chas. F. Davis et al.	Ri 8889	18 Feb. 1869	Davis v. Brown	20 O. G. 1021, 9 Fed. Rep. 647
" "	Moore		18 Apr. 1848	Moore v. Marsh	7 Wall 515
" "	Joseph Ingels	Ri	17 May 1870	Ingels v. Mast	1 Flippin 424, 2 Ban & Ard. 34
" "	"	Ri	"	"	6 Fish. 415
" Seed	Hiram Moore	30085	20 Nov. 1860	Moore v. Thomas	3 Ban & Ard. 13

Drills, Seed	Hiram Moore		30685	20 Nov. 1860	Moore v. Ludlow	14 O. G. 1
"	"		31819	26 Mar. 1861	"	
" and Planters	Application				Westcott v. Wayne Agri'l Works	11 Fed. Rep. 298
Drills, Wheat	Richard J. Gatling				Ex parte West	2 O. G. 30
"	"				Newell v. Gatling	7 Ind. 147
					Gatling v. Newell	12 Ind. 118
Drills, Hand	Henry H. Packer		20728	24 Jun. 1858	Ex parte Packer	2 O. G. 31
" and Power	Horace Woodman			25 May 1858	Ex parte Woodman	1 O. G. 570
Drills, Rock	Application				Ex parte Sergeant	6 O. G. 963
"			52160		Burleigh Drill Co. v. Lobdell	1 Holmes 450, 7 O. G. 836, 1 Ban & Ard. 625
"	Asahel J. Severance	Ri	3690	28 Oct. 1869	Amer.D.R.B.Co.v.Rutland M.Co.	18 Blatch. 146, 2 Fed. Rep. 355
"	"		"	"	"	18 Blatch. 147, 2 Fed. Rep. 356
"	"		"	"	American D. R. B. Co. v. Sheldon	17 Blatch. 303
"	"		"	"	"	17 Blatch. 208
"	"		"	"	"	18 Blatch. 50, 1 Fed. Rep. 870
"	"		"	"	Amer.D.R.B.Co.v.Sullivan M.Co.	14 Blatch. 119, 2 Ban & Ard. 122
"	"		"	"	Am. D.R.B.Co.v.Sutherland T.M. [Co.	18 Blatch. 148, 2 Fed. Rep. 358
"	Wm. Smith et al.			1 Jun. 1869	Ferree v. Smith	29 La. An. 811
Driving Belts, Metallic					Ex parte McCloskey	3 McArthur 14
Drive Chains	W. D. Ewart	Ri	6387	20 Apr. 1875	Ex parte Ewart	17 O. G. 448
Dummies for Displaying Clothing	W. E. Brock		76394	7 Apr. 1868	Palmenburg v. Buckholz	23 O. G. 652, 13 Fed. Rep 672
Dumping Scows	Interference				Ex parte Bird	14 O. G. 234
Dust Deflector	James M. Cook	Ex		16 Oct 1869	Cook v. Howard	4 Fish. 269
Dyeing Machine	William Barrett				Stearns v. Barrett	1 Mason 153, 1 Robb 97
Dyeing Silk Goods	Abner Stearns et al.			9 Sept. 1818	Barrett v. Hall	1 Mason 447, 1 Robb 207
" "	"			"	Stearns v. Barrett	118 Mass. 443
" Woolen Yarns	Alexander Smith	Ri		11 May 1852	Smith v. Higgins	1 Fish. 537
" "	"			"	"	2 Fish. 97
" Fastening Colors	Application				Ex parte Smith	16 O. G. 630
Economizing Fuel	Christian E. Detmold	Ri		23 Jan. 1845	Detmold v. Reeves	1 Fish. 127
Egg Beater	Edwin P. Monroe	Ri	1062	16 Oct. 1860	Monroe v. Dover Stamping Co.	1 Holmes 413, 6 O. G. 685, 1 Ban & Ard 401
" Transporter	C. E. Coburn et al.	Ri	8091	19 Feb. 1878	Coburn v. Brainard	16 Fed. Rep. 412
" "	"		"	"	Coburn v. Schroeder	22 O. G. 1538
" "	John L. & Geo. W. Stevens		"	"	McKay v. Wooster	2 Saw. 373, 3 O. G. 46, 6 Fish. 375
" "	"		"	"	Coburn v. Schroeder	20 O. G. 1524, 8 Fed. Rep. 519
" "	"		"	"	"	20 O. G. 1085, 8 Fed. Rep. 521
" "	"		"	"	"	22 O. G. 419, 11 Fed. Rep. 425
Eggs, Process of Preserving	Application				Ex parte Howell	9 O. G. 921.
Elastic Fabrics, Corded	William Smith	Ri	3014	30 Jun. 1868	Smith v. Nichols	6 Fish. 61; 21 Wall. 112, 1 Holmes 172, 2 O. G. 649
" "	"		9653	5 Apr. 1867	Smith v. Glendale E. F. Co.	1 Holmes 340, 5 O. G. 429
" "	"		"	"	Smith v. Elliott	9 Blatch. 400, 1 O. G. 331, 5 Fish. 315
" "	"	Ri	2844	14 Jan. 1868	Elastic Fabric Co. v. Smith	100 U. S. 110
	"	Ri	2848	"		
	"	Ri	3014	30 Jan. 1868		
Electric Baths	Mark W. House			5 May 1863	House v. Young	3 Fish. 335
Electric Lights	Interference				Fuller v. Brush	16 O. G. 1188
" Annunciators	Elisha Gray		172993	1 Feb. 1876	West. Elec. Manf. Co. v. Chicago Elec. Manuf. Co.	14 Fed. Rep. 691
" "	Augustus Hahl		148471	10 Mar. 1874		
" "	Charles W. Lewis			15 Feb. 1876	Western Elec Manf. Co v. Odell	18 Fed. Rep. 321
" " Carbons for	Charles E. Brush			23 Oct. 1877	Farmer v. Brush	17 O. G. 150
" Lights	Various Patents				Perkins v. U.S. Electric Light Co.	21 O. G. 204
" Gas Lighters	Application				Ex parte Bogert	10 O. G. 113

Electric Gas Lighters	Interference			Packard v. Sanford	16 O. G. 1182
" Railroad Signals	Frank L. Pope	140536	1 July 1873	Electric R. S. Co. v. Hall R. S. Co.	6 Fed. Rep. 603
Electro Galvanic Chains	Isaac L. Pulvemacher	120772		Ex parte Pulvemacher	10 O. G. 2
" Magnetic Machine	Henry Wilde			Wilde v. Smith	8 Daly 196
Electroplated Yellow Metal	Application			Ex parte O'Neill	16 O. G. 1049
Elevators	Otis Tufts	60143	11 Dec. 1866	Tufts v. Machine Co.	1 Holmes 459, 8 O. G. 259, 1 Ban & Ard. 633
"	Reedy	Ri 4273	21 Feb. 1871	Reedy v. Scott	23 Wall. 352, 7 O. G. 463
" Blast				Somers v. Richards	46 Vt. 170
" Hay	Fowler	1869	14 Feb. 1865	Bennett v. Fowler	8 Wall. 445
" "	"	1870	"		
" "	Edward L. Walker	Ri 2429	18 Dec. 1866	Nellis v. McLanahan	6 Fish. 286
" "	Seymour Rogers	Ri 2260	"		
" "	"	"	"	Nellis v. Pennock Manuf. Co.	22 O. G. 1131, 13 Fed. Rep. 451
" Hod	Thomas M. Pelham	95262	28 Sep. 1869	Pelham v. Demarest	22 O. G. 772, 12 Fed. Rep. 494
" "	"	"	"	Pelham v. Edelmeyer	15 Fed. Rep. 262
" Hydraulic	Application			Ex parte Baldwin	9 O. G. 639
" "	Stebbins	132111	8 Oct. 1872	Stebbins H. E. Manuf. Co. v. Stebbins	17 O. G. 1348, 4 Fed. Rep. 445
" Hyd. Safety Devices for	"	132112	"		
Enameled Iron Ware	Application			Ex parte Niedringhaus	7 O. G. 171
" "	"			"	2 McArthur 149, 8 O. G. 279
" "	Fred'k G. Neidringhaus	Ri 7779	3 July 1877	St. Louis Stamp'g Co. v. Quimby	16 O. G. 135, 4 Ban & Ard. 192
" "	"	"	"	"	18 O. G. 571
" Mouldings	Wallicks	163825	25 May 1875	Wallicks v. Cantrell	21 O. G. 1878, 12 Fed. Rep. 790
Envelopes	Application			Ex parte Marshall	15 O. G. 1011
"	"			Ex parte Orr	6 O. G. 77
" Counter				Ex parte Rheutan	5 O. G. 521
" Machines	George H. Reay	Ri 2529	26 Mar. 1867	Reay v. Rau	23 O. G. 1928, 15 Fed. Rep. 749
Exercising Apparatus	George H. Taylor	75212	3 Mar. 1868	Taylor v. Wood	12 Blatch. 110, 8 O. G. 90, 1 Ban & Ard. 270
	"	77993	12 May 1868		
	"	75217	3 Mar. 1868		
Extension Tables	Merrill E. Carter et al.	Ri	4 Apr. 1871	Carter v. Messinger	11 Blatch. 34
Extinguishing Fires	Interference			Ex parte Stanton & Perley	4 O. G. 500
" "	Alexander Graham, Adm.	205942	9 July 1878	Fire Exting. Mfg. Co. v. Graham	16 Fed. Rep. 543
" "	Dawson Miles	Ri 4994	16 July 1872	Northw'n F. Ex. Co. v. Phila. Co.	6 O. G. 34, 1 Ban & Ard. 177
Explosives	Dittmar		18 Jan. 1870	Dittmar v. Rix	17 O. G. 973, 1 Fed. Rep. 342
"	Alfred Noebel		Oct. 1865	Powder Co. v. Powder Works	98 U. S. 126, 15 O. G. 289, 3 Saw. 488, 2 Ban & Ard. 131
"	Atlantic Giant Pow'r Co.	Ri 5799	17 Mar. 1874	Giant P. Co. v. Cala V. P. Co.	6 Saw. 508, 5 Fed. Rep. 197
"	"	"	"	"	18 O. G. 1339, 4 Fed. Rep. 720
"	"	"	"	At. G. P. Co. v. Dittmar P. M. Co.	17 Blatch. 531, 17 O. G. 969, 1 Fed. Rep. 328
"	"	"	"	"	20 O. G. 1380, 9 Fed. Rep. 316
"	"	"	"	Atlantic G. P. Co. v. Goodyear	13 O. G. 45, 3 Ban & Ard. 161
"	"	"	"	Atlantic G. P. Co. v. Mowbray	12 O. G. 560, 2 Ban & Ard. 442
"	"	"	"	Atlantic G. P. Co. v. Parker	16 Blatch. 281, 16 O. G. 495
"	"	"	"	Atlantic G. P. Co. v. Rand	16 Blatch. 250, 16 O. G. 86
"	A. Dieckerhoff	178277	6 Jun. 1876	Ex parte Dieckerhoff	12 O. G. 429.
Explo. Fluids, Method of Using	Wm. Beschke	57245	14 Aug. 1866	Ashcroft v. Hollings	11 O. G. 879
Eyes of Picks, Forming	John C. Klein	Ri 6951	29 Feb. 1876	Klein v. Park	13 O. G. 5, 3 Ban & Ard. 145
Fare Boxes	John B. Slawson	Ri 4240	24 Jan. 1871	Slawson v. Grand St. etc. R. R. Co.	24 O. G. 99
"	James F. Winchell et al.	121920	12 Dec. 1871		
"	W. H. McLellan	Ri 3376	4 Mar. 1872	Ex parte McLellan	2 O. G. 89
"	John B. Slawson		7 Aug. 1876	Ex parte Slawson	1 O. G. 254
"	"	Ri 4240	24 Jan. 1871	Slawson v. Railroad Co.	17 Blatch. 512, 4 Fed. Rep. 531
	Elijah C. Middleton	121920	17 Apr. 1873		

Fare Boxes, Portable	Application				Ex parte Haasz	4 O. G. 610
" Register	Interference				Fowler v. Benton	17 O. G. 266
" "	Fountain	188349			Yuengling v. Johnson	1 Hughes 607, 5 Ban & Ard. 99
" "	William C. McGill		14 Apr.	1868	R'way Reg. Co. v. Highland S. R. Co.	4 Ban & Ard. 116
" "		Ri 8013			Horman P. M'f'g Co. v. Brooklyn C. R. R. Co.	15 Blatch. 544
		Ri 8014				
Faucets	Nathaniel Jenkins	48407	27 June	1865	Zane v. Peck	23 O. G. 191, 13 Fed. Rep. 75
"	Francis Roach	Ri 7571	27 Mar.	1877		
"	Nathaniel Jenkins	48107	27 June	1865	"	12 O. G. 518, 3 Ban & Ard. 36
"	"	"	"		"	9 Fed. Rep. 101
"	"	"	"		"	2 Fed. Rep. 229
"	Morris		May	1822	Zane v. Loffe	1 Paine 348, 1 Robb 448
Feather Dusters	Interference				Morris v. Huntingdon	16 O. G. 903
" "	Susan M. Hibbard	177933	30 May	1876	Richmond v. Hibbard	17 O. G. 1155
" "	"	"	"		Hibbard v. Richmond	21 O. G. 635, 9 Fed Rep. 558
" "	George W. Hibbard		15 Sept.	1874	Nat'l F. D. Co. v. Hibbard	24 O. G. 407
Feather Steamer and Renovator	B. & A. Todd				Nat'l F. D. Co. v. Dearborn D. Co.	7 Blatch. 136
Felly Plate Dies	Interference				Mullikin v. Latchem	1 O. G. 275
Felting Machines	James S. Taylor	Ex	3 May	1867	Morse v. Clark	1 Holmes 42, 4 Fish. 388
" "	John Arnold et al.	Ri	18 Mar.	1856	Hawley v. Mitchell	2 Fish. 389
Fences, Iron	John B. Wickersham	26166	16 Aug.	1859	Union M'f g Co. v. Lounsbury	4 O. G. 155
" Wire	Application				Ex parte Wickersham	17 O. G. 853
" "	Henry Jenkins		13 Feb.	1849	Ex parte Preston	2 Fish. 179
" Barbed Wire	William D. Hunt	Ri 6976	7 Mar.	1876	Wire Railing Co. v. Walker	
	Michael Kelly	Ri 6902	8 Feb.	1876	Washburn & M. M'f'g Co. v. Haish	1 Fed. Rep. 906
" "	Joseph F. Glidden	Ri 6913	8 Feb.	1876	" "	19 O. G. 173, 4 Fed. Rep. 900
	"	"	"			
	William D. Hunt	Ri 6976	7 Mar.	1876		
	Joseph F. Glidden	Ri 6913	8 Feb.	1876		
	"	Ri 6914	8 Feb.	1876		
" "		Ri 7136			W. & M. M'f'g Co. v. Colwell	1 Fed. Rep. 225
	Michael Kelly	Ri 6902	8 Feb.	1876		
		Ri 7026				
		Ri 7566				
" "	L. & J. C. Merrill	155538	29 Sept.	1874	Merrill v. Glidden	10 O. G. 863
" "	Joseph F. Glidden	Ri 6914	8 Feb.	1876	"	11 O. G. 196
" "	"	"	"			
" "	Michael Kelly	Ri 6902	8 Feb.	1876	Washburn & M. M'f'g Co. v. Haish	18 O. G. 465, 9 Biss 111
" "	"	74379	11 Feb.	1868	"	4 Ban & Ard. 571
" "	Washburn & Moen Mfg Co.	Ri 6 02	8 Feb.	1876	Washburn & Moen M'f'g Co. v. Fuchs	16 Fed. Rep. 661
	"	Ri 6913	8 Feb.	1876		
	Sidney M. Stevens	253781	14 Feb.	1882		
	Noble G. & Thos. D. Ross	214706	22 Apr.	1879	Washburn & Moen M'f'g Co. v. Griesche	16 Fed. Rep. 669
	"	233116	12 Oct.	1880		
	Jacob Brotherton	207710	3 Sept.	1878		
" Splicing Wire	Application				Ex parte Westenhaven & Adair	5 O. G. 695
Fertilizer	Boykin, Carmer & Co.	206077	16 July	1878	Boykin v. Baker	9 Fed. Rep. 699
File Cutting Machines	Etienne Bernot	29236	24 July	1860	New Am. F. Co. v. Nicholson F. Co.	20 O. G. 524, 8 Fed. Rep. 816
Filters	Lansburgh		16 Sept.	1869	Lansburgh v. Hasbrouck	16 Fed. Rep. 566
Finishing Surface of Wood	Nathan Wheeler		18 Jan.	1876	Bridgep't Wood Fin'g Co. v. Hooper	18 Blatch. 459, 20 O. G. 156, 5 Fed. Rep. 63
Fire Alarm Registers	Phelps et al.		30 Mar.	1875	Busha v. Phelps	9 O. G. 1010
Fire Arms	Application				Ex parte Morse	6 O. G. 763
"	Interference				Burgess v. Wetmore	16 O. G. 765
	"				Freund v. King	11 O. G. 2

Fire Arms	Ethan Allen	Ri	3 Aug. 1844	Allen v. Blunt	1 Blatch. 480
"	"	Ri	"	Allen v. Sprague	1 Blatch. 567
"	"		11 Nov. 1837	Allen v. Blunt	2 Wood & M. 121
"	"		"	"	3 Story 742
"	Hiram Berdan			Berdan F. A. M. Co. v. Remington	3 O. G. 688
"	John W. Cochran		7 May 1870	U. S. Rifle Co. v. Whitney Arms Co.	14 Blatch. 94, 11 O. G. 373, 2 Ban & Ard. 493
"	Samuel Colt	Ex	10 Mar. 1849	Colt v. Massachusetts Arms Co.	1 Fish. 108
"	"		"	Colt v. Young	2 Blatch. 471
"	Alexander Henry	119846	10 Oct. 1871	Henry v. Providence Tool Co.	14 O. G. 855, 3 Ban & Ard. 501
"	William C. Hicks	Ri	1 Mar. 1870	Renwick v. Cooper	10 Blatch. 201, 6 Fish. 31
"	"		"	Renwick v. Pond	10 Blatch. 39, 2 O. G. 392, 5 Fish. 569
"	Thomas Lee		27 Apr. 1858	Ex parte Lee	1 O. G. 435
"	Daniel M. LeFever	205193	25 Jun. 1878	LeFever v. Remington	13 Fed. Rep. 86
"	"	"	"	"	22 O. G. 1537
"	Edward Maynard		22 Sept. 1845	Smith v. Sharp Rifle Co.	3 Blatch. 545
"	George W. Morse	20503	8 Jun. 1858	Ex parte Morse	1 O. G. 603
"	Charles A. Palmer	37052	2 Dec. 1862	Palmer v. Gatling Gun Co.	20 O. G. 815, 8 Fed. Rep. 513
"	Pettibone			Pettibone v. Derringer	4 Wash. C. C. 215, 1 Robb 152
"	Benjamin S. Roberts	Ri	3 May 1870	Roberts v. Schuyler	12 Blatch. 444, 2 Ban & Ard. 5
"	Joseph Shaw		7 May 1829	Shaw v. Cooper	7 Pet. 292, 1 Robb 643
"	Horace Smith et al.		18 Dec. 1860	Smith v. Allen	2 Fish. 572
"	Rollin White		3 Apr. 1855	White v. Allen	2 Cliff. 224, 2 Fish. 440
"	"		"	White v. Boker	3 Fish. 66
Fire Engines	Franklin Ransom et al.		13 Feb. 1841	New York v. Ransom	23 How. 487
"	"		"	Ransom v. New York	1 Fish. 252
" Bells for	Park			Park v. Little	3 Wash. C. C. 196, 1 Robb 17
" Steam	Interference			Ex parte Perley & Orr	5 O. G. 457
" "	William A. Brickill	81132	18 Aug. 1868	Brickill v. New York	18 Blatch. 273, 18 O. G. 463, 9 Fed. Rep. 479
" "	James Knibbs	42920	24 May 1864	Campbell v. New York	20 O. G. 1817, 9 Fed. Rep. 500
" "	"	"	"	Concord v. Norton	16 Fed. Rep. 477
Fireplaces	Calvin Dodge		18 Mar. 1856	Dodge v. Card	1 Bond 393, 2 Fish. 116
Fireplace Heaters	Application			Ex parte Reynolds	6 O. G. 641
" "	"			"	9 O. G. 744
" "	Henry R. Robbins	Ri	12 Nov. 1872	Ex parte Robbins	3 O. G. 292
" "	Samuel B. Sexton	Ri 1621	12 Feb. 1867	Ex parte Sexton	3 O. G. 409
" "	"	"	"	"	9 O. G. 251
" "	John M. Thatcher	101376	14 Jun. 1870	Thatcher Heating Co. v. Burtis	22 O. G. 262, 12 Fed. Rep. 569
" "	"	"	"	Thatcher Heat. Co. v. Drummond	3 Ban & Ard. 138
Flecking Machine for Felt Goods	Williams	Ri	4 Jun. 1872	Williams v. Barker	18 O. G. 243, 2 Fed. Rep. 649
Floating Dry Dock	John Floyd		19 Aug. 1826	Bartlett v. Holbrook	67 Mass. 114
Flour-mill Machinery	Application			Ex parte Campbell	14 O. G. 83
" "	"			Ex parte Nagel	17 O. G. 198
" "	Oliver Evans		18 Dec. 1790	Evans v. Chambers	2 Wash. C. C. 125, 1 Robb 7
" "	"		"	Evans v. Eaton	3 Wheat. 454, 1 Pet. C. C. 322, 1 Robb 68, 243
" "	"		"	"	7 Wheat. 356, 3 Wash. C. C. 443, 1 Robb 193, 336
" "	"		"	Evans v. Hettick	7 Wheat. 453, 3 Wash. C. C. 408, 1 Robb 166, 117
" "	"		"	Evans v. Jordan	9 Cranch 199, 1 Brock 248, 1 Robb 20, 57
" "	"		"	Evans v. Kremer	1 Pet. C. C. 215, 1 Robb 66
" "	"		"	Evans v. Robinson	1 N. C. L. Rep. 209
" "	"		"	Evans v. Weiss	2 Wash. C. C. 342, 1 Robb 10
	William F. Cochrane	37319	13 Jan. 1863		
	"	37320	"		
" "	"	Ri 5841	21 Apr. 1874	Cochrane v. Deener	94 U. S. 780, 11 O. G. 687
	"	Ri 6030			
	"	Ri 6594			
	"	Ri 6595			

Flour, Method of Bolting	William F. Cochrane	Ri	5841	21 Apr. 1874	Amer. M. P. Co. v. Atlantic M. Co.	4 Dillon 100, 3 Ban & Ard. 168
" " "	"			"	"	5 Dillon 127, 15 O. G. 467
" " "	"			"	American M. P. Co. v. Christian	4 Dillon 448, 3 Ban & Ard. 42
" " "	"			"	American M. P. Co. v. Vail	15 Blatch. 315
" " " of Dressing	Benjamin F. Barter			"	Amer. M. P. Co. v. Atlantic M. Co.	5 Dillon 127, 15 O. G. 467, 4 Ban & Ard. 148
" Cooling and Drying Meal	John Deuchfield				Smith v. Barter	7 O. G. 1
" " "	"	Ri		16 Jan. 1872	Bignall v. Harvey	18 Blatch. 353, 18 O. G. 1275, 4 Fed. Rep. 534
" " "	"			"	Herring v. Gage	15 Blatch. 124, 3 Ban & Ard. 396
" Middlings	Robert L. Downton			"	Herring v. Nelson	14 Blatch. 293, 12 O. G. 753, 3 Ban & Ard. 53
" "	"			20 Apr. 1875	Downton v. Allis	9 Fed. Rep. 766
" "	"			"	Downton v. Yaeger Milling Co.	9 Fed. Rep. 403
" Middlings Purifier	Application			"	"	1 McCrary 26, 17 O. G. 906, 1 Fed. Rep. 199
" "	George T. Smith				Ex parte Smith	6 O. G. 470
" "	Guilder				Clark v. Smith	21 Minn. 539
" "	Wm. H. Huntley	Ri	8388		Consolidated M. P. Co. v. Guilder	9 Fed. Rep. 155
" "	E. P. Welch		163074	11 May 1875	Huntley v. Smith	18 O. G. 795
" Bran Duster	Issarcher Frost et al.			1 Apr. 1877	Ex parte La Croix & Welch	4 O. G. 526
" "	"	Ri		13 Mar. 1855	Carr v. Rice	1 Fish. 198
" "	"			"	"	4 Blatch. 200, 1 Fish. 325
				"	Swift v. Whisen	2 Bond 115, 3 Fish. 343
Flour Sacks	Application				Ex parte Schuyler	2 O. G. 174
Fluting Machine	Interference				Keller v. Felder	10 O. G. 944
" "	"				Weitling v. Cabell	2 O. G. 223
" "	George E. King	Ri	3000	23 Jun. 1868	King v. Mandlebaum	8 Blatch. 468, 4 Fish. 577
" "	"	Ri	3001	"	"	
" "	"			"	King v. Werner	12 Blatch. 270, 8 O. G. 361, 1 Ban & Ard. 386
				"	Werner v. King	96 U. S. 218, 13 O. G. 176
" "	Susan R. Knox	Ri	3681	1 Apr. 1870	Knox v. Loweree	6 O. G. 802, 1 Ban & Ard. 589
	"	Ri	3935	26 Apr. 1870		
	Flora B. Cabell	Ri	3856	1 Mar. 1870		
	"	Ri	4653	28 Nov. 1871		
Fly Traps	Jacob H. Burtis			20 Jun. 1874	Natl. Manuf. Co. v. Meyers	7 Fed. Rep. 855
"	John Parker	Ri	6811	21 Dec. 1875	Natl. Manuf. Co. v. Meyers	15 Fed. Rep. 238, 23 O. G. 1443
"	James M. Harper	Ri	6493	22 Jun. 1875		
	"			"	Harper v. Cooke	5 Ban & Ard. 50
Food for Infants and Invalids	Application				Ex parte Horlick	7 O. G. 628
Forge, Portable	"				Ex parte Baxter	2 O. G. 470
" Hammer Arm					Geiger v. Cook	3 W. & S. 266
Fruit Dryer	William S. Plummer		191072	22 May 1877	Cowally Fruit Co. v. Curran	7 Saw. 270, 8 Fed. Rep. 150
"	A. Quincy Reynolds		190368	1 May 1877	Wilt v. Grier	19 O. G. 427, 5 Fed. Rep 450
Fruit Houses	Benjamin M. Nyce	Ri		5 Jan. 1869	Chicago Fruit House Co. v. Busch	2 Biss. 472, 4 Fish. 395
" Picker	Application				Ex parte Mills	7 O. G. 961
Fruit Jars	Interference				Ex parte Mason, Imlay & Co.	2 O. G. 274
"	John L. Mason			24 Sep. 1872	Consol. Fruit Jar Co. v. Whitney	1 Ban & Ard. 356
"	"			"	"	2 Ban & Ard. 30
"	"		102913	10 May 1870	Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright	94 U. S. 92, 12 Blatch. 149, 6 O. G. 327, Ban & Ard. 320
"	D. Irving Holcomb		97290	14 Dec. 1869	McCully v. Cunningham	19 Pitts. L. J. 142
"	"			"	Watson v. Cunningham	4 Fish. 528
" Screw Rings for	Application				Houghton v. Rowley	9 Phila. 288
Furnaces					Black v. Hubbard	12 O. G. 842, 3 Ban & Ard. 39
"	J. Augustus Roth	Ex		31 Oct. 1873	Collins v. Peebles	2 Fish. 541
" Bagasse or Wet Fuel	Gideon Bantz	Ri	4731	6 Feb. 1872	Bantz v. Elsas	6 O. G. 117, 1 Ban & Ard. 351
" " "	"			"	Bantz v. Frantz	105 U. S. 160, 21 O. G. 2037

Furnaces, Bagasse or Wet Fuel	Moses Thompson				Black v. Munson	14 Blatch. 265, 2 Ban & Ard. 623
" " "	"	Ri	7 Oct. 1856	Ri	Black v. Thorne	10 Blatch. 16, 7 O. G. 176, 2 O. G. 388
	"		15 Dec. 1857			
" Boiler	Application				Ex parte Heginbotham	8 O. G. 237
" "	Martin Bell		10 Jun. 1840		Bell v. Daniels	1 Bond 212, 1 Fish. 372
" "	"		"		Bell v. McCullough	1 Bond 194, 1 Fish. 380
" Glass	Interference				Nicholson v. Bennett	16 O. G. 631
" Hot Air	Application				Ex parte Twitchell	6 O. G. 506
" "	George F. Flint	Ri	7552	8 Aug. 1876	Flint v. Roberts	4 Ban & Ard. 65
" "	Robert T. Liddle				Liddle v. Cory	7 Blatch. 1
" "	John M. Thatcher		71244	19 Nov. 1867	Thatcher H.Co.v.CarbonStoveCo	15 O. G. 1051, 4 Ban & Ard. 68
" "	"		"	"	Thatcher Heating Co. v. Spear	17 O. G. 623
" Metallurgic	Abner G. Bevan			4 May 1869	Bevan v. East Hampton Bell Co.	9 Blatch. 50, 5 Fish. 23
" "	Huttner et al.			21 Oct. 1876	Huttner v. Knox	16 O. G. 1046
" Quicksilver	Application				Ex parte Knox	16 O. G. 1048
" Regenerative	C. Wm. Siemens		89441	27 Apr. 1869	Ex parte Siemens	12 O. G. 626
" "	"	Ri		12 Jan. 1869	Siemens v. Sellers	23 O. G. 2234
" Tobacco Curing	Jackson C. Millner	Ri	9108		Millner v. Schofield	4 Hughes 258
" " "	"		"		Millner v. Voss	4 Hughes 262
" White Oxide of Zinc	Interference				Trotter v. Bartlett	7 O. G. 3
" " "	John E. Burrows				Burrows v. Lehigh Zinc Co.	1 Ban & Ard. 529
" Supports for Portable	Application				Ex parte Baxter	1 McArthur 520
Furnace, Slag Iron	John J. Vinton		143600	14 Oct. 1873	Vinton v. Hamilton	104 U. S. 485, 21 O. G. 557
Gas Burners	Theodore Clough		104271	14 Jun. 1870	Clough v. Barker	106 U. S. 166
" "	"		"	"	Clough v. Gilbert & B. Manuf. Co.	15 O. G. 1009, 3 Ban & Ard 523
" "	"		"	"	"	22 O. G. 2157
" Heaters	Hiram Y. Lazear		79989	14 July 1868	Sharp v. Dover Stamping Co.	103 U. S. 250, 19 O. G. 1283
" Compressing	Cyrus Manvel		29481		Manvel v. Holdredge	45 N. Y. 151
" Manufacturing	Interference				Martin v. Olney	9 O. G. 1107
" "	John C. Pendrick		12535	13 Mar. 1855	Munson v. Gilbert & B. Manuf. Co.	18 O. G. 194, 3 Ban & Ard. 595
" Meter, Wet	Application				Ex parte Hopper	2 O. G. 4
" Pipe Joints	Richard C. Robbins			15 Jan. 1863	Gaylord v. Case	1 C. L. B. 382
" Pumps	Goulds Manufac. Co.			8 Aug. 1871	Goulds Manuf. Co. v. Cowing	12 Blatch. 243, 8 O. G. 277, 1 Ban & Ard. 375
" Reflector	Isaac P. Frink	Ri	3826	8 Feb. 1870	Frink v. Petry	11 Blatch. 422, 5 O. G. 201, 1 Ban & Ard. 1
" Retorts			36085	July 1862	Wren v. S. O. Manuf. Co.	18 O. G. 857
" " Charging	Application				Ex parte Dietrich	11 O. G. 195
" Regulating Pressure	"				Ex parte Pressprich	11 O. G. 195
" Stoves	Alanson H. Tifft	Ri	7077	27 Apr. 1876	Tifft v. Sharp	18 Blatch. 138, 17 O. G. 1284, 10 Fed. Rep. 673
" " Burners	James L. Sharp	Ri	6835	4 Jan. 1876	Sharp v. Tifft	18 Blatch. 132, 17 O. G. 1282, 2 Fed. Rep. 697
" Tubing, Flexible	Interference				Taylor v. Bourguignon	16 O. G. 958
" " "	Wm. B. S. Taylor			21 Feb. 1865	Taylor v. Archer	8 Blatch. 315, 4 Fish. 449
Gates	Application				Ex parte Heaton	15 O. G. 1054
Gear Cutting Machines	"				Ex parte Holmes	6 O. G. 360
Glass Cutter	Samuel G. Monce			8 Jun. 1869	Monce v. Adams	12 Blatch. 1, 7 O. G. 177, 1 Ban & Ard. 126
" Patterns	Application				Ex parte Rees	16 O. G. 460
" Ware, Graduated	"				Ex parte Shinn	16 O. G. 458
" " "					Walsh v. Shinn	16 O. G. 1006
" " "	Interference					
" " Flaring & Crimping	John H. Hobbs		132208	15 Oct. 1872	Hobbs v. King	19 O. G. 1709, 8 Fed. Rep. 91
" Knobs	Interference				Kirchner v. Blair	13 O. G. 364
Glazier's Pin Cutter	Henry Whitney et al				Whitney v. Emmett	Bald. 303, 1 Robb 567
" Tool	Application				Ex parte Baker	1 O. G. 632
" "	B. F. Adams				Monce v. Adams	1 O. G. 1
Globe Holders	Samuel G. Monce		91150	8 Jun. 1869	Monce v. Woodward	19 O. G. 998, 4 Ban & Ard. 307
		Ri	7280		White v. Gleason Manuf. Co.	19 O. G. 1494, Fed. Rep. 917

Globe Holders	J. White	Ri	7826	29 Aug. 1876	White v. E. P. Gleason Man. Co.	24 O. G. 205
Glove Fastenings	Joseph F. Field		155077	15 Sep. 1874	Field v. De Cornean	O. G. —, 5 Ban & Ard. 40
" Valves	James Powell	Ri	6523	6 July 1875	Ex parte Powell	13 O. G. 911
Glue	Thos. P. Milligan et al.	Ri	4072	12 July 1870	Glue Co. v. Upton	97 U. S. 3, 4 Cliff. 237, 6 O. G. 837, 1 Ban & Ard. 497.
Gold and Silver	Shaw & Wilcox Co.	Ri		15 Jun. 1869	Shaw & W. Co. v. Lovejoy	7 Blatch. 282
Gongs for Engine Houses	Robert Bragg		16517		Ex parte Bragg	8 O. G. 935
Graduating Carpenter's Squares	Hart, Bliven & Mea[illegible] M. Co.	Ri	5408	13 May 1873	H. B. & M. Man. Co. v. Sargeant	14 O. G. 45, 3 Ban & Ard. 263
Grain Bands, &c.	Elisha Foote		135899	187[illegible]	Foote v. Frost	14 O. G. 880, 3 Ban & Ard. 637
" Binders	Interference				Appleby v. Morgan	16 O. G. 96
" "	Application				Ex parte Locke	16 O. G. 1140
" Cleaners	Interference				Baker v. Throop	8 O. G. 1
" "	John W. Free et al.			12 Jan. 1864	Schwartzel v. Holenshade	2 Bond 29, 3 Fish. 116
" Dryer	James W. Sykes			15 Apr. 1862	Sykes v. Manhattan Co.	6 Blatch. 496
" and Grass Cutter	W. F. Ketchum	Ri	4484	25 July 1871	Ketchum H. M. Co. v. Johnson	13 O. G. 178, 3 Ban & Ard. 139
" Reducer	Application				Ex parte Touillin [H. Co.	15 O. G. 657
" Register	"				Ex parte Nesmith	3 O. G. 268
" and Seed Screener	Watson				Hess v. Young	59 Ind. 379
" Screen					Neidefer v. Chastain	71 Ind. 363
" Separator	Jonathan L. Booth	Ri	1826	29 Nov. 1864	Booth v. Parks	1 Flippin 381, 1 Ban & Ard. 225
" "	"		"	"	Parks v. Booth	102 U. S. 96, 17 O. G. 1039
" "	"		"	"	Booth v. Severs	19 O. G. 1140
" "	John R. Moffitt	Ri		23 Mar. 1858	Moffit v. Gaar	1 Blatch. 273, 1 Bond 315, 1 Fish. 610
" "	Royer		167570	7 Sep. 1875	Royer v. Russell	20 O. G. 1819, 9 Fed. Rep. 693
" " and Cleaner	Simeon Howes et al.		19637	16 Mar. 1858	Ex parte Howes	1 O. G. 22
" " "	"	Ri		5 Mar. 1872	Howes v. McNeal	15 Blatch. 103, 15 O. G. 603, 3 Ban & Ard. 376
" " "	"	Ri			"	17 Blatch. 396, 17 O. G. 799, 4 Fed. Rep. 151
Graining Buckets					Wilder v. Kent	15 Fed. Rep. 217
Grate Bars	Application				Ex parte Van Wagenen	1 O. G. 89
"	Henry Collman et al.		77458		Gillett v. Bate	86 N. Y. 87
"	Marcus Rounds			12 Mar. 1861	Wier v. N. Chicago Rolling M. Co.	9 Biss. 504, 23 O. G. 191, 14 Fed. Rep. 42
"					Gould v. Spicer	15 Fed. Rep. 344
Grinding Needles	Cook & Porter Needle Co.		172339	25 Jan. 1876	Porter Needle Co. v. Nat'l N. Co.	17 Fed. Rep. 536
Grindstones, Manufacture of	Application				Ex parte Hubbard	4 O. G. 54
Gunny Cloth	Francis Peabody				Peabody v. Norfolk	98 Mass. 452
Gutter Making Machine	A. K. P. Buffham	Ri	6675	5 Oct. 1875	Buffinn v. Oakland Manuf. Co.	4 Ban & Ard. 599
Hams, Putting up Cemented	Horace Billings				Billings v. Ames	32 Mo. 265
Hand Mirror	Zeun				Zeun v. Kaldenberg	23 O. G. 2514
Hand Stamps	Application				Casilear v. McIntire	8 O. G. 474
"	J. W. F. Dorman			8 Jun. 1875	Cooke v. Chamberlaine	10 O. G. 325
"	Horace Holt		48924	4 July 1865	Ex parte Holt	5 O. G. 148
"	Helen M. Ingalls	Ri	4141	4 Oct. 1870	Campbell v. James	17 Blatch. 43, 18 O. G. 979
"	"		"	"	"	18 Blatch. 92, 18 O. G. 1191, 2 Fed. Rep. 333
"	"		"	"	"	5 Fed. Rep. 805
"	"		"	"	"	18 O. G. 390
"	"		"	"	James v. Campbell	104 U. S. 356, 21 O. G. 337
"	"		"	"	Secombe v. Campbell	18 Blatch. 108, 2 Fed. Rep. 357
"	"		"	"	"	5 Ban & Ard. 632
"	Marcus P. Norton		25026	9 Aug. 1859	Ex parte Norton	4 O. G. 156
"	"		37175	16 Dec. 1862	Campbell v. Ward	12 Fed. Rep. 150
"	"		38175	14 Apr. 1863		
"	Thomas J. W. Robertson	Ri		12 Dec. 1871	Robertson v. Garrett	10 Blatch. 490, 6 Fish. 278
"	"			"	Robertson v. Hill	4 O. G. 132, 6 Fish. 465
					Robertson v. Secombe Co.	10 Blatch. 481, 3 O. G. 112, 6 Fish. 268

Hand Stamps, Rubber Bands for Harness Trimmings	Application				Ex parte Dorman	9 O. G. 1061
" "	Andrew Albright	Ri 5155	26 Nov. 1872		Albright v. Celluloid H. T. Co.	12 O. G. 227, 2 Ban & Ard. 229
" "	Theberath	99032	18 Jan. 1870		Theberath v. Rubber & C. H. T. Co.	3 Fed. Rep. 151
		Ri 5606	13 Jan. 1871			
" "	"	167040	24 Aug. 1875		" "	23 O. G. 1121, 15 Fed. Rep. 246
Harrow	Adam B. Spies	153225	21 July 1874		Ward v. Grand Detour Plow Co.	14 Fed. Rep. 696
"	Coe				Rowe v. Blanchard	18 Wis. 441
" Cylindrical	Stewart Neil				Neil v. Cummings	75 Ill. 170
Harvester	Application				Ex parte Clinton & Knowlton	9 O. G. 249
"	"				Ex parte Emmert	1 O. G. 90
"	"				Ex parte Graham	3 O. G. 211
"	"				Hull v. Commissioner	2 McArthur 90, 7 O. G. 559
"	Interference				Le mont v. Kromer	16 O. G. 1141
"	"				Wheeler v. Russell	1 O. G. 183
"	"				Yost v. Powell	13 O. G. 122
"	Alvaro B. Graham	74312	11 Feb. 1868		Graham v. Gammon	7 Biss. 490, 3 Ban & Ard. 7
"	"	"	"		Graham v. Geneva S. C. M'f'g Co	21 O. G. 1536, 11 Fed. Rep. 178
"	"	"	"		Graham v. McCormick	21 O. G. 1533, 11 Fed. Rep. 859
"	Samuel W. Tyler	Ri 6609	24 Aug. 1875		Tyler v. Crane	19 O. G. 128, 9 Fed. Rep. 775
"	William A. Kirby		15 Nov. 1859		Kirby v. Beardsley	5 Blatch. 438, 3 Fish. 265
"	W. A. Kirby et al	Ex	10 Feb. 1866		Kirby v. Dodge Manuf Co.	10 Blatch. 307, 3 O. G. 181, 6 Fish. 156
"	Aaron Palmer et al.	Ri			Seymour v. Osborne	11 Wall. 516, 3 Fish. 555
"	"					
"	William H. Seymour					
"	Albert W. Morse				Morse v. Davis	5 Blatch. 40
"	Philo Sylla et al.		20 Sept. 1853		Aultman v. Holley	11 Blatch. 317, 5 O.G. 3, 6 Fish. 534
"	Frederick Nishurtz	Ri 3371	13 Apr. 1869		Ex parte Nishurtz	1 O. G. 143
"	"	Ri 3372	"			
"	Interf. of B F. Waters et al.				Waters v. Yost	8 O. G. 517
"	R. H. McCormick				Whiteley v. McCormick	10 O. G. 826
"	Henry F. & Jacob J. Mann	Ri 1281	28 Feb. 1871		Mann v. Bayless	10 O. G. 113, 789
"	Hoffheins	Ri 2224	10 Apr. 1866		Hoffheins v. Russell	23 O. G. 2030
"	"	Ri 2490	19 Feb. 1867			
"	Owen Dorsey	Ex	4 Mar. 1870		Dorsey R. H. Rake Co. v. Bradley	12 Blatch. 202, 1 Ban & Ard. 339
"	Read & Whitaker		11 Aug. 1857		Read v. Bowman [Manuf. Co.	2 Wall. 591
"	Jonathan Read	Ex	12 Apr. 1856		Read v. Miller	2 Biss. 12, 3 Fish. 310
	Lewis Miller	Ri	4 May 1858			
	"	Ri				
"	"	Ri			Ex parte Miller	1 O. G. 431
	"	Ri				
	"	Ri				
"	Chas. G. Dickinson	22786	1 Feb. 1859		Ex parte Dickinson	3 O. G. 91
"	T. N. Foster	30215	2 Oct. 1860		Ex parte Foster	4 O. G. 377
"	Byron Dinsmore	Ri	28 Jan. 1862		Whitely v. Kirby	11 Wall. 678
"	Thomas S. Steadman	Ri	19 June 1860		Whitely v. Swayne	7 Wall. 685, 4 Fish. 117
"	Thomas Plumleigh	121291	30 Jan. 1872		Ex parte Plumleigh	3 O. G. 29
" Grass and Grain	Cyrenus Wheeler, Jr.	Ri 786	14 May 1867		Wheeler v. Clipper Co.	10 Blatch. 181, 2 O. G. 412, 6 Fish. 1
" "	"	Ri 2632	28 May 1867			
" "	"	"	"		Wheeler v. McCormick	11 Blatch 334, 4 O. G. 692, 6 Fish. 551
" "	"	"	"		"	8 Blatch. 267, 4 Fish. 133
" Grain	Aaron Palmer et al.	Ri 1682	31 May 1864		Marsh v. Seymour	97 U. S. 348, 13 O. G. 725, 2 O. G. 675, 6 Fish.
" "	Rice et al.				Rice v. Garnhart	34 Wis 153 115
" Self Binding	James F. Gordon	152181	30 June 1874		Gordon v. Withington	9 O. G. 1099

Harvester, Automatic Binders for	Interference				Withington v. Locke	11 O. G. 417
" Grinding Sic. Bars for	Application				Ex parte McLaren & Coventry	10 O. G. 335
" Com. Rake & Reel for	"				Ex parte Kirby	16 O. G. 1095
" Attachments for	W. F. Ketchum	Ri	4672	12 Dec. 1871	Ketchum Harvesting Machine Co. v. Johnson Harvesting Co.	13 O. G. 178, 3 Ban & Ard. 139
" Rake and Reel	"	Ri	4673	"		
" Cutters	Application				Kirby v. Johnston	1 O. G. 405
" Rakes	"				Ex parte Hall	9 O. G. 1
" "	Interference				Barnes v. Clinton	9 O. G. 1158
Hats	Owen Dorsey	Ex		4 Mar. 1870	Dorsey Co. v. Marsh	6 Fish. 387, 9 Phila. 395
"	Thomas W. Adams et al.			24 Dec 1861	Mallory v. White	8 Blatch. 552, 4 Fish. 628
" and Bonnets	George Mallory		78392	11 Feb. 1868	Mallory Manuf. Co. v. Marks	20 O. G. 152, 11 Fed. Rep. 887
" " Fabric for	David Scrymgeour			5 Dec. 1871	Kendall v. Scrymgeour	2 O. G. 705
" Felting Machine for	Henry Loewenberg			28 Feb. 1865	Baldwin v. Schultz	9 Blatch. 494, 2 O. G. 315, 5 Fish. 75
" " "	L. Kendall & R. H. Trested			9 Feb. 1869		
" Sweat Lining for	James F. Taylor	Ex		3 May 1867	Mitchell v. Hawley	1 O. G. 306, 4 Fish. 388
" " "	"	"		"	"	16 Wall. 544, 3 O. G. 241, 6 Fish. 331
	Beatty		185716	26 Dec. 1876	Beatty v. Hodges	20 O. G. 1666, 8 Fed. Rep. 610
	John Bigelow		218220	5 Aug. 1879	Greenwood v. Bracher	17 O. G. 1151, 1 Fed. Rep. 856
Hat Bodies	Henry A. Burr et al.	Ri		30 Sept. 1856	Burr v. Cowperthwait	4 Blatch. 163
"	"	Ri		7 Oct. 1856		
"	Henry A. Burr	Ri	396	30 Sept. 1858	Burr v. Duryee	2 Fish. 275
"	"	Ri	1087	4 Dec. 1860		
"	"	Ri	1088	"		
"	"	"		"	"	1 Wall. 531
" Machine	Eickmeyer Hat Body Co.	Ri		1 Dec. 1868	Eickmeyer Machine Co. v. Pearce	10 Blatch. 203, 3 O. G. 150, 6 Fish. 219
" "	Joseph Grant [Anderson			22 Apr. 1825	Grant v. Raymond	6 Pet. 218, 1 Robb 604
" "	Wm. S. Hancock & J. H.				Gill v. Wells	22 Wall. 1, 6 O. G. 881, 2 A. L. T. 101
" "	Eliza Wells, Adx.	Ri	2942	19 May 1868	Brett v. Quintard	10 Fed. Rep. 741
" "	"	"		"	Wells v. Gill	2 O. G. 590, 6 Fish. 89
" "	"	"		"	"	4 O. G. 669, 6 Fish. 574
" "	"	"		"	"	1 Ban & Ard. 77
" "	"	"		"	Wells v. Jacques	5 O. G. 364, 1 Ban & Ard. 60
" "	"	"		"	"	5 Fish. 136
" Pouncing	Henry A. Wells			25 Apr. 1846	Jacques v. Wells	5 O. G. 364
	"				Brett v. Quintard	17 Fed. Rep. 529
Hat Pressing Machine	[Manley S. S. Wheeler & D. B.			14 Aug. 1866	Nichols v. Pearce	7 Blatch. 5
Hatter Rings	Chester Gorham				Gorham v. Mixter	1 Am. L. J. 539
Hay, Baling Short Cut	Lucius C. Chase	Ri		28 July 1863	Chase v. Wessen	1 Holmes 274, 4 O. G. 476, 6 Fish. 517
" " "	Charles Brown		68282	27 Aug. 1867	Faulks v. Kamp	10 Fed. Rep. 675
" Forks, Horse	"			"	"	17 Blatch. 432, 17 O. G. 851, 3 Fed. Rep. 898
" Tedders	Seymour Rogers	Ri	2260	20 May 1866	Nellis v. Pennock Manuf. Co.	22 O. G. 1131, 13 Fed. Rep. 451
Head Blocks	"		53345	20 Mar. 1866		
"	J. G. Perry		97438	30 Nov. 1869	Ex parte Stoddard & Perry	6 O. G. 33
Head Coverings	Nelson F. Beckwith		122215	26 Dec. 1871	Allis v. Buckstaff	22 O. G. 1705, 13 Fed. Rep. 879
"	"		"	"	Allis v. Stowell	15 Fed. Rep. 242
Heads for Worsted Cards	S. A. Blake			24 Dec. 1861	Baldwin v. Bernard	9 Blatch. 509, 2 O. G. 320, 5 Fish. 442
Healds	Robert Gray		219462	9 Sept. 1879	Bernard v. Hermann	21 O. G. 140, 9 Fed. Rep. 400
Heating Vacuum Pans	"			"	"	22 O. G. 1134
" "	Application				Ex parte Dobson	4 O. G. 499
Hemp and Flax Dresser	Application				Emmons v. Sladdin	9 O. G. 352, 2 Ban & Ard. 199
Hexagonal Columns	"				Dodd v. Cobb	10 O. G. 462
	James Hines et al.				"	10 O. G. 826
	Application				Dickinson v. Hall	31 Mass. 217
					Ex parte Sellers	3 O. G. 246

Hinges	Application				Ex parte Cryer	17 O. G. 452
"	"				Ex parte Dodge	3 O. G. 179
"	Lorenz Bommer		40879	8 Dec. 1863	Bommer v. Amer. S. Spring Co.	14 N. Y. Sup. 454
					Overshiner v. Wischart	59 Ind. 135
Hog Trap	Middleton Tool Co.		Ri	6 Feb. 1866	Middleton v. Judd	3 Fish. 141
Hooks, Self-mousing	Chas. B. Bristle		47761	16 May 1867	Fitch v. Bragg	20 O. G. 1589, 8 Fed. Rep. 588
" Snap	Wm. M. Welling		98727	1 Jan. 1870	Welling v. Crane	23 O. G. 189, 14 Fed. Rep. 571
Horn Composition	William Leonard				American Saddle Co. v. Hogg	1 Holmes 177, 2 O. G. 595, 6 Fish. 67
Horse Collars	S. B. McCorkle				Cowan v. Mitchell	3 Cold. 278
" " Stuffing Machine	"				"	11 Heisk. 87
" " "						
Horse Power	Daniel Carey			27 June 1846	Pitts v. Hall	2 Blatch. 229
" Shoes	Nelson J. Blatherwick		170809	7 Dec. 1875	Blatherwick v. Carey	9 Fed. Rep. 202
" "	Henry Burden			30 June 1857	Burden v. Corning	2 Fish. 477
" "	Jones				Foss v. Richardson	81 Mass. 303
" "	W. W. Lewis		Ri 3354	30 Mar. 1869	Ex parte Lewis	3 O. G. 92
Hose Couplings	Wm. H. Bliss			21 Dec. 1869	Bliss v. Brooklyn	8 Blatch. 533, 4 Fish. 596
" "	"				"	10 Blatch. 521, 3 O. G. 269, 6 Fish. 289
" "	"				"	
					Bliss v. Gaylord Manuf. Co.	7 Blatch. 279
" "	Robert B. Lawton et al.		23033	22 Feb. 1859		
" "	William H. Bliss			25 Feb. 1862	Bliss v. Haight	7 Blatch. 7, 3 Fish. 621
" "	Robert B Lawton et al.		23033	22 Feb. 1859	Ex parte Lawton & Bliss	3 O. G. 150
" "	Oliver Selgee		68656	10 Sept. 1867	Watson v. Smith	20 O. G. 300, 7 Fed. Rep. 350
" Leather	Abraham L. Pennock, &c.			6 July 1818	Pennock v. Dialogue	1 Robb 466 2 Pet. 1, 1 Robb 542, 4 Wash. C. C. 538
" Rubber	Charles Goodyear				McBurney v. Goodyear	65 Mass. 569
" "	Thomas J. Mayall		Ri 5511	22 Oct. 1872	Ex parte Mayall	4 O. G. 582
" "	"		"	"	Mayall v. Murphy	5 O. G. 359
Hose Couplings	Lawton and others		23033	22 Feb. 1869	Ex parte Lawton & Bliss	3 O. G. 150
" "	Oliver Selgee		68656	10 Sept. 1867	Watson v. Smith	20 O. G. 300, 7 Fed. Rep. 350
Hot Blast Apparatus	Jonas J. Pierce			7 July 1870	Vinton v. Pierce	3 O. G. 629
Hotel Register	Charles L. Hawes		63889	16 Apr. 1867	Hawes v. Antisdel	8 O. G. 685, 2 Ban & Ard. 10
" "	John L. Mitchell				Hawes v. Gage	5 O. G. 494
" "	"				Hawes v. Cook	5 O. G. 493
" "	"				Hawes v. Washburne	7 O. G. 491
Houses	Application				Ex parte Ward	4 O. G. 35
Hydrating Gas	Maynard			30 Jan. 1877	Maynard v. Pawling	18 O. G. 244, 3 Fed. Rep. 711
Hydrants	Washburn Race et al.		Ri 4887	30 Apr. 1872		
"	"		96959	16 Nov. 1869	Matthews v. Machine Co.	105 U. S. 54, 21 O. G. 1319
					Meyer v. Bailey	8 O. G. 437, 2 Ban & Ard. 73
Hydraulic Engines	Application				Ex parte Moller	16 O. G. 358
" "	"				Ex parte Smith	4 O. G. 349
" Mining Apparatus	Fisher		Ri 5193	17 Dec. 1872	Fisher v. Craig	3 Saw. 69, 1 Ban & Ard. 365
" Power Accumulator	Thomas M. Maguire		202660	23 Apr. 1878	Maguire v. Eames	15 Blatch. 312, 3 Ban & Ard. 499
" "	"		"	"	"	18 Blatch. 321, 8 Fed. Rep. 761
Hydro Carbon Vapor	Samuel T. McDougall				McDougall v. Fogg	2 Bosw. 387
Ice Cutter	Nathaniel J. Wyeth			18 Mar. 1829	Wyeth v. Stone	1 Story 273, 2 Robb 23
" Machine	Application				Ex parte Carre	4 O. G. 180
" "	"				Ex parte DuMotay	16 O. G. 499
" "	"				"	16 O. G. 1002
" Pitchers	James H. Stimpson				Stimpson v. Rogers	4 Blatch. 333
" Planes	Application				Ex parte Thompson	16 O. G. 588
India Rubber	Edwin M. Chaffee		Ex	31 Aug. 1850	Chaffee v. Boston Belting Co.	22 How. 217
" "	"			"	Chaffee v. Hayward	20 How. 208
" "	"			"	Day v. Union Rubber Co.	3 Blatch. 488, 20 How. 216

India Rubber	Edwin M. Chaffee			31 Aug. 1850	Hartshorn v. Day	19 How. 211, 3 Fish. 32
" "	Charles Goodyear			25 Dec. 1849	Goodyear v. Bishop	2 Fish. 154
" "	"			"	"	4 Blatch. 438, 2 Fish. 96
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Bourn	3 Blatch. 266
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Cary	4 Blatch. 271
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Central R. R. Co.	2 Wall. Jr. 556, 1 Fish. 626
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Chaffee	3 Blatch. 268
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Congress Rubber Co.	3 Blatch. 447
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Day	2 Wall. Jr. 283
" "	"			"	"	1 Blatch. 565
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Dunbar	3 Wall. Jr. 310, 1 Fish. 472
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. McBurney	3 Blatch. 32
" "	"		Ex	15 Jun. 1858	Goodyear v. Beverly Rubber Co.	1 Cliff. 348
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Providence Rub. Co.	9 Wall. 788, 2 Cliff. 351, 2 Fish. 499
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Union Rubber Co.	4 Blatch. 63
" "	"			"	Washing Machine Co. v. Earle	3 Wall. Jr. 320, 2 Fish. 203
" "	Charles Goodyear, Exec.		Ri 1034	20 Nov. 1860	Rubber Co. v. Goodyear	9 Wall. 788, 2 Cliff. 351, 2 Fish. 499
" "	"		Ri 1085	20 Nov. 1860		
" "	Henry B. Goodyear, Adm.		Ex	6 May 1865	Goodyear v. Alleyn	6 Blatch. 33, 3 Fish. 374, 1 A. L. T. 91
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Berry	2 Bond 189, 3 Fish. 439
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Honsinger	2 Biss. 1, 3 Fish. 147
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Hollihen	2 Hughes 492, 3 Fish. 251
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Wait	5 Blatch. 468, 3 Fish. 242
" "	"			"	Goodyear Dental Co. v. Evans	6 Blatch. 121, 3 Fish. 190
" "	"		Ri	18 May 1858	Goodyear v. Gutta Percha Co.	2 Fish. 312
" "	"			"	Goodyear v. Hills	3 Fish. 134
" "	"				Goodyear v. McHee	5 Blatch. 463, 3 Fish. 260
" "	"				"	3 Fish. 420
" "	"				"	5 Blatch. 429, 3 Fish. 269
" "	"				Goodyear v. Phelps	3 Blatch. 91
" "	"				Goodyear v. Rust	6 Blatch. 229, 3 Fish. 456
" "	"				Goodyear v. Toby	6 Blatch. 130
" "	"				Gutta Per'a Co. v. Goodyear R. Co.	3 Saw. 512
" "	Charles Goodyear			24 May 1844	Suydam v. Day	2 Blatch. 20
" "	"			15 Jun. 1844		
" "	David Hayward		Ri	28 Aug. 1868	Carew v. Boston Elastic Fabric Co	1 Holmes 45
" "	"			"	"	3 Cliff. 356, 1 O. G. 91, 5 Fish. 90
" "	Vulcanizing Appar	Interference			Smith v. Edson	7 O. G. 827
" "	Coating Articles	"			Finley v. Chapman	1 O. G. 277
" "	Erasers	Application			Ex parte Richards	9 O. G. 1062
" "	"	Lockwood		167455 7 Sept. 1875	Lockwood v. Cutter Tower Co.	11 Fed. Rep. 724
" "	"	Francis H. Holton		167445 7 Sept. 1883	Lockwood v. Cleveland	18 Fed. Rep. 37
" "	Overshoes	Christopher Meyer et al.	Ri	16 July 1872	Meyer v. Pritchard	12 Blatch. 101, 7 O. G. 1012, 1 Ban & Ard. 261
" "	"	Isaac F. Williams		131201 10 Sept. 1872	Williams v. Candee	18 B'atch. 140, 2 Fed. Rep. 683
" "	"	"		166669 10 Aug. 1875		
" "	Nuts	Interference			Dunlap v. Minetree	1 O. G. 403
" "	Pencil Heads	Patent No. 19783 & 9 others			Hovey v. Rubber Tip Pencil Co.	33 N. Y. Sup. 522, 57 N. Y. 119
" "	"	J. B. Blair		66938 23 July 1867	Rubber Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard	1 O. G. 407, 5 Fish. 377, 20 Wall. 498, 7 O. G. 172, 9 Blatch. 493
" "	Springs	National Spring Co.	Ri	13 Dec. 1870	Nat. Spr'g Co. v. Union Car S. M. Co.	12 Blatch. 80, 6 O. G. 224, 1 Ban & Ard. 210
" "	Toys				N. Y. Rubber Co. v. Chaskel	9 O. G. 923
Ingot Moulds	"	John Illingworth		166760 17 Aug. 1875	Illingworth v. Spaulding	9 Fed. Rep. 151
"	"	"		"	"	9 Fed. Rep. 611
Inkstands		Application			Ex parte Bower	4 O. G. 450

Inkstands	Application				Philp v. Nock	17 Wall. 460
Insect Powder	"				Ex parte Loesser	9 O. G. 837
"	"				Ex parte McDougal	2 O. G. 87
"	"				Ex parte Rodgers	16 O. G. 545
					"	16 O. G. 1233
Iron Cylinders, Cast	Samuel Falkenberg			20 Jun. 1858	Ex parte Falkenberg	2 O. G. 3
" Rounder	Reutgen				Reutgen v. Kanowrs	1 Wash. C. C. 168, 1 Robb 1
Irrigation, System of	Application				Ex parte Carmichael	10 O. G. 864
Isinglass	John J. Manning et al.	134690		7 Jan. 1873	Manning v. Cape Ann I. & G. Co.	23 O. G. 2413, 4 Ban & Ard. 612
Japanned Furniture Springs	Eagleton Manuf. Co.	122001		19 Dec. 1871	Eagleton M. Co. v. W. B. & C. M. Co.	18 Blatch. 218, 17 O. G. 1504, 2 Fed. Rep. 774
Jelly Glass	Jas. S. & T. B. Atterbury				Atlantic G. P. Co. v. Rand	16 Blatch. 250, 16 O. G. 87
"					Atterbury v. Gill	13 O. G. 276, 3 Ban & Ard. 171
" Package, Closed	Application				Ex parte Sherwood	6 O. G. 361
Jewelry Designs	Miller				Miller v. Smith	18 O. G. 1047, 5 Fed. Rep. 359
" Settings	Wood	11409			Wood v. Dolby	20 O. G. 523, 7 Fed. Rep. 475
Kindling Wood	J. Wesley Webber			17 Aug. 1869	Alcott v. Young	16 Blatch. 134, 16 O. G. 403
Knitting Machine	Dana Bickford	68595		10 Sept. 1867	Bickford v. Laporte	5 Ban & Ard. 349
	"	162886		4 May 1875		
	"		Ri 6423	11 May 1875		
	"		Ri 6424	"		
"	"			"	Springfield v. Drake	58 N. H. 19
"	Campbell		Ri 8391	3 Aug. 1878	Campbell v. Kavanaugh	11 Fed. Rep. 83
"	Daniel Tainter			30 Nov. 1852	Tompkins v. Gage	5 Blatch. 268, 2 Fish. 577
"	Clark Thompkins et al.		Ri	15 May 1860		
"	Thomas Crane		Ri 7368	31 Oct. 1868	F. & P. Knitting M. Co. v. Lamb K. M. Co.	19 O. G. 1000
	Wm. Franz & Wm. Pope	105189		12 July 1870		
		123657		13 Feb. 1872		
		102529		3 May 1870		
		99425		1 Feb. 1870		
"	"	99425		"	F. & P. Knitting M. Co. v. Bickford	18 O. G. 734
"	Thomas Crane		Ri 7368	31 Oct. 1868		
"	George Merrill	140635		8 July 1873	New York B. & P. Co. v. Sibley	23 O. G. 1444, 15 Fed. Rep. 386
" Needles	Application				Ex parte Peaslee	2 O. G. 513
" "	James Hibbert			9 Jan. 1849	Aiken v. Dolan	3 Fish. 199
" "	"			"	Aiken v. Manchester Print W'ks	2 Cliff. 435
" "	Thomas Sands		Ri	15 Nov. 1861	Sands v. Wardwell	3 Cliff. 277
Label					Coffeen v. Brunton	4 McLean 516
"					Ex parte Dix	2 O. G. 147
"					Ex parte Godillot	6 O. G. 641
"					Lorillard v. Drummond Tob. Co.	22 O. G. 1208, 14 Fed. Rep. 111
"					Sawyer v. Kellogg	19 O. G. 1627
"					Ex parte Schumacher & Ettlinger	9 O. G. 594
"					Ex parte Waeferling	16 O. G. 764
Lace Fabric and Purling	Warner P. Jennings	10448		12 Feb. 1878	Jennings v. Kibbe	22 O. G. 331, 10 Fed. Rep. 669
	Abraham G. Jennings	10388		1 Jan. 1878		
Ladies' Bustles or Skirts	Edward F. Woodward		Ri	29 Apr. 1857	West v. Silver Wire Skirt Co.	5 Blatch. 477, 3 Fish. 306
" Dress Trimming	Werner	11186		6 May 1879	Werner v. Reinhart	20 O. G. 1163, 10 Fed. Rep. 676
" "	Application				Murray v. Wuterich	3 O. G. 659
" Hair Nets	Joseph Dalton			5 Mar. 1872	Dalton v. Jennings	93 U. S. 271, 5 O. G. 615, 12 Blatch. 96, 11 O. G. 111, 1 Ban & Ard. 256
Lamp Black	John G. Mini			13 Nov. 1844	Child v. Adams	3 Wall. Jr. 20, 1 Fish. 189
" (Animal)	Application				Ex parte Designolle	13 O. G. 227
Lamps	"				Ex parte Arnold	6 O. G. 223
"	"				Ex parte Blake	3 O. G. 2

Lamp	Application				Ex parte Harrison	13 O. G. 547
"	Interference				Hull v. Lowden	20 O. G. 741
"	Ebenezer Blackman	Ri	7417	5 Dec. 1876	Blackman v. Hibler	17 Blatch. 333, 17 O. G. 107
"	Burton		10497	19 Feb. 1878	Burton v. Greenville	18 O. G. 411, 3 Fed. Rep. 642
"	"		9488	5 Sep. 1876	"	
"	Carlton & Merrill	Ri		11 Aug. 1868	Carlton v. Bokee	17 Wall. 463, 2 O. G. 520, 6 Fish. 40
"	Michael H. Collins			19 Sep. 1865	Wallace v. Holmes	9 Blatch. 65, 1 O. G. 117, 5 Fish. 37
"	Deguinon				Bierce v. Stocking	77 Mass. 144
"	James French			13 Feb. 1872	Ex parte Hyatt & French	4 O. G. 609
"	Joseph Funck		184855	28 Nov. 1876	Ex parte Funck	14 O. G. 158
"	"		"	"	"	3 McArthur 460, 14 O. G. 157
"	"		"	"	Funck v. Doty	13 O. G. 322
"	Horace Howard			10 Feb. 1843	Hardesty v. Smith	3 Ind. 39
" and Lanterns	John H. Irwin		66230	28 May 1867	Irwin v. Dane	9 O. G. 642
" "	"		73012	7 Jan. 1868	"	
" "	"		89770	4 May 1869	"	
" "	"		86549	2 Feb. 1869	"	
" "	"		99443	5 Feb. 1870	"	
" "	"		"	"	"	2 Biss. 442, 4 Fish. 359
"	Edward F. Jones	Ri		11 Jan. 1859	Jones v. Vankirk	2 Fish. 586
"	Rufus S. Merrill		28072	19 Jan. 1860	Ex parte Merrill	1 McArthur 301, 5 O. G. 120
"	E. Miller et al.	Ri		11 Jan. 1876	Miller v. Brass Co.	12 O. G. 667, 3 Ban & Ard. 20; 104 U. S. 350, 21 O. G. 201, 14 Blatch. 282
"	Thomas Walton et al.		206281	23 July 1878	Walton v. Dennis	16 O. G. 959
"	Chas. S. Westfield		206061	16 July 1878	White v. Heath	22 O. G. 500, 10 Fed. Rep. 291
"	Irvin A. Williams	Ri		19 Dec. 1865	Williams v. Rome, W. & O. R. R. Co.	15 Blatch. 200, 15 O. G. 563, 3 Ban & Ard. 413
"	"			"	"	18 Blatch. 181, 17 O. G. 1447, 2 Fed. Re. 702
"	"		"	"	Williams v. B. & A. R. R. Co.	17 Blatch. 21, 16 O. G. 906, 4 Ban & Ard. 441
" Burners	Interference				Ex parte Moore	7 O. G. 697
" Chimneys	Kerosene Lamp Heat. Co.	Ri	7069	18 Apr. 1876	Kerosene Lamp Heat. Co. v. Littell	13 O. G. 1009, 3 Ban & Ard. 312
" "	Frederick S. Shirley	Ri		8 May 1877	Shirley v. Sanderson	8 Fed. Rep. 905
" " and Shade	Application				Ex parte Atterbury	9 O. G. 640
" " Cleaner	"				Ex parte Seaman	4 O. G. 691
" Fixtures	Bradley & Hubbard M. Co	Ri		20 Apr. 1877	B. & H. Man. Co. v. C. Parker Co.	17 Fed. Rep. 240
" Shade Holders	Interference				Marshall v. Fish	16 O. G. 129
" "		Ri	10087	11 Apr. 1882	Schneider v. Bassett	22 O. G. 1447, 14 Fed. Rep. 351
" "	Carl Volti	Ri	7511	13 Feb. 1877	Schneider v. Lovell	22 O. G. 499, 10 Fed. Rep. 606
" "	"		"	"	Schneider v. Thill	18 Blatch. 241, 5 Fed. Rep. 91
	"	Ri	7511	13 Feb. 1877		
" "	Bennett B. Schneider		191102		"	5 Ban & Ard. 565
	"		191103			
	"		191224			
" "	"		"	"	"	5 Ban & Ard. 595
Lanterns	John H. Irwin				Irwin v. McRoberts	16 O. G. 853, 4 Ban & Ard. 411
"	"		50391	24 Oct. 1865	Adams v. Illinois Manf. Co.	18 O. G. 412, 4 Ban & Ard. 543
"	"				Adams v. Meyrose	7 Fed. Rep. 208
"	"				"	10 Fed. Rep. 671
"	"	Ri	8598	25 Feb. 1879	Steam Gauge & Lant'rn Co. v. Miller	20 O. G. 889, 8 Fed. Rep. 314
"	"		"	"	"	11 Fed. Rep. 718
"	Conrad Gersten			25 Jan. 1850	Dane v. Chicago Manuf. Co.	3 Biss. 380, 2 O. G. 677
"	James F. Dane et al.	Ri		23 Nov. 1869	"	7 O. G. 924
"	J. H. Mittmore	Ri		9 Apr. 1867	Adams & W. Man. Co. v. Meyrose	12 Fed. Rep. 440
"	Hugh & James Sangster	Ri		21 Aug. 1855	Sangster v. Miller	5 Blatch. 243, 2 Fish. 563
"	Charles Watts			17 July 1855	Dennis v. Cross	3 Biss. 380, 6 Fish. 138

Lathes, Carriage Axle	Jonathan G. Aram et al.	127211	28 May 1872	Aram v. Moline Wagon Co.	16 Fed. Rep. 236
" Gauge	Livern Hull	Ri 7262	15 Aug. 1876	American Whip Co. v. Lombard	4 Cliff. 495, 14 O. G. 900, 2 Ban & Ard. 598
" Self-feeding	John L. Brown et al.			Moore v. Bare	11 Iowa 198
" Irregular Forms	Thomas Blanchard		6 Sep. 1819	Blanchard's Factory v. Warner	1 Blatch. 258
" "	"		20 Jan. 1820	Blanchard v. Beers	2 Blatch. 411
" "	"		"	Blanchard v. Eldridge	2 Whart. Dig. 358
" "	"		"	"	1 Wall. Jr. 337, 2 Robb 737
" "	"		"	Blanchard v. Reeves	1 Fish. 103
" "	"		"	Blanchard v. Sprague	1 Cliff. 288
" "	"		"	"	2 Story 164, 3 Sum. 535.
" "	"		"	Blanchard v. Whitney	3 Blatch. 307
" "	Nathaniel Gear		8 Nov. 1853	Gear v. Grosvenor	1 Holmes 215, 3 O. G. 380, 6 Fish. 315
" "	"		"	Gear v. Holmes	6 Fish. 595
" "	William O. Sloan	Ex	31 Mar. 1871	Whitney v. Rollstone Machine	8 O. G. 908, 2 Ban & Ard. 170
" "	Baxter D. Whitney	Ex	7 Aug. 1874	Works	
" "	Chas. & And. Spring		30 May 1859	Spring v. Domestic S. M. Co.	16 O. G. 721, 2 Ban & Ard. 427
" "	"		"	"	21 O. G. 633, 9 Fed. Rep. 505
" "	"		"	Spring v. Packard	7 O. G. 341, 1 Ban & Ard. 531
" Attachment	Application			Ex parte Tucker	6 O. G. 470
" "	Benjamin F. Sturtevant	26627	27 Dec. 1859	Ex parte Sturtevant	5 O. G. 2
" Chuck	John L. Mason	19786	30 Mar. 1858	Ex parte Mason	1 O. G. 357
" "	"		"	"	9 O. G. 1196
" "	"		"	Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Whitney	2 Ban & Ard. 375
" Tool	Manton			Hope Iron Works v. Holden	58 Me. 146
Laundry Machine	Smith			Smith v. Standard L. M. Co.	22 O. G. 587
Lawn Sprinklers	Pennington et al.	203069	30 Apr. 1878	Pennington v. King	19 O. G. 1658, 7 Fed. Rep. 462
Lead Cames	Application			Ex parte Tracy	8 O. G. 144
" Pipe Machinery				Gay v. Cornell	1 Blatch. 506
" "	George N. Tatham et al		29 Mar. 1841	Tatham v. Loring	5 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 207
" "	Benjamin Tatham et al.		14 Mar. 1846	Tatham v. Lowber	2 Blatch. 49
" "	"		"	"	4 Blatch. 86
Leather, Crimping	Interference			Farnsworth v. Andrews	9 O. G. 195
" "	Platts et al.	143783	21 Oct. 1873	Platts v. Walden	15 O. G. 827
" Dressing	Miles S. Cahill	83925	10 Nov. 1868	Cahill v. Beckford	1 Holmes 48
" "	"	"	"	Cahill v. Brown	15 O. G. 697, 3 Ban & Ard. 580.
" Ornamenting	Charles T. Woodman	42136	29 Mar. 1864	Stimpson v. Woodman	10 Wall. 117, 3 Fish. 98
" "	"	"	"	Woodman P. M. Co. v. Guild	4 Cliff. 185
" Preparing	Nathathan C. Russell	Ri	Feb. 1870	Russell v. Dodge	93 U. S. 460, 11 O. G. 151
" "	"		"	Russell v. Place	94 U. S. 606, 12 O. G. 53
" "	"		"	"	9 Blatch. 173, 5 Fish. 134
" Raw Hide	Coupe	213323	18 Mar. 1879	Coupe v. Weatherhead	23 O. G. 1927
" Splitting	Joseph F. Flanders		14 Aug. 1860	Amer. Leather Co. v. Am. Tool Co.	4 Fish. 284
" "	John Woodcock		8 May 1809	Woodcock v. Parker	1 Gallis. 438, 1 Robb 37
" Utilizing	Brummitt	177466	16 Mar. 1876	Brummitt v. Howard	3 Fed. Rep. 801
" Treating	Russell	Ri	1 Feb. 1870	Klein v. Russell	19 Wall. 433
Lemon Squeezers	Josephine P. Fanning et al.	21 19	15 July 1879	Onderdonk v. Fanning	2 Fed. Rep. 568
"	"	"	"	"	4 Fed. Rep. 148
"	"	"	"	"	9 Fed. Rep. 106
"	"	"	"	"	5 Ban & Ard. 562
Levers	Thomas		6 Nov. 1826	Thomas v. Weeks	2 Paine 92
"	Henry C. Guyon		2 July 1836	Guyon v. Serrell	1 Blatch. 244
Levels	Application			Ex parte Taylor & Banks	2 O. G. 519
Lifting Jacks	"			Ex parte Howland	12 O. G. 889
"	Jacob O. Joyce	154989	15 Sep. 1874	Joyce v. Chillicothe Foundry	15 Fed. Rep. 260

Lights, Floating	Application			Ex parte Pintsch	11 O. G. 597
Lighting Device	George Selden	Ri	8940 12 Nov. 1878	Selden v. Stockwell S. L. G. B. Co.	20 O. G. 1737, 9 Fed. Rep. 390
Lime, Burning	Richard E. Schroeder		6 May 1851	Hill v. Thuermer	13 Ind. 351
" Kilns	Powell Griscom et al.		19 Nov. 1857	Shelly v. Brannan	2 Biss. 315, 4 Fish. 198
Linen and Cotton Thread	Henry Terry		15 May 1855	Johnson v. Linen Co.	36 Conn. 436
Lining Paper Board	Henry S. Palmer	Ri	7517 20 Feb. 1877	Faurot v. Hawes	3 Fed. Rep. 456
Locks	Application			Ex parte Schoomaker	13 O. G. 595
"	"			Ex parte Slaight	4 O. G. 82
"	Calvin Adams		24 Feb. 1857	Adams v. Jones	1 Fish. 527
"	Halbert S. Greenleaf			Greenleaf v. Yale Lock Man. Co.	17 Blatch. 253, 17 O. G. 625
"	John E. Marston		15 Jun. 1858	Ex parte Marston	1 O. G. 608
"	Charles A. Miller	Ri	27 Jan. 1863	Coffin v. Ogden	7 Blatch. 61, 3 Fish. 640
"	"		"	"	18 Wall. 120, 5 O. G. 270
"	Nock			Philip v. Nock	13 Wall. 185
"	James Sargent	Ri	2 Jan. 1872	Sargent v. Yale Lock Manf. Co.	17 Blatch. 244, 17 O. G. 105, 4 Ban & Ard. 574
"	"		"	"	17 Blatch. 249, 17 O. G. 106, 4 Ban & Ard. 579
"	John P. Sherwood	Ex	9 Nov. 1854	Littlefield v. Perry	21 Wall. 205, 7 O. G. 964
"	"	Ex	14 Dec. 1856	Livingston v. Jones	1 Fish. 521
"	"		"	Jones v. Morehead	1 Wall. 155
"	"		"	Morehead v. Jones	3 Wall. Jr. 306
"	Rudolphus L. Webb		31 Dec. 1867	R. & E. M. Co. v. Corbin M. Co.	12 Blatch. 36, 1 Ban & Ard. 159
"	"		"	R. & E. M. Co. v. P. & F. C. M. Co.	12 Blatch. 36, 7 O. G. 383
"	"		"	Russell Manuf. Co. v. Mallory	10 Blatch. 140, 2 O. G. 495, 5 Fish. 632
"	Linus Yale, Jr.	Ri	28 Apr. 1863	Yale Manuf. Co. v. North	5 Blatch. 455, 3 Fish. 279
" Permutation	Application			Ex parte Gross	11 O. G. 739
" Time	"			Ex parte Kook & Hall	16 O. G. 543
" "	"			Ex parte Sargent	12 O. G. 475
" "	John Burge		194506 21 Aug. 1877	Ex parte Burge	13 O. G. 498
" "	Yale Lock Manuf. Co.	Ri	8550 21 July 1879	Yale Lock Manuf. Co. v. Norwich Nat'l Bank	6 Fed. Rep. 377
	"		173366 8 Feb. 1876		
	James Sargent	Ri	7947 13 Nov. 1877		
" "	James Sargent		165878 20 July 1873	Ex parte Sargent & Burge	10 O. G. 285
	John Burge		166255 3 Aug. 1875		
" "	Samuel A. Little	Ri	8580	Yale Lock Manuf. Co. v. Berkshire Nat'l Bank	17 Fed. Rep. 531
	James Sargent	Ri	9747		
Looms	Application			Ex parte Crompton	4 O. G. 82
"	"			"	9 O. G. 5
"	"			Ex parte Kemp	15 O. G. 775
"	"			Ex parte Kuh	10 O. G. 587
"	Interference			Drummond v. Greenough	16 O. G. 959
"	"			Greenough v. Drummond	16 O. G. 959
"	"			Wyman v. Knowles	13 O. G. 329
"	Nicholas J. Allen et al.			Allen v. Gilman	2 O. G. 293
"	E. B. Bigelow	Ex	10 Apr. 1869	Lowell Manuf. Co. v. Carpet Co.	2 Fish. 472
"	"		23 Oct. 1849		
"	Hugo Carstaedt	Ri	12 Nov. 1872	Carstaedt v. U. S. Corset Co.	13 Blatch. 119, 9 O. G. 151, 2 Ban & Ard. 119
"	"			"	13 Blatch. 371, 10 O. G. 3, 2 Ban & Ard. 331
"	Crompton	Ri	5718 1874	Crompton v. Knowles	7 Fed. Rep. 199
"	Horace Wyman	Ri	1875	"	7 Fed. Rep. 204
"	Merrill A. Forbush et al.	Ri	13 Sep. 1853	Forbush v. Bradford	1 Fish. 317, 21 Law Rep. 471
"	"		"	Forbush v. Cook	2 Fish. 668
"	Edmund H. Graham et al.	Ri	28 May 1867	Graham v. Mason	4 Cliff. 88, 5 Fish. 1
"	"		"	"	1 Holmes 88, 1 O. G. 608, 5 Fish. 290
"	"		"	Mason v. Graham	23 Wall. 290, 7 O. G. 833

Looms		Patrick McGilroy		9 May 1835	Dyer v. Rich	42 Mass. 180
"		George H. Holmes	Ri	25 Jun. 1878	Holmes v. Plainville Manuf. Co.	9 Fed. Rep. 757
"		J. Knowles	134992	21 Jan. 1873	Wicks v. Knowles	11 O. G. 196
"		Moses Marshall	Ex	11 Dec. 1863	Crompton v. Belknap Mills	3 Fish. 536
"		Amasa Stone		30 Apr. 1829	Stone v. Sprague	1 Story 270, 2 Robb 10
"		William Webster	130961	27 Aug. 1872	Webster v. Carpet Co.	5 O. G. 522, 1 Ban & Ard. 84
"		"	"	"	"	9 O. G. 203, 2 Ban & Ard. 67
"		"	"	"	Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins	13 Blatch. 349, 9 O. G. 965
"		"	"	"	"	105 U. S. 580, 21 O. G. 2031, 15 Blatch. 446; 16 O. G. 675, 4 Ban. & Ard. 68
"		"	"	"	Webster Loom Co. v. Short	10 O. G. 1019
"		John Wilson		29 May 1849	Pierce v. Wilson	34 Ala. 596
"		"		"	Wright v. Wilson	11 Rich 144
Maccaroon Composition		Application			Ex parte Heide & Wirtz	8 O. G. 817
Magneto-Electric Machine		Interference			Van Attenick v. Thomson	17 O. G. 571
" "		Zenobe T. Gramme et al.	120057	17 Oct. 1871	Gramme Elec. Co. v. Arnoux & [H. Elec. Co.	25 O. G. 193, 17 Fed. Rep. 838
Making up Tapes and Ribbons		Marcus B. Westhead	50318	3 Oct. 1865	Goff v. Stafford	14 O. G. 748, 3 Ban & Ard. 610
Manure Bales		Interference			Ackerman v. Archer	15 O. G. 562
Marble for Buildings		Application			Ex parte Hardy	12 O. G. 1075
Martingale Rings		William H. Welling	37941	17 Mar. 1863	Welling v. Rubber Co.	7 O. G. 608, 2 Ban & Ard. 1
" "		"	"	"	Rubber & C. H. T. Co. v. Welling	17 U. S. 7, 13 O. G. 727
Matches		Alonzo D. Phillips		24 Oct. 1836	Ryan v. Goodwin	3 Sum. 514, 1 Robb 725
"		"			Brooks v. Byam	2 Story 525, 2 Robb 161
"		"	Ri	11 Sept. 1850	Byam v. Eddy	24 Vt. 666
"		"	Ri	24 Oct. 1836 11 Sept. 1850	Byam v. Bullard	1 Curt. 100
"		"	Ri	"	Byam v. Eddy	2 Blatch. 521
"		"	Ri	"	Byam v. Farr	1 Curt. 260
" Box		Schoerken	63004	19 Mar. 1867	Schoerken v. St. C. & B. Man. Co.	19 O. G. 1493, 7 Fed. Rep. 489
" Card		Interference			Ex parte Smith and others	5 O. G. 89
Mats		Application			Ex parte Rice	5 O. G. 522
"		Edwin M. Chaffee	19347	16 Feb. 1868	Brown v. Rubber Stamp Mfg. Co.	13 O. G. 369, 3 Ban & Ard. 232
"		"	"	"	Rubber Step M. Co. v. Metropol- [itan R. R. Co.	13 O. G. 549, 3 Ban & Ard. 252
Mattresses		Elias Howe	Ri	18 Mar. 1841	Howe v. Abbott	2 Story 190, 2 Robb 99
Measuring Syrups		Edmund Bigelow		6 Apr. 1858 25 Jan. 1859	Bigelow v. Matthews	7 Blatch. 77
"		"				
		Person Noyes		2 Nov. 1869	Ex parte Underwood	1 O. G. 549
Mechanical Power		Morey			Case v. Morey	1 N. H. 317
Medical Compound		Application			Ex parte Willia	10 O. G. 748
" "					N. Y. Pharmical Asso n v. Tilden	23 O. G. 272, 14 Fed. Rep. 741
" Inhaler		"			Ex parte Donaldson	4 O. G. 4
Medicines, Preparing		Samuel Thompson		25 Jan. 1823	Jordan v. Dayton	4 Ohio 294
Melodeons or Organs		Jonas Berger			Berger v. Peterson	78 Ill. 633
" "		Interference			Goodman v. Scribner	2 O. G. 673
" "		Riley Burdett		23 Feb. 1869	Burdett v. Estey	15 Blatch. 349, 15 O. G. 877
" "		"		"	"	16 Blatch. 105, 3 Fed. Rep. 545
" "		"		"	"	19 Blatch. 1
" " Tremolo Att.		Alonzo Hitchcock, &c	Ri 3665	5 Oct. 1869	Hitchcock v. Tremaine	9 Blatch. 385, 5 Fish. 310
" " "		"	"	"	"	9 Blatch. 550, 1 O. G. 633, 5 Fish. 537
" " "		"	"	"	Saxe v. Hammond	1 Holmes 456, 7 O. G. 181, 1 Ban & Ard. 629
" " "		"	"	"	Tremaine v. Hitchcock	23 Wall. 518, 7 O. G. 1055, 3 Blatch. 440, 4 Fish 508
" " "		El Dora Louis, Adm.	Ri	25 July 1871	Hammond v. Hunt	4 Ban & Ard. 111
"		"		"	Hammond [illegible] & H. Organ Co.	92 U.S. 724, 1 Holmes 296, 5 O.G. 31, 6 Fish. 92

Melodeons or Organs, Tremolo Attachment	Jeremiah Cahart	Ri	24 June 1856	Cahart v. Austin		2 Cliff. 528, 2 Fish. 543
"	"	Ri	18 Aug. 1857	"		
Metal Mouldings	Herman Miller	Ri 7609	17 Apr. 1877	Combined Can Co. v. Lloyd		11 Fed. Rep. 149
Metallic Coverings for Buildings	F. E. Perkins et al	177386	30 May 1876	Belt v. Crittenden		1 McCrary 208, 18 O. G. 191, 2 Fed. Rep. 82
" Laths	Application			Ex parte Carter		14 O. G. 201
Meters, Liquid	Union Water Meter Co.	Ri 5866	24 Mar. 1874	Water Meter Co. v. Desper		101 U. S. 332
Mill, Bark	Richard Montgomery et al.		12 Aug. 1840	Wilber v. Bucher		2 Blatch. 132
" Coffee and Spice	Peck, Stow & Wilcox Co.	Ri 8866	19 Aug. 1879	Peck S. & W. Co. v. Lindsay		18 O. G. 63, 2 Fed. Rep. 688
" "	Strobridge	Ri 7583	27 Mar. 1877	Strobridge v. Landers		21 O. G. 1027, 11 Fed. Rep.
" "	"	"	"	Strobridge v. Lindsay		18 O. G. 62, 2 Fed. Rep. 692
" "	"	"	"	"		19 O. G. 1285, 6 Fed. Rep. 510
" Disintegrating	G. B. Davids		14 Dec. 1869	Carr v. Davids		3 O. G. 440
" Fanning	Griswold			Johnson v. McCabe		37 Ind. 535
" "	Scott			Scott v. Sweet		2 G. Greene 224
" Grist	Moses Mendenhall			Kernodle v. Hunt		4 Blackf. 57
" "	Benjamin Tyler			Tyler v. Tuell		6 Cranch 324, 1 Robb 14
" Rolling	Application			Ex parte Beavis		16 O. G. 1233
" "	"			Ex parte Pennock		1 McArthur 541, 5 O. G. 668
" "	"			"		2 O. G. 590
" Shingle	J. S. Pennock	152508	23 June 1874	Ex parte Dermody		14 O. G. 202
" Smut	Willard Earle		Dec. 1882	Earl v. Page		6 N. H. 477
" Wind	Daniel Shaw	Ri 3794	11 Jan. 1870	Knox v. Murtha		9 Blatch. 205, 5 Fish. 174
	L. H. Wheeler	68674	19 Sept. 1867	Ex parte Wheeler & Wheeler		4 O. G. 5
Millstones	James T. Gilmore et al.	86279	26 Jan. 1869	Gilmore v. Aiken		118 Mass. 94
"	"	38670	26 May 1863	"		
" Balancing	Leonard Anderson	Ri 3279	28 Oct. 1862	Wise v. Allis		9 Wall. 737
" Dressing	Samuel Golay		21 Jan. 1868	Gilmore v. Golay		3 Fish. 522
" Grinding, &c.	Jesse C. Smith		25 Sept. 1837	Smith v. Pearce		2 McLean 176, 2 Robb 13
Mineral Wool	A. D. Elbers	194422	17 Sept. 1877	Ex parte Elbers		12 O. G. 1076
Mirrors, Compound	Pierre Leopold Brot	182633	26 Sept. 1876	Hall v. Stern		15 Fed. Rep. 463
" Hand	W. U. Dudley et al		27 July 1869	Clark v. Scott		9 Blatch. 301, 1 O. G. 4, 5 Fish. 245
" "	"			Florence Manuf. Co. v. Boston		1 Holmes 415, 6 O. G. 728, 1 Ban & Ard. 396
Mitre Machines	George W. La Baw	Ri	18 May 1869	La Baw v. Hawkins	[D. Co.	6 O. G. 724, 1 Ban & Ard. 428
" "	"			"		2 Ban & Ard. 561
Mop Heads	Oliver S. Garretson		22 May 1866	Garretson v. Clark		15 Blatch. 70, 14 O. G. 485, 3 Ban & Ard. 352
"	"		13 Aug. 1867	"		
Mortising Machines	Luke Taylor	Ri	19 Oct. 1869	Taylor v. Garretson		9 Blatch. 156, 5 Fish. 116
Moulding Machines	Hezekiah B. Smith		10 Jan. 1854	Smith v. Fay		6 Fish. 446
" "	Valentine Fischer	74068	4 Feb. 1868	Fischer v. Hayes		20 O. G. 239, 6 Fed. Rep. 76
" "	"	"	"	"		20 O. G. 242, 6 Fed. Rep. 86
" "	"	"	"	"		20 O. G. 601, 6 Fed. Rep. 63
" "	"	"	"	"		20 O. G. 672
" "	"	"	"	Fischer v. Neil		19 O. G. 603, 6 Fed. Rep. 89
" "	"	"	"	Fischer v. Wilson		16 Blatch. 220, 16 O. G. 445, 4 Ban & Ard. 228
" "	Nathaniel Gear		8 Nov. 1853	Gear v. Fitch		16 O. G. 1231
" "	"		"	"		3 Ban & Ard. 573
" "	Alfred J. Sewell	Ri	21 June 1853	Sewell v. Collins		1 Fish. 289
" "	"		"			4 Blatch. 61
Mowers	Application			Ex parte Wilber		1 O. G. 379
"	John B. Tinker	51364	5 Dec. 1865	Tinker v. W. E. M. & R. Manuf.		1 Fed. Rep. 138
"	Silas E. & Morgan P.	Ri 3460	25 May 1869	Jackson v. Breck	[Co.	11 O. G. 112
"	Jonathan Hams [Jackson		4 Sept. 1855	Commissioner v. Whitely		4 Wall. 522
"	Frederick Nishurtz	Ri 3372	13 Apr. 1869	Sprague v. Adriance		14 O. G. 308, 3 Ban & Ard. 124

Mowers	L. S. Stone			Clough v. Patrick	37 Vt. 421
Nail Brushes	Interference			Loring v. Hall	15 O. G. 471
Nails and Spikes	Application			Ex parte Nichols	4 O. G. 105
" Cut Shoe	Hosea F. Whidden	90902	1 Jun. 1869	Dunbar v. Albert F. M. Co.	4 Fed. Rep, 543
" "	"	164889	22 Jun. 1875	"	
" Horseshoe	"	"	"	Dunbar v. Estabrook	4 Fed. Rep. 545
Nail and Spike Machinery	Whipple			Whipple v. Miner	15 Fed. Rep. 117
" "	Henry Burden			Corning v. Burden	15 How. 252
" "	"		2 Sep. 1840	Troy Factory v. Corning	7 Blatch. 16
" "	"		"	"	10 Blatch. 223, 6 Fish. 85
" "	"		"	Troy Factory v. Odiorne	17 How. 72
" "	"			Troy Factory v. Winslow	11 Blatch. 513, 2 Ban & Ard. 98
" "	"		2 Dec. 1834	Troy Factory v. Corning	14 How. 193, 1 Blatch. 467
" "	"		"	"	6 Blatch. 228, 3 Fish. 497
" "	Gruppy & Armstrong		14 Feb. 1799	Gray v. James	1 Pet. 394, 1 Robb 120
" "	"		"	"	1 Pet. 476, 1 Robb 140
" "	Jesse Reed		1814	Odiorne v. Amesbury Nail Fact'y	2 Mason 28, 1 Robb 300
" "	"		"	Odiorne v. Winkley	2 Gallis 51, 1 Robb 52
" "	John P. Sawin		Feb. 181[illegible]	Sawin v. [illegible]d	1 Gallis 485, 1 Robb 47
" "	West		6 July 1802	West v. [illegible]on	2 Bibb 376
Nail Plate Feeders	Application			Ex parte [illegible]	10 O. G. 203
Navigation of Particular Waters	Livingstone et al.		[illegible]3	Livingst[illegible] Jones	3 Wall. Jr. 330, 2 Fish. 207
Neckties	Hart	Re[illegible]	[illegible]7	Ha[illegible]yer	1 O. G. 791, 10 Fed. Rep. 746
"	Interference			La[illegible]v[illegible]lagg	16 O. G. 1141
Newel Posts	Henry Textor	12	880	Sin[illegible]v. [illegible]avis	12 Fed. Rep. 144
Nickel Plating	Isaac Adams, Jr.	[illegible]	[illegible]9		
"	"		[illegible]70	[illegible] Ni[illegible]o. v. A[illegible]s	1 Holmes 135, 1 O. G. 578, 5 Fish. 517
"	"		1870		
"	"		[illegible].1869		
"	Isaac Adams, J[illegible]		[illegible]ay 18, Au[illegible]	[illegible]ted N[illegible]...P. Works	4 Ban & Ard. 74
"	"	1	10 Ma[illegible]	[illegible]d [illegible]. Melchior	17 Fed. Rep. 340
"	"			[illegible]el Co. v. Keith	1 Holmes 328, 1 Ban & Ard. 44
"	"	93157	[illegible]g..	[illegible]kel Co. v. Harris	15 Blatch. 319, 17 O. G. 325, 3 Ban & Ard. 627
"	"	"	"	[illegible]ickel Co. v. Man. Brass Co	16 Blatch. 68, 4 Ban & Ard. 173
"	"		"	United Nickel Co. v. Pendleton	15 Fed. Rep. 739
"	Wm. H. Remington			Hawkes v. Remington	111 Mass. 171
"	A. Herman et al.	166367		Ex parte Herman & Taylor	12 O. G. 865
Nuts, Manufacture of	J. P. Haigh et al.		15 Feb. 1859		
	Henry Carter		19 Jun. 1855	Wood v. Cleveland Rolling Mill	4 Fish. 550
	Henry Carter et al.		19 Jun. 1855		
" Locks.	Application			Ex parte Campbell	2 O. G. 644
" "	Interference			Hanscom v. Latham	9 O. G. 1157
" "	Daniel R. Pratt	156235		Ex parte Pratt	16 O. G. 1005
Oil, Essential, Tubs for Distilling	Barton P. Van Marter	Ri	17 Aug. 1869	Van Marter v. Miller	15 Blatch. 562, 4 Ban & Ard. 124
" Hydrocarbon	Joshua Merrill	90284	18 May 1869	Merrill v. Yeomans	5 O. G. 267, 1 Ban & Ard. 47; 94 U. S. 568, 11 O. G. 970, 1 Holmes 331
" Lubricating	Lippincott	57737		Ex parte Lippincott	16 O. G. 632
" Sperm	Mason			Thomas v. Quintard	5 Duer 80
" Purifying	Robert A. Chesebrough		12 Aug. 1865	National Oil Co. v. Arctic Oil Co.	8 Blatch. 416, 4 Fish. 514
" "	Application			Ex parte Eveleigh	1 O. G. 303
" Still	"			Ex parte Van Sickel	1 O. G. 330
Oil Cloth	Sparkman et al.		24 July 1846	Sparkman v. Higgins	1 Blatch. 205
Oil Stone Holders	Homer Brown	102218	26 Apr. 1870	Union Stone Co. v. Allen	14 Fed. Rep. 353

Ore Crusher	H. J. Huttner et al.	183934		Hendy v. G. S. & M. Iron Works	8 Saw. 408
" Roasters	Interference			Ex parte Huttner	14 O. G. 118
" Separators	"			Bradford v. Imlay	16 O. G. 814
" Washers	Application			Ex parte Paul & Dorland	4 O. G. 552
Ornamented Felt Fabrics	"			Ex parte Dailey	13 O. G. 228
Ornamenting Hardware	"			Ex parte Tieman	11 O. G. 1
Ornamented Tracings	Hosea Ball	Ri	14 June 1870	Ex parte Benson	15 O. G. 512
Ovens	"		"	Ball v. Langles	102 U. S. 128, 18 O. G. 1405
"	"	Ri	14 June 1870	Ball v. Withington	1 Ban & Ard. 549
"	Duncan McKenzie	Ri 6397	20 Apr. 1875	Garneau v. Dozier	102 U. S. 230, 19 O. G. 1
"	Duncan McKenzie	Ri 6397	20 Apr. 1875	McKenzie v. Baillie	4 C. L. B. 209
Packing Stick Candy	William B. Howe	Ri 9942	22 Nov. 1881	Howe v. Necmes	18 Fed. Rep. 40
Padlocks	Interference			Hedges v. Daniels	17 O. G. 152
"	"			"	17 O. G. 394
"	James W. Lyon	35030	22 Apr. 1862	Miller v. Smith	16 O. G. 313, 4 Ban & Ard. 314
Paint for Ship's Bottoms	J. A. Tarr & A. H. Wonson	Ri 4599	17 Oct. 1879	Tarr v. Folsom	1 Holmes 312, 5 O. G. 92, 1 Ban & Ard. 24
" "	"	"	"	Tarr v. Webb	1 Blatch. 96, 2 O. G. 568, 5 Fish 593
" "	"	"	"	Wonson v. Gilman	11 O. G. 1011, 2 Ban & Ard. 590
" Mixed Liquid	Damon R. Averill	Ri 7031	4 Apr. 1876	Wonson v. Peterson	13 O. G. 548, 3 Ban & Ard. 249
" Zinc White	Samuel T. Jones	Ex	23 July 1864	Averill C. P. Co. v. Nat'l M. P. Co.	22 O. G. 585, 9 Fed. Rep. 462
" Making White Oxide of Zinc	Samuel J. Wetherill		13 Nov. 1855	Jones v. Osgood	6 Blatch. 435
" " "	"		"	Wetherill v. Zinc Co.	5 O. G. 460, 1 Ban & Ard. 105
					2 O. G. 471, 6 Fish 50, 9 Phila. 385
Pan Forming Machine	Geo. A. Bowers	219293	23 Sept. 1879	Ex parte Bowers	16 O. G. 1004
Pantaloons	Jacob W. Davis	Ri	16 Mar. 1875	Strauss v. King	18 Blatch. 88, 17 O. G. 1450, 2 Fed. Rep. 236
"	Rodman Gibbons	172287	6 Jun. 1876	Elfelt v. Steinhart	6 Saw. 480, 11 Fed. Rep. 826
	"	172428	6 Jun. 1876		
Paper, Abrasive	J. G. Buzzell	178994	20 Jun. 1876	Buzzell v. Fifield	7 Fed. Rep. 465
" Building and Roofing	Application			Ex parte Cobb	16 O. G. 175
" " "	James Howard	91183	Jun. 1869	Howard v. Christy	10 O. G. 981, 2 Ban & Ard. 457
	"	95683	12 Oct. 1869		
" Files	Eldridge J. Smith	Ri	19 Apr. 1872	Smith v. Woodruff	1 McArthur 459, 4 O. G. 635, 6 Fish. 476
" Folders	John North		10 Aug. 1858	Appleton v. Bacon	2 Black 699
" Holders	Fred'k W. Smith et al.	217909	29 July 1879	Shannon v. Stationery Co.	9 Fed. Rep. 205
" Machinery				Ames v. Howard	1 Sum. 482
" Perforator	George C. Howard		21 May 1861	Toppan v. Nat'l Bank Note Co.	4 Blatch. 509, 2 Fish. 195
" Pulp	Application			Ex parte Farquharson	19 O. G. 702
" "	Marie A. C. Mellier		26 May 1857	Anthony v. Carroll	9 O. G. 199, 2 Ban & Ard. 195
" "	"		"	Buchannan v. Howland	5 Blatch. 151, 2 Fish. 341
" "	Marie A. C. Mellier		26 May 1857	Wood Paper Co. v. Glens Falls Co.	8 Blatch. 513, 4 Fish. 531
" "	Chas. Watt et al.		18 July 1854	"	8 Blatch. 516, 4 Fish. 524
" "	"		"		
" "	A. Pagenstetcher	Ri	6 Jun. 1871	Miller v. Androscoggin Pulp Co.	1 Holmes 142, 1 O. G. 409, 5 Fish. 340
	Chas. Watt et al.		18 July 1854		
" "	Wm. F. Ladd et al.	Ri 1448	7 Apr. 1863	American Wood Paper Co. v. Fibre Disintegrating Co.	23 Wall. 566
	"	Ri 1449	7 Apr. 1863		
	Chas. Watt et al.		18 July 1854		
	Wm. F. Ladd et al.	Ri 1448	7 Apr. 1863		
" "	"	Ri 1449	7 Apr. 1863	Wood Paper Co. v. Fibre Co.	6 Blatch. 27, 3 Fish. 362
	Marie A. C. Mellier		26 May 1857		
	Morris L. Keen		13 Sept. 1859		
	"		16 Jun. 1863		
" "	"		"	Wood Paper Co. v. Heft	8 Wall. 333, 3 Fish. 316

Paper, Pulp Screens	John S. Warren		154733		Ex parte Warren	10 O. G. 1
" Ruled	Henry D. Cone		158249	29 Dec. 1874	Cone v. Morgan Envelope Co.	4 Ban & Ard. 107
" Waxing	S. Hammeschlag	Ri	8460	22 Oct. 1878	Hammerschlag v. Scammoni	20 O. G. 1449
" "	"		206393	29 Oct. 1878	"	20 O. G. 75, 7 Fed. Rep. 584
" "	"		"	"	Hammerschlag v. Garrett	9 Fed. Rep. 43
" "	"		"	"	"	21 O. G. 1199, 10 Fed. Rep. 479
" "	"	Ri	8460	23 Oct. 1878	Hammerschlag Mfg. Co. v. Wood	12 Fed. Rep. 175
" and Cloth, Uniting	George K. Snow		134105	17 Dec. 1872	Snow v. Tapley	13 O. G. 548, 3 Ban & Ard. 228
" and Tobacco Cutter	Interference				Crossley v. Leger	16 O. G. 722
" Dishes	Application				Ex parte Ingersoll	15 O. G. 389
" Twine Machine	John B. Wortendyke	Ri	1825	22 Nov. 1864	Wortendyke v. White	2 Ban & Ard. 25
" Bags	James Arkell				Ex parte Arkell	15 Blatch. 437
" "	Jas. Arkell & Benj. Smith			6 Jun. 1865	Arkell v. Paper Bag Co.	7 Blatch. 475
" "	Union Paper Bag Co.	Ri		24 Dec. 1872	Union Paper Bag Co. v. Crane	1 Holmes 429, 6 O. G. 801, 1 Ban & Ard. 494
" "	Application				Ex parte Arkell	1 O. G. 28
" Bags, Machinery	C.F. Annan & H. S. Merrill				Binney v. Annan	107 Mass. 94
" "	Edwin J. Howlett	Ri	6050		Union P.B.M.Co.v. Atlas Bag Co.	6 Fed. Rep. 398
" "	Horatio G. Armstrong			2 Oct. 1860	Union Paper Co. v. Binney	5 Fish. 166
" "	Union Paper Bag Co.			5 May 1863	"	
" "	Benjamin S. Binney			12 Sep. 1865	Union Paper Bag Co. v. Newell	11 Blatch. 379, 5 O. G. 459, 6 Fish. 582
" "	"				"	11 Blatch. 549, 5 O. G. 173, 1 Ban & Ard. 113
" "	Union Paper Bag Co.			28 Apr. 1857	Union Paper Bag Co. v. Nixon	1 Flippin 491, 9 O. G. 691, 2 Ban & Ard. 244
" "	"			6 Mar. 1860	"	4 O. G. 31, 6 Fish. 402
" "	"			5 May 1863	"	
" "	William Goodale		24734	12 July 1859	Union P. B. Co. v. P. & W. Co.	15 Blatch. 160, 15 O. G. 423, 3 Ban & Ard. 403
" "	"		"	"	"	16 Blatch. 76, 4 Ban & Ard. 151
" "	"		"	"	Machine Co. v. Murphy	97 U. S. 120, 13 O. G. 866
" "	Charles H. Morgan	Ri		6 Mar. 1860	Paper Bag Cases	105 U. S. 766, 21 O. G. 1275
Pavement, Concrete	Interference				Ex parte Tucker & Davis	2 O. G. 224
" "	John J. Schillinger	Ri	4364	2 May 1871	Cal. A. S. P. Co. v. Perine	7 Saw. 190, 20 O. G. 813, 8 Fed. Rep. 821
" "	"		"	"	Schillinger v. Gunther	14 Blatch. 152, 10 O. G. 831, 2 Ban & Ard. 544
" "	"		"	"	"	15 Blatch. 303, 14 O. G. 713, 3 Ban & Ard. 491
" "	"		"	"	"	17 Blatch. 66, 16 O. G. 905, 4 Ban & Ard. 479
" "	"		"	"	California A S.P. Co. v. Freeborn	8 Saw. 443
" "	"		"	"	Schillinger v. Greenway B. Co.	24 O. G. 495, 17 Fed. Rep. 244
" Stone	Charles Gaudet	Ri	4105	23 Aug. 1870	Gaudet v. Barber	5 O. G. 149
" "	"		"	"	Gaudet v. Brooklyn	13 O. G. 773, 3 Ban & Ard. 291
" "	"		"	"	Gaudet v. Palmer	10 Blatch. 217, 6 Fed. Rep. 82
" Wooden	Application				Ex parte Slow	3 O. G. 322
" "	"				Ex parte Barton	1 O. G. 329
" "					Greaton v. Griffith	4 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 310
" "	Samuel Nicholson			8 Aug. 1854	Amer. Pavement Co. v. Elizabeth	4 Fish. 189
" "	"			"	"	6 Fish. 424
" "	"			"	"	6 O. G. 772
" "	"			"	"	6 O. G. 764
" "	"			1 Dec. 1862	Bigelow v. Louisville	3 Fish. 602
" "	"			"	Nicholson Co. v. Hatch	4 Saw. 692, 3 Fish. 432
" "	"				Dean v. Charlton	23 Wiss. 590
" "	"	Ri		20 Aug. 1867	Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.	97 U. S. 126
" "	George P. Bigelow, Adm.	Ex		8 Aug. 1868	Nicholson Co. v. Jenkins	14 Wall. 482
" "	Turner Cowing		101590	5 Apr. 1870	Ballard v. Pittsburgh	12 Fed. Rep. 783
" "	Wm. H. Ballard & B. B. Waddell		94062	24 Aug. 1869	"	
	"		94063	"	"	

Pavement, Wooden	Robert C. Phillips	121544	5 Dec. 1871	Phillips v. Detroit	17 O. G. 191, 4 Ban & Ard. 347
" "	"	"	"	"	16 O. G. 627, 3 Ban & Ard. 150
" "	Henry M. Stow	Ri 3274	19 Jan. 1869	Stow v. Chicago	104 U. S. 547, 21 O. G. 790, 8 Biss. 47, 3 Ban & Ard. 83
	"	74862	25 Feb. 1868		
	D. L. De Golyer	88765	6 Apr. 1869		
	Henry M. Stow	134404	31 Dec. 1872		
Passenger Tickets	Application			Ex parte Sheldon	13 O. G. 817
Pasting Machine	Perkins			Perkins v. N. C. & G. R. Co.	17 O. G. 1285, 2 Fed. Rep. 451
Pencils	Application			Walpuski v. Jacobsen	9 O. G. 964
" Charm	"			Ex parte Hicks	10 O. G. 112
" Lead	"			Hovey v. Miller	3 O. G. 149
" and Eraser	Hymen L. Lippman	19783	30 Mar. 1868	Ex parte Lippman	1 O. G. 304
" "	"	"	"	Reckendorfer v. Faber	92 U. S. 347, 10 O. G. 71, 12 Blatch. 68, 5 O. G. 697, 1 Ban & Ard. 229
" Erasers	Application			Ex parte Hufeland	1 O. G. 278
" "	"			Ex parte Hovey & Hufeland	6 O. G. 31
" "	Interference			Hovey v. Hufeland	2 O. G. 493
" " Moulds for	Arthur Neill		22 July 1861	Ashcroft v. Cutter	6 Blatch. 511
Pens, Nickel Plating	Application			Ex parte Brower	7 O. G. 40
" Gold	Adam Wm. Rapp		6 Jan. 1852	Rapp v. Bard	1 Fish. 196
" Fountain	William A. Morse		14 Jan. 1868	Morse Co. v. Esterbrook Co.	3 Fish. 515
	Alonzo T. Cross	199621	29 Jan. 1878		
" Stylographic	"	227416	11 May 1880	Cross v. Livermore	21 O. G. 139, 9 Fed. Rep. 607
" "	"	Ri 9716			
Perforating Rule	"	199621	29 Jan. 1878	Cross v. Mackinnon	22 O. G. 586, 11 Fed. Rep. 601
Petroleum, Manuf. of Oils from	Application			Ex parte White	1 O. G. 162
" Process of Refining	Robert A. Chesebrough			Chesebrough v. Toppan	1 O. G. 464
" Products	Henry T. Slemmer		27 Feb. 1866	Slemmer's Appeal	58 Penn. 155
" Vessel for Holding	Application			Ex parte Tweddle	10 O. G. 747
Photographs on Glass	Elisha Waters	81141		Ex parte Waters	8 O. G. 399
" Printing	Benjamin T. Irish	179316	27 Jun. 1876	Irish v. Knapp	18 O. G. 735
Photographic Impressions				Lilienthal v. Washburn	8 Fed. Rep. 707
" Shield	Albert S. Southworth	Ri 1049	25 Sept. 1860	Wing v. Anthony	106 U. S. 142
Photometers	Ebenezer Gordon		19 Oct. 1858	Gordon v. Anthony	16 Blatch. 234, 16 O. G. 1135
Pianoforte Pedals	Application			Ex parte Goodwin	3 O. G. 347
Pictures	W. F. Ulman	169931		Wilson v. Chickering	14 Fed. Rep. 917
" Cards	Application			Ex parte Sprague	6 O. G. 469
Pill Machines	"			Ex parte Hookham	16 O. G. 545
" "	"			Ex parte Canhope	17 O. G. 328
" "	Thomas J. Young	156398	27 Oct. 1874	Ex parte Dunton	10 O. G. 243
	J. A. McFerran	152666	30 Jun. 1874		
Pillow Frames	Pierre Canhope		3 Jan. 1871	McKesson v. Carndick	21 O. G. 137
	Interference			Hoag v. Abbott	15 O. G. 471
Pin Papering Machine	Samuel Slocum		30 Sept. 1841	American Pin Co. v. Oakville Co.	3 Blatch. 190
	John J. Howe		24 Feb. 1843		
Pipes or Metal Tubes	Application			Ex parte Wheeler	4 O. G. 3
" "	David A. Ritchie	124011		Lamb v. Hamblen	11 Fed. Rep. 722
" "	J. B. Root	96037	13 Oct. 1869	Root v. Lamb	19 O. G. 937, 7 Fed. Rep. 223
" "	Benjamin Tatham et al.		11 Dec. 1841	Le Roy v. Tatham	22 How. 132
" "	"		"	"	14 How. 156, 2 Blatch. 474
	James B. Ashton	142661			
" "	George Ross	53383		Smith v. Marshall	10 O. G. 375, 2 Ban & Ard. 371
	John Firth	37037			
Pipe, Tin Lined Lead	Peter Naylor	Ri 3744	23 Nov. 1869	Shaw v. Colwell Lead Co.	11 Fed. Rep. 711

Pipe, Perforated Sheet Metal	Application of Hall&Hall			Ex parte Hall & Hall	2 O. G. 589
Pipe Tongs	James R. Brown		30 Nov. 1838	Ashcroft v. Walworth	1 Holmes 152, 2 O. G. 546, 5 Fish. 523
Pitching Inside of Barrels	J. F. T. Holbeck et al.	42580	3 May 1864	Gottfried v. Bartholomee	8 Biss. 219, 13 O. G. 1128, 3 Ban & Ard. 308
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. Conrad S B. Co.	8 Fed. Rep. 322
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. Crescent B. Co.	22 O. G. 497, 9 Fed. Rep. 762
" "	"	"	"	"	22 O. G. 1447, 13 Fed. Rep. 479
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. Miller	104 U. S. 521, 21 O. G. 711, 10 Fed. Rep. 471
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. Moerlein	14 Fed. Rep. 170
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. P. Best B. Co.	17 O. G. 675
" "	"	"	"	Gottfried v. Stahlmann	22 O. G. 1788, 13 Fed. Rep. 673
Plaiting Machine	Toohey	192038	19 Jun. 1877	Toohey v. Harding	1 Fed. Rep. 174
Planes	Leonard Bailey	Ri 6498	22 Jun. 1875	Stanley R. & L. Co. v. Bailey	14 Blatch. 510, 3 Ban & Ard. 297
"	Interference			Traut v. Hawley	10 O. G. 979
"	Isaacs		17 Nov. 1819	Isaacs v. Cooper	4 Wash. C. C. 259, 1 Robb 332
Planing Machine	William Woodworth		27 Dec. 1828	Brooks v. Fiske	15 How. 212
" "	"		"	Brooks v. Jenkins	3 McLean 432
" "	"		"	Brooks v. Norcros	2 Fish. 661
" "	"		"	Brooks v. Stolley	3 McLean 523, 2 Robb 281
" "	"		"	Brooks v. Bicknell	3 McLean 250, 2 Robb 118
" "	"		"	"	4 McLean 64
" "	"		"	"	4 McLean 70
" "	"		"	Bloomer v. Gilpin	4 Fish. 50
" "	"		"	Bloomer v. McQuewan	14 How. 539
" "	"		"	Bloomer v. Milligan	1 Wall. 340
" "	"		"	Bloomer v. Stolley	5 McLean 158
" "	"		"	Smith v. Mercer	5 Penn. L. J. 520, 4 West L. J. 49
" "	"		"	Olcott v. Hawkins	2 Am. L. J. 317
" "	"		"	Simpson v. Wilson	4 How. 709
" "	"	Ri	Nov. 1838	Gibson v. Woodworth	8 Paige 132
" "	"	Ri	16 Nov. 1842	Washburn v. Gould	3 Story 122, 2 Robb 206
" "	"	Ri	8 July 1845	Foss v. Herbert	1 Biss. 121, 2 Fish. 31
" "	"		"	Jenkins v. Greenwald	1 Bond 126, 2 Fish. 37
" "	"		"	Sloat v. Patton	1 Fish. 154
" "	"			Bicknell v. Todd	5 McLean 236
" "	"			Baker v. Mason	3 R. I. 45
" "	"			Motte v. Bennett	2 Fish. 642
" "	"			Rich v. Hotchkiss	16 Conn. 409
" "	"			Gibson v. Bernard	1 Blatch. 388
" "	"			Gibson v. Betts	1 Blatch. 163
" "	"			Gibson v. Cook	2 Blatch. 144
" "	"			Gibson v. Gifford	1 Blatch. 529
" "	"			Gibson v. Harris	1 Blatch. 167
" "	"			Gibson v. VanDusar	1 Blatch. 582
" "	Wm. W. Woodworth Adm.			Wilson v. Rosseau	4 How. 646, 2 Robb 373, 1 Blatch. 3
" "	"			Wilson v. Sandford	10 How. 99
" "	"			Wilson v. Sherman	1 Blatch. 536
" "	"			Wilson v. Simpson	9 How. 109
" "	"			Wilson v. Stolley	4 McLean 275
" "	"			"	5 McLean 1
" "	"			Wilson v. Turner	4 How. 712, Taney 278
" "	"		20 Feb. 1866	Woodward v. Morrison	1 Holmes 124, 5 Fish. 357
" "	"			Woodworth v. Cook	2 Blatch. 151
" "	"			Woodworth v. Curtis	2 W. & M. 524, 2 Robb 603
" "	"			Woodworth v. Edwards	3 W. & M. 120, 2 Robb 610

Planing Machine	Wm. W. Woodworth, Adm				Woodworth v. Hall	1 W. & M. 248, 289, 2 Robb 495, 517
"	"				Woodworth v. Rogers	3 W. & M. 135, 2 Robb 025
"	"				Woodworth v. Sherman	3 Story 171, 2 Robb 257
"	"				Woodworth v. Stone	3 Story 749, 2 Robb 286
"	"				Woodworth v. Weed	1 Blatch. 165
"	"				Woodworth v. Wilson	4 How. 712, 2 Robb 473
"	"				Livingston v. Woodworth	15 How. 546
"	"				Barnard v. Gibson	7 How. 650
"	"				Ritter v. Serrell	2 Blatch. 379
"	"				Van Hook v. Pendleton	1 Blatch. 187
"	"				Wilson v. Barnum	8 How. 258, 1 Wall. Jr. 347, 2 Robb 749, 2 Fish. 635
"	"			2 Dec. 1878	Pitts v. Edmonds	1 Biss. 168, 2 Fish. 52
"	"				Dean v. Mason	20 How. 198
"	H. Clymer & J. D. Riley		30066	27 Nov. 1866	Ex parte Clymer & Riley	6 O. G. 505
"	James Goodrich & others	Ri	8438	1 Oct. 1878	Fay v. Preble	14 Fed. Rep. 653
"	John Sperry		21782	12 Oct. 1858	Ex parte Sperry	2 O. G. 387
"	Henry D. Stover		32304	23 July 1861	Stover v. Halstead	13 Blatch. 95, 8 O. G. 558, 2 Ban & Ard. 98
"	Joseph P. Woodbury		138462	29 Apr. 1873	Anson v. Woodbury	11 O. G. 243
"	"		"	"	Planing Machine Co. v. Keith	101 U. S. 479, 17 O. G. 1021
Plank Protector	William Mellus			8 Aug. 1822	Mellus v. Silsbee	4 Mason 108, 1 Robb 506
Plashed Hedges	Application				Ex parte Kirkbridge	9 O. G. 1109
Plastering Hair Bale	Wendell R. King			30 Jun. 1874	King v. Frostel	8 Biss. 510, 16 O. G. 956
Plows	Application				Ex parte Wiard	16 O. G. 858
"	"				Ex parte Smith	1 O. G. 403
"	Interference				Blinn v. Gale	16 O. G. 459
"	"				"	16 O. G. 723
"					Lapham v. Betteudorf	16 O. G. 137
"					Hapgood v. Hewitt	21 O. G. 1786, 11 Fed. Rep. 422
"	Albert Ball			3 Jan. 1871	Cook v. Bidwell	20 O. G. 1083
"	"			4 Jan. 1876	"	
"	James C. Bethea			5 Jun. 1867	Whitely v. Fieher	4 Fish. 248
"	Thomas S. Cox			16 Aug. 1859	Cox v. Griggs	1 Biss. 362, 2 Fish. 174
"	Gideon Davis			1 Oct. 1825	Davis v. Palmer	2 Brock 298, 1 Robb 518
"	Abraham Ezra			19 Feb. 1856	Hays v. Sulsor	1 Bond 279, 1 Fish. 532
"	William H. Foye		158182	5 Jan. 1875	Freeborn v. Foye	9 O. G. 884
"	"		"	"	Foye v. Nichols	22 O. G. 2243, 13 Fed. Rep. 125
"	Horatio Gale	Ri	6824	28 Dec. 1875	Gale Manuf. Co. v. Prutzman	17 O. G. 743
"	H. R. Huie			20 Oct. 1868	Carter v. Baker	1 Saw. 512, 4 Fish. 404
"	Ogle			1818	Ogle v. Ege	1 Wash. C. C. 584, 1 Robb 516
"	David Prouty & J. Mears				Prouty v. Draper	2 Story 199
"	"				Prouty v. Ruggles	1 Story 568, 16 Pet. 336, 2 Robb 75, 92
"	Matthew G. Slemmons	Ri		10 Nov. 1874	Leggett v. Avery	101 U. S. 256, 17 O. G. 445
"	J. H. Sherman		67222	10 July 1867	Manny v. Oyler	16 Fed. Rep. 658
	J. C. Pfeil	Ri	4533	29 Aug. 1871		
"	Watt	Ri		17 Aug. 1869	Watt v. Starke	101 U. S. 247, 17 O. G. 1092
	John P. Zeller			18 May 1875	Oliver v. Zeller	10 O. G. 416
	Application				Ex parte Brunner	1 O. G. 203
Plow Points, Moulds for	John McCloskey		220767	21 Oct. 1879	Du Bois v. McCloskey	17 O. G. 1158
Plumber's Trap	"		"	"	McCloskey v. Du Bois	19 O. G. 1286, 20 O. G. 371, 8 Fed. Rep. 719
"	"		"	"	"	20 O. G. 1086, 3 Fed. Rep. 38
"	"		"	"	McCloskey v. Hamill	15 Fed. Rep. 750
"	Frederick N. Du Bois			24 Aug. 1875	Wicks v. Du Bois	11 O. G. 244

Pocket Book Clasp	Charles Seaver		47135	4 Apr. 1865	Zinn v. Weiss	7 Fed. Rep. 914
	Zinn & Messer	Ri	3106	26 Feb. 1878		
	"	Ri	8123	12 Mar. 1878		
Pocket Check Book	Waring	Ri	8199	23 Apr. 1878	Waring v. Johnson	19 O. G. 1068, 6 Fed. Rep. 500
Polished Sheet Iron	Application				Ex parte Spear	16 O. G. 1052
Portable Lint Room	"				Ex parte Ellis	9 O. G. 1110
Post Office Boxes	Yale Lock Manuf. Co.	Ri	8783	1 July 1879	YaleLockMan.Co.v.Scoville M.Co	15 Fed. Rep. 342
" "	"		"	"	"	18 Blatch. 248, 3 Fed. Rep. 288
Preserving Fish	John Atwood		90334	25 May 1869	Boneless Fish Co. v. Roberts	12 Fed. Rep. 627
" "	"		"	"	Crowell v. Harlow	5 Ban & Ard. 63
" "	"		"	"	"	18 O. G. 466, 3 Ban & Ard. 478, 1 Fed. Rep. 140
" "	"		"	"	Crowell v. Parmenter	18 O. G. 360, 3 Ban & Ard. 480
" "	Enoch Piper		732	19 Mar. 1861	Piper v. Brown	1 Holmes 196, 3 O. G. 37, 6 Fish. 240
	"			5 Aug. 1862		
" "	"		"	"	Brown v. Piper	4 Fish. 175
						91 U. S. 37, 10 O. G. 417, 1 Holmes 20
" "	"		"	19 Mar. 1861	Piper v. Moon	10 Blatch. 284, 3 O. G. 4, 6 Fed. Rep. 180
" Green Corn	Isaac Winslow		34928	8 Apr. 1862	Sewall v. Jones	91 U. S. 171, 6 O. G. 47
" "	"		35274	13 May 1862		
" "	"		"	"	Jones v. Sewall	3 Cliff. 563, 3 O. G. 630, 6 Fish. 343
" "	"		"	"	Jones v. Burnham	67 Me. 93
" "	"		"	"	Ex parte Winslow	9 O. G. 795
" "	"		"	"	Jones v. Hodges	1 Holmes 37
" "	"		"	"	Jones v. Merrill	8 O. G. 401
" "	J. Winslow Jones	Ri	7067	18 Apr. 1876	Jones v. McMurray	2 Hughes 527, 13 O. G. 6, 3 Ban & Ard. 130
	"	Ri	7061	18 Apr. 1876		
	Isaac Winslow		51397			
" "	J. Winslow Jones		54170		Jones v. Barker	22 O. G. 771, 11 Fed. Rep. 597
	Lewis		94013			
" Hops	Interference				Bates v. Seeger	2 O. G. 495
	William J. Wilson	Ri	6370	6 Apr. 1875		
" Meats	John A. Wilson	Ri	7923	23 Oct. 1877	Wilson Pack.Co.v.Chi.P.&P.Co.	21 O. G. 411, 9 Fed. Rep. 547
	William C. Marshall	Ri	6451	25 May 1875		
" "	"		"	"	Wilson Packing Co. v. Clapp	8 Biss. 154, 13 O. G. 368, 3 Ban & Ard. 243
" "	"		"	"	"	8 Biss. 545
" "	"		"	"	Packing Co. Cases	105 U. S. 566, 21 O. G. 1689
" "	John C. Schooley			13 Mar. 1835	Pike v. Potter	3 Fish. 55
" "	Application				Ex parte Wheat	16 O. G. 360
" " during Transp.	John J. Bate		197314	20 Nov. 1877	Bate Refrig. Co. v. Eastman	11 Fed. Rep. 90
" " "	"		"	"	Bate Refrig. Co. v. Gillett	22 O. G. 1205, 13 Fed. Rep. 553
" " "	"		"	"	"	9 Fed. Rep. 387
" " "	"		"	"	Gillette v. Bate Refrigerating Co.	12 Fed. Rep. 108
Presses, Baling	Wendell R. King		60196	28 Aug. 1866	King v. Louisville Cement Co.	4 O. G. 181, 6 Fish. 336
		Ri	7983	17 Dec. 1877		
		Ri	8130	19 Mar. 1878		
" "	Peter K. Dederick	Ri	8292	18 Jun. 1878	Dederick v. Cassell	20 O. G. 1233, 9 Fed. Rep. 306
		Ri	8295	25 Jun. 1878		
		Ri	8312	2 July 1878		
		Ri	8316	2 July 1878		
Prevent. Alterat. Checks & Bonds	Interference				Duthie v. Casilear	1 O. G. 255
Printing, Bank Note	Kneass				Kneass v. Schuylkill Bank	4 Wash. C. C. 9, 1 Robb 303
" Die and Plate	Interference				Hewitt v. Harmon	16 O. G. 724
Printing Presses	Application				Ex Parte Neale	15 O. G. 511
" "	"				Ex parte Cottrell	9 O. G. 435

Printing Presses	Interference			Scott v. Ford	14 O. G. 413
" "	"			Tucker v. Kahler	15 O. G. 966
" "	Edwin Allen		22 Oct. 1867	Hill v. Whitcomb	1 Holmes 317, 5 O. G. 430, 1 Ban & Ard. 34
" "	"		12 Nov. 1867	"	"
" "	"		4 Feb. 1868	"	"
" "	William Bullock et al.	38200	14 Apr. 1863	Bullock Printing Press Co. v. Jones	13 O. G. 124, 3 Ban & Ard. 195
" "	Richard M. Hoe et al.	131217	10 Sept. 1872	Hoe v. Kahler	2 Fed. Rep. 111
" "	John W. Kelberg			Kelberg's Appeal	86 Penn. 129
" "	Charles Montague	98087	21 Dec. 1869	Child v. Boston & F. Iron Works	1 Holmes 303, 5 O. G. 61, 6 Fish. 606
" " Lithographic	Richard M. Hoe		16 Mar. 1869	Hoe v. Cottrell	17 Blatch. 546, 18 O. G. 59, 1 Fed. Rep. 597
" " Feeding Att'mt		220938	13 July 1860	Goss v. Cameron	23 O. G. 741, 14 Fed. Rep. 576
" " Paper Folder	Interference			Lander v. Crowell	16 O. G. 405
" " "	"			Hoe v. Scott	14 O. G. 447
" " "	C. Chambers	23445	5 Apr. 1859	Ex parte Chambers	3 O. G. 320
" " Printing Bed	R. & A. Cross		27 Dec. 1864	Clark v. Bousfield	10 Wall. 133
" " Inking Roll'rs	Lewis Francis	Ri	3 Aug. 1869	Francis v. Mellor	1 O. G. 48, 5 Fish. 153, 8 Phila. 1
	" et al.	Ri	26 Nov. 1869	"	"
Printers' Galleys	Richard M. Hoe	Ri 6328	9 Mar. 1875	Hoe v. Cole	13 O. G. 500
" "	"	"	"	Hoe v. Tuthill	3 Ban & Ard. 206
	Enoch Jacobs		7 Jan. 1859	Jacobs v. Baker	7 Wall. 275
Prisons	"		20 Dec. 1859	"	"
	"		21 Feb. 1860	"	"
	"		24 July 1860	"	"
"	"		"	Jacobs v. Commissioner	1 Bond 500, 4 Fish. 81
Projecting Life Saving Lines	Lewin A. Peck	206128	16 July 1878	Carver v. Peck	131 Mass. 291
Pulleys	Application			Ex parte Murdock	6 O. G. 506
"	Thomas A. Weston		6 Aug. 1867	Weston v. White	13 Blatch. 364, 9 O. G. 1196, 2 Ban & Ard. 321
"	"		"	"	13 Blatch. 447, 2 Ban & Ard. 364
Pulverulent Acid for Soda P'd'rs	Eben N. Horsford		22 Apr. 1858	Attorney Gen. v. Rumford Works	9 O. G. 1063, 2 Ban & Ard. 298
" " "	"		14 Apr. 1868	Oliver v. Morgan	10 Hoisk. 322
" " "	Rumford Chem. Works	Ri 2970	9 June 1868	Rumford Chem. Works v. Hecker	11 O. G. 320, 2 Ban & Ard. 386
" " "	"	"	"	"	10 O. G. 289, 2 Ban & Ard. 351
" " "	"	"	"	"	11 Blatch. 552, 5 O. G. 644, 1 Ban & Ard. 120
" " "	"	"	"	Rumford Chem. Works v. Vice	14 Blatch. 179 11 O. G. 600
" " "	"	"	"	Rumford Chem. Works v. Hecker	10 Blatch. 123, 3 O. G. 249, 5 Fish. 615
	"	Ri 2979		Oliver v. Rumford Chem. Works	25 O. G. 784
Pumps	William Adair	Ri 6964	29 Feb. 1876	Adair v. Thayer	17 Blatch. 468, 4 Fed. Rep. 441
"	"	"	"	"	20 O. G. 523, 7 Fed. Rep. 920
"	Jesse Reed		5 Aug. 1831	Reed v. Cutter	1 Story 590, 2 Robb 81
"	Jesse & Josiah Reed		19 Nov. 1833	"	"
"	James Suggett		29 Mar. 1864	Haselden v. Ogden	3 Fish. 378
"	Jacob Perkins		1818	Lowell v. Lewis	1 Mason 182, 1 Robb 131
"	Nat'l Pump Cylinder Co.	Ri 7006	1 Nov. 1870	Nat'l Pump C. Co. v. Simons H. Co.	18 Fed. Rep. 324
	Herman Fischer	108898			
"	Worswick Manuf. Co.	Ri 8025		Worswick Manuf. Co. v. Steiger	17 Fed. Rep. 250
	"	Ri 8026		"	"
" Chain	W. C. Barker	Ri 6531	6 July 1875	Barker v. Stowe	11 Fed. Rep. 303
" "	"	"	"	"	15 Blatch. 49, 14 O. G. 559, 3 Ban & Ard. 237
" "	"	"	"	Barker v. Todd	22 O. G. 1448, 13 Fed. Rep. 473
" "	"	"	"	"	23 O. G. 438
" Force	Jeffrey			McClure v. Jeffrey	15 Fed. Rep. 265
" Gas (for oil wells)	Goulds Manuf. Co.	117925	8 Aug. 1871	Goulds Manuf. Co. v. Cowing	8 Ind. 79
" "	"	"	"	"	14 Blatch. 315, 12 O. G. 492, 3 Ban & Ard. 75
					105 U. S. 253, 21 O. G. 1277

Pump Oil Well	John B. Root	47133	4 Apr. 1865	Doubleday v. Beatty	22 O. G. 859, 11 Fed. Rep. 729
" Siphon	Hugh Coll	Ri 9109	18 May 1880	Shoriff v. Fulton	23 O. G. 87, 12 Fed. Rep. 136
" Vessels	Ells Loud	188879	Mar. 1877	Loud v. Stone	11 Fed. Rep. 721
Pump Filters	John Christman	Ri	24 Mar. 1877	Christman v. Rumsey	17 Blatch. 148, 88 How. Pr. 114, 17 O. G. 903
" "	E. N. Tillotson et al.		3 Oct. 1870	Tillotson v. Munson	5 Biss. 423
Punching and Stamping Machine	Frederick M. Huntington	131004	3 Sept. 1872	Sturges v. VanHagen	6 Fish. 572
Purifying Fats	Richard Tilghman	11766	3 Oct. 1854	Mitchell v. Tilghman	19 Wall. 287, 5 O. G. 299, 4 Fish. 599
" "	"	"	"	Tilghman v. Mitchell	9 Blatch. 1, 2 Fish. 518
" "	"	"	"	"	9 Blatch. 18, 4 Fish. 615
" "	"	"	"	Tilghman v. Werk	1 Bond 511, 2 Fish. 229
" "	"	"	"	Tillingham v. Proctor	102 U. S. 707, 19 O. G. 859
" Spirits	Vester et al.		1812	Holden v. Curtis	2 N. H. 61
Putting up Powders	Henry Sawyer	Ri	1 Oct. 1867	Sawyer v. Bixby	1 O. G. 165, 9 Blatch. 361, 5 Fish. 283
Railroad Chairs	W. M. C. Cushman	22031	18 Jan. 1859	Ex parte Cushman	3 O. G. 29
" Rails	Application			Ex parte Holub	17 O. G. 854
" Repairing	"			Ex parte Hooper	6 O. G. 360
Rail Joints	"			Ex parte Fisher	17 O. G. 570
Railways, Elevated	Interference			Ex parte Gilbert	5 O. G. 428.
" "	Richard P. Morgan, Jr.		20 Apr. 1869	Morgan E. R. Co. v. Pullman	14 Fed. Rep. 648
Railway Frogs	Interference			Wood v. Morris	3 O. G. 239
" "	"			"	4 O. G. 131
" Gates				Perine v. Goldsworthy	10 O. G. 980
" Track Cleaners	Day	Ri 8388	27 Aug. 1878	Day v. Detroit C. R. W. Co.	22 O. G. 946
" " Brooms	Marcus C. Isaacs	180717	8 Aug. 1876	Isaacs v. Abrams	14 O. G. 861, 3 Ban & Ard. 616
" Water Tanks	John Burnham		27 July 1869	Ex parte Burnham	1 O. G. 164
" "	McGowan Pump Co.	Ri 5544	7 Aug. 1873	Pc.gue v. McGowan	15 Fed. Rep. 398
" Switches	C. S. Cooke	Ri 7690	23 May 1877	Cooke v. N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co.	16 O. G. 856, 4 Ban & Ard. 398
" "	George R. Smith	29959	20 July 1858	Ex parte Smith	2 O. G. 117
" " and Turn Table	Application			Ex parte Borntraezer	16 O. G. 858
" Trucks	Alba F. Smith		11 Feb. 1862	Locomotive Truck Co. v. Rail Co.	6 O. G. 927, 1 Ban & Ard. 427
" "	"		"	Locomotive Co. v. Railway Co.	10 Blatch. 292, 3 O. G. 93, 6 Fish. 187
" "				Locomo. S. T. Co. v. Penna. R. Co.	2 Fed. Rep. 677
Rake	Application			Ex parte Carter	16 O. G. 809
"	"			Ex parte Chase	16 O. G. 809
" Grain	Harkness			Fowler v. Swift	3 Ind. 88
" Horse	Harvey W. Sabine	Ri 7811	3 Dec. 1850	Ex parte Cox	3 O. G. 2
" "	Application	Ri 7811	3 Dec. 1850	Ex parte Cox	2 O. G. 491
" "	Charles Mason et al.	Ri 1914	28 Mar. 1865	Hoffheins v. Brandt	3 Fish. 218
" "	"	Ri 1915	"		
" "	J. M. Wanzer		11 June 1867	Dodds v. Stoddard	24 O. G. 799
" " Hay	George Whitcomb		5 Oct. 1858	Edgarton v. F. & B. Manuf. Co.	21 O. G. 251, 9 Fed. Rep. 450
" " "	"	Ri 2924	16 June 1868	Brown v. Whittemore	2 O. G. 248, 5 Fish. 584
" " "	"	"	"	Edgarton v. Breck	5 Ban & Ard. 42
" " "	Nye	Ri 6731	1881	Nye v. Allen	15 Fed. Rep. 114
" " "	Seymour Rogers		20 Mar. 1866	Nellis v. McLanahan	6 Fish. 286
" " "	James E. Wisner	Ri	11 Dec. 1877	Wisner v. Dodd	2 Fed. Rep. 781
" " "	"	"	"	"	14 Fed. Rep. 655
" " "	"	"	"	Wisner v. Grant	7 Fed. Rep. 485
" " "	"	"	"	"	17 O. G. 447
" " "	William H. Field	Ri 8475	5 Nov. 1878	"	7 Fed. Rep. 922
" " "	"	"	"	"	18 O. G. 192
" Revolving Hay				Joliffe v. Collins	21 Mo. 338
" Self	James S. Marsh			Marsh v. Dodge	5 Lans. 541
" "	"			"	6 T. & C. 568, 11 N. Y. Supr. 278, 66 N. Y. 533

Rake & Plaster Sower Combined	Application				Ex parte Morse	3 O. G. 647
" Tooth	"				Ex parte Holmes	3 O. G. 1
Reaper	Cyrus H. McCormick	Ri		31 Jan. 1845	McCormick v. Talcot	20 How. 402
"	"			23 Oct. 1847		
"	"			24 Feb. 1850		
"	"			31 Jan. 1845	Seymour v. McCormick	16 How. 480, 2 Blatch. 240
"	"			23 Oct. 1847	"	19 How. 96, 3 Blatch. 209
"	Application			"	Ex parte Emerson	16 O. G. 1232
"	"				"	17 O. G. 1451
"	Interference				Marsh v. Dodge	2 O. G. 643
"	C. W. & W. W. Marsh	Ri	2014		Ex parte Marsh	2 O. G. 197
"	"	Ri	2015			
"	James S. Marsh	Ri	2354	11 Sept. 1866	Marsh v. Dodge & Stevenson M. Co.	3 O. G. 398, 6 Fish. 562
"	Eunice B. Hussey Adm'x	Ri		7 Aug. 1871	Hussey v. Bradley	5 Blatch. 134, 2 Fish. 862
"	"	Ri		"	"	5 Blatch. 210
"	Obed Hussey	Ri	449	14 Apr. 1857		
"	"	Ri	450	"	Hussey v. McCormick	1 Biss. 500, 1 Fish. 509
"	"	Ri	451	"	"	
"	"			"	Hussey v. Whitely	1 Bond 407, 2 Fish. 120
"	"			31 Dec. 1833	Hussey v. Bradley	5 Blatch. 210
"	William H. Seymour	Ri	1633	7 May 1861	Marsh v. Seymour	97 U. S. 348, 13 O. G. 723 2 O. G. 675, 6 Fish. 115
"	A. Palmer & S. G. Williams	Ex		1 July 1865	Seymour v. Marsh	2 O. G. 675, 9 Phila. 330, 6 Fish. 115
"	Wm. H. Seymour	Ex		8 July 1865		
	Four sep. Pats. not named				Nourse v. Allen	3 Fish. 63
	E. Ball			12 Aug. 1856		
	"			18 Oct. 1859		
	"			20 Mar. 1860		
" and Mower	"			20 May 1860	Saxton v. Dodge	57 Barb. 84
	John Butler & E. Ball	Ri		17 July 1860		
	J. A. Saxton			15 Nov. 1869		
" " Cutting Bars for	Application				Ex parte Mewes	2 O. G. 617
Rectifying Spirits	Parsons			23 Jun. 1808	Parsons v. Barnard	7 Johns 144
Refrigerators	Application				Ex parte Bate	15 O. G. 1012
"	"				"	16 O. G. 266
"	Frederick Rolson		193158	11 Dec. 1877	Ex parte Rolson	15 O. G. 471
"	D. W. C. Sanford	Ri		21 Apr. 1867	Roberts v. Buck	1 Holmes 224, 3 O. G. 268, 6 Fish. 325
"	"	Ri		"	Roberts v. Harndon	2 Cliff. 500
"	"	Ri		"	Roberts v. Ryer	91 U. S. 150, 10 O. G. 204, 11 Blatch. 11, 3 O. G. 550, 6 Fish. 293
Refrigerating Apparatus	Applica'n of Andw. Muhl				Ex parte Muhl	17 O. G. 744
" "	" Reid & Roebuck				Ex parte Reid & Roebuck	15 O. G. 893
" Process	John B. Bate				Elliott v. Higgins	63 N. C. 459
" "		Ri	7643	24 Apr. 1877	Bate Refrigerating Co. v. Toffey	6 Fed. Rep. 514
Registered Coupon Bond	Application				Ex parte McNaughton	4 O. G. 525
Registering Device	"				Ex parte Ives	15 O. G. 385
Removing Obstruc. under Water	Samuel Lewes	Ri	6240	26 Jan. 1875	Cammeyer v. Newton	16 O. G. 720, 4 Ban & Ard. 139
Rendering Lard and Tallow	Broadnax	Ri	5025	23 Jun. 1874	Broadnax v. Central S. Y. & T. Co.	4 Fed. Rep. 214
Reservoir					Bussey v. Wager	9 O. G. 300, 2 Ban & Ard. 229
Revenue Stamps	Addison C. Fletcher			8 Jun. 1869	Fletcher v. Blake	19 O. G. 221
"	"			"	Fletcher v. Selden	16 Blatch. 468, 4 Ban & Ard. 394
"	"			"	"	25 I. R. R. 249
" for Barrels	Edward A. Locke			2 Aug. 1869	Ben & B. Man. Co. v. Hollister	4 Fed. Rep. 83
Rivets	John C. Wooten		67624		Ex parte Wooten	3 O. G. 521

Rollers, Chilled	James Harley		3 Mar. 1886	McClurg v. Kingsland	1 How. 202, 2 Robb 105.
Rolling Pins	Application			Ex parte Frazier	6 O. G. 381
" Shutter Slats	"			Ex parte Kohler	4 O. G. 53
" Sucker Rod Joints	Interference			Wilson v. Yakel	10 O. G. 944
Rolls for Reducing Metal	Application			Ex parte Lamb	16 O. G. 405
Roofing, Metallic				American Iron Co. v. Angle Amer Roofing Co.	16 Fed. Rep. 915
" Composition	William L. Potter		16 July 1867	Plastic Slate Roof'g Co. v. Moore	1 Holmes. 67
" Fabric				Ready Roofing Co. v. Taylor	15 Blatch 95, 3 Ban & Ard. 368
Rubber Boot Straps	Erskine F. Bickford	198788	6 Nov. 1877	Bost. Rubber Shoe Co. v. Lamkin	18 Fed. Rep. 93
Ruffles	George B. Arnold	28244	20 May 1860	Ex parte Arnold	5 O. G. 553
"	"	"	8 May 1860	Magic Ruffle Co. v. Douglas	2 Fish. 330
"	"	"	"	Magic Ruffle Co. v. Elm City Co.	13 Blatch. 151, 8 O. G. 773, 2 Ban & Ard. 152
"	"	"	"	"	14 Blatch. 109, 11 O. G. 501, 2 Ban & Ard. 506
" Band	Thomas Robjohn		19 Apr. 1864	Wooster v. Calhoun	11 Blatch. 215, 6 Fish. 514
Ruffling Machine	George H. Wooster	Ri 6565	27 July 1875	Wooster v. Blake	20 O. G. 158, 7 Fed. Rep. 816
"	"	Ri 6566	"	"	8 Fed. Rep. 429
"	"	"	"	Wooster v. Clark	21 O. G. 264, 9 Fed. Rep. 854
"	"	"	"	Wooster v. Howe Machine Co.	16 O. G. 314, 4 Ban & Ard. 319
"	"	"	"	Wooster v. Marks	17 Blatch. 368
"	"	"	"	Wooster v. Taylor	14 Blatch. 403, 3 Ban Ard. 241
Saddles			16 July 1819	Dixon v. Moyer	4 Wash. C. C. 68, 1 Robb 324
Saddles and Pads, Harness	Interference			Frevert v. Gahr	3 O. G. 660
" "				Albright v. Teas	23 O. G. 829, 22 O. G. 2069, 13 Fed. Rep. 456
" "	John T. Denniston		29 Nov. 1846	North v. Kershaw	4 Blatch. 70
" "	A. H. Gazley		14 Mar. 1848		
	R. C. Sturges		19 Jan. 1869	American Saddle Co. v. Hogg	1 Holmes 133, 2 O. G. 59, 5 Fish. 353
Saddle Trees	John Grimsley et al.	97236	23 Nov. 1869	Burns v. Meyer	100 U. S. 671
"	Still et al		18 Sept. 1877	Still v. Reading	20 O. G. 1025, 9 Fed. Rep. 40
Safes, Fire Proof	Application			Ex parte Farrell	2 O. G. 340
" "				Delano v. Scott	1 Gilp. 489, 1 Robb 700
" "	Daniel Fitzgerald		1 Jun. 1843	Adams v. Edwards	1 Fish. 1
" "	"		"	Gayler v. Wilder	10 How. 477
" "	"		"	Rich v. Lippincott	2 Fish. 1
" "	"		"	Wilder v. Adams	2 W. & M. 329
" "	"		"	Wilder v. Gaylor	1 Blatch. 511
" "	"		"	"	1 Blatch. 597
" "	"		"	Wilder v. McCormick	2 Blatch. 31
" "	James B. Floyd	Ri 1311	16 Oct. 1868	Ex parte Floyd	6 O. G. 541
" "	Burt G. Wilder			Wilder v. Stearns	48 N. Y. 656
" " Doors	Joseph L. Hall	67046	23 July 1867	Hall v. Macneale	23 O. G. 937
Salt, Manufacture of	Interference			Rice v. Burt	16 O. G. 1050
" "	"			"	17 O. G. 799
Sand Blast	Benjamin C. Tilghman	103408	18 Oct. 1870	Tilghman v. Hartell	1 W. N. 52
"	"	"	"	"	9 O. G. 886, 2 Ban & Ard. 260
"	"	"	"	Tilghman v. Morse	9 Blatch. 421, 1 O. G. 574, 5 Fish. 323
Sand Paper Holder, (Boot Mach.)	Herbert L. Willis	100229		Buzzell v. O'Connell	4 Fed. Rep. 325
Sand Washer and Crusher	John R. Smith et al.		27 Aug. 1867	Smith v. Frazer	2 O. G. 175, 5 Fish. 543
Sash and Blind Machine	Leavens			Elmer v. Pennel	40 Me. 430
Sash Fasteners	Application			Ex parte Le Duc	1 O. G. 549
"	Hopkins & Dickinson Mfg. Co.	Ri	10 Oct. 1875	H. & D. Manuf. Co. v. Corbin	103 U. S. 786, 20 O. G. 297, 14 Blatch. 396, 3 Ban & Ard. 199.
"	"	Ri	"	"	14 O. G. 3
Sash Holder	Application			Ex parte Mixer	1 O. G. 48

Sash Holder	Franklin Babcock		29 Sep. 1868	Babcock v. Judd	17 O. G. 1351, 1 Fed. Rep. 408
" Supporters	Charles A. Schaefer	RI 8672	15 Apr. 1879	Judd v. Babcock	23 O. G. 92
" "	"	"	"	Judd v. Babcock	8 Fed. Rep. 605
" Stopper and Lock	W. Van Gaasbeck			Groff v. Hansel	33 Md. 161
Saucepans, Earthenware	Scott et al.	225492	16 Mar. 1880	Scott v. Evans	11 Fed. Rep. 726
Sawing Machine	John Myers and others		23 May 1868	Dunbar v. Myers	94 U. S. 187, 11 O. G. 35
" "	"		"	Eunson v. Dodge	18 Wall. 414, 5 O. G. 95
" "	Robert G. Emerson et al.		23 May 1854	Emerson v. Simm	3 O. G. 293, 6 Fish. 281
Saws	Emerson	66692	16 July 1867	American Saw Co. v. Emerson	8 Fed. Rep. 306
"	Application			Ex parte Gray	11 O. G. 329
"	J. K. Lockwood	RI 8076	5 Feb. 1876	Curtis v. Branch	15 O. G. 319, 4 Ban & Ard. 189
"	Nathan W. Spaulding		21 Apr. 1863	Spaulding v. Page	1 Saw. 702, 4 Fish. 641
"	"		"	Spaulding v. Tucker	4 Fish. 633
"	"		"	Tucker v. Spaulding	5 Fish. 297, 13 Wall. 453, 1 O. G. 144, 1 Deady 649
"	Robert S. Thomas			Orr v. Burwell	15 Ala. 378
"	Joseph H. Tuttle	RI 4096	9 Aug. 1870	Wheeler v. Simpson	6 O. G. 435, 1 Ban & Ard. 420
" Filing and Setting	Application			Ex parte Castle	4 O. G. 179
" Circular	Nicholas G. Norcross		15 Jan. 1850	Lee v. Blandy	1 Bond 361, 2 Fish. 89
" Frames	Charles F. Ramsay et al.			Tillotson v. Ramsay	51 Vt. 309
" Set			24 May 1830	Aiken v. Bemis	1 Wood & M. 349
" Teeth	Application			Ex parte Sperry	3 O. G. 467
Saw Mill	Palmer Hamilton	51810	5 Dec. 1865	Hamilton v. Kingsbury	15 Blatch. 64, 14 O. G. 448, 3 Ban & Ard. 346
" "	"	"	"	"	17 Blatch. 284, 17 O. G. 147
" "	"	"	"	"	17 Blatch. 460, 17 O. G. 847, 4 Fed. Rep. 423
" "	"	"	"	Hamilton v. Rollins	5 Dill. 495, 3 Ban & Ard. 157
" "	"	"	"	Hamilton v. Ives	3 O. G. 30, 6 Fish. 244
" "	"	"	"	Ives v. Hamilton	92 U. S. 426, 10 O. G. 336, 6 Fish. 244
" "				Crosby v. Lapouraille	Taney 374
" " Portable	Iram Nye			Nye v. Raymond	16 Ill. 153
" " "	George Page			Phillips v. Page	24 How. 164
" " Circular	"			Page v. Ferry	1 Fish. 298
" " " Steam Feed for	DeWitt C. Prescott	RI 8160	9 Apr. 1878	Etches v. Prescott	17 O. G. 267
" " Carriages	Lewis C. Pattee	121468	3 Dec. 1871	Pattee v. Russell	3 O. G. 181
" " "	Titus H. Russell	121664	3 Dec. 1871	Pattee v. Russell	3 O. G. 181
" " Dogs	"	"	"	Ex parte Pattee	2 O. G. 618
" " "	Beckwith			Allis v. Stowell	18 O. G. 465
" " "	Selden			Allis v. Stowell	18 O. G. 465
" " "	"	"		"	19 O. G. 727
" " "	"	"		"	9 Fed. Rep. 304
	Henry D. Dann	RI 6743	9 Nov. 1875	Neacy v. Allis	22 O. G. 1621, 13 Fed. Rep. 874
	Francis M. Strong et al.	14119	15 Jan. 1856	Prime v. Brandon Manuf. Co.	16 Blatch. 453, 4 Ban & Ard. 379
Scales	"	23162	24 May 1859	Prime v. Brandon Manuf. Co.	16 Blatch. 453, 4 Ban & Ard. 379
	"	25148	16 Aug. 1859	Prime v. Brandon Manuf. Co.	16 Blatch. 453, 4 Ban & Ard. 379
	John Howe, Jr.	35248	20 May 1862	Prime v. Brandon Manuf. Co.	16 Blatch. 453, 4 Ban & Ard. 379
"	Badge & Russell			Wilson v. Hentges	26 Minn. 288
Screws	David F. Fetter	RI 8121	12 Mar. 1878	Fetter v. Newhall	25 O. G. 502, 17 Fed. Rep. 841
Screw Cutting Machine	Henry Crum		14 Nov. 1836	Pierson v. Eagle Screw Co.	3 Story 402, 2 Robb 268
Screw Driver	Application			Ex parte Clarke	3 O. G. 239
Screw Threading Machine	Edward G. Blakeslee	116922	11 Jan. 1871	Detweiler v. Voege	8 Fed. Rep. 600
Scythes	Application			Ex parte Roby	16 O. G. 545
" Snathes	Dexter Peirce		11 Mar. 1837	Alden v. Dewey	1 Story 336
Seam Making Tool, Metallic	Campbell		1865	Campbell v. Barclay	5 Biss. 179
Seats for Public Buildings	Aaron H. Allen	RI 1126	15 Jan. 1861	Allen v. Brooklyn	3 Blatch. 535, 4 Fish. 598

Seats for Public Buildings	Aaron H. Allen				Allen v. New York	5 Ban & Ard. 57
" "	"				"	17 Blatch. 350, 17 O. G. 1281
" "	"				"	18 Blatch. 289, 7 Fed. Rep. 483
" "	"				Hayward v. Andrews	23 O. G. 533
" "	"				"	12 Fed. Rep. 786
" Circus and Shows	"				Jackson v. Allen	120 Mass. 64
" "	David C. Price		125329	2 Apr. 1872		
" "	"		134486	31 Dec. 1872	Price v. Kelley	11 O. G. 639, 2 Ban & Ard. 534
" "	"		163537	18 May 1875		
Seeding Machine	Interference				Smith v. Winchell	13 O. G. 1127
"	Benjamin Delong		216025	3 Jun. 1879	Delong v. Beckford	22 O. G. 2243
"	John M. Westcott		176719	28 Apr. 1876	Fulgham v. Westcott	16 O. G. 1005
Seed Planters	William Blessing			13 Dec. 1852	Trader v. Messmore	7 O. G. 385, 1 Ban & Ard. 639
"	Jarvis Case		Ri	16 Nov. 1868	Case v. Brown	2 Wall. 320, 1 Biss. 382, 2 Fish. 268
"	George W. Brown		Ri	11 Sept. 1860	Brown v. Selby	2 Biss. 457, 4 Fish. 367
"	Charles W. Cahoon			1 Sept. 1857	Cahoon v. Ring	1 Cliff. 592, 1 Fish. 397
"	Elbridge G. Matthews		88971	13 Apr. 1869	Holbrook v. Small	10 O. G. 508, 2 Ban & Ard. 396
Seed Sower, Broadcast	Moses D. Wells			14 Dec. 1852	Stone v. Palmer	28 Mo. 539
" Wheel, Rotary	Aaron H. Cragin				Cragin v. Fowler	34 Vt. 326
" "					Brown v. Deere	19 O. G. 361, 6 Fed. Rep. 484
					"	19 O. G. 1217, 6 Fed. Rep. 487
Sewer Basin Covers	Chase et al.			2 Apr. 1872	Chase & White v. Chase	4 O. G. 4
Sewing Machines	Application				Ex parte Barcellos	17 O. G. 110
"	"				Ex parte Chamblant	4 O. G. 106
"	"				Ex parte Jones	5 O. G. 585.
"	"				Ex parte Langlois	14 O. G. 84
"	Interference				Ex parte Morrison	16 O. G. 359
"	"				Banks v. Snediker	16 O. G. 1096
"	"				"	17 O. G. 508
"	Application				Davis v. Scharffe	14 O. G. 345
"	"				Ex parte Bouscay, Jr.	9 O. G. 743
"	Geo. B. & Alfred Arnold		28139	8 May 1860	Ex parte Arnold	5 O. G. 553
"	"		28244	25 Sept. 1860		
"	"		"	"	Magic Ruffle Co. v. Douglass	2 Fish. 330
"	Application				Ex parte Bigelow	13 O. G. 913
"	"				"	14 O. G. 821
"	"				Ex parte Bland	15 O. G. 775
"	"				"	15 O. G. 828
"	"				"	16 O. G. 47
"					Burdell v. Comstock	15 Fed. Rep. 395
"					Burdell v. Denig	15 Fed. Rep. 397
"	Barber		Ri	7860	Barber v. Hallett	20 O. G. 449, 10 Fed. Rep. 130
"	John Batchelder		Ri	12 Dec. 1865	Batchelder v. Moulton	11 Blatch. 304, 4 O. G. 501, 6 Fish. 408
"	"			"	Potter v. Braunsdorf	7 Blatch. 97
"	"			"	Potter v. Stewart	18 Blatch. 561, 19 O. G. 997, 9 Fed. Rep. 215
"	Lyman R. Blake		20775	6 July 1858	McKay v. Dibert	19 O. G. 1351, 5 Fed. Rep. 587
"	"		29562	14 Aug. 1860		
"	"		"	"	McKay v. McKnight	5 Fed. Rep. 593
"	"		"	"	McKay v. Scott & S.S. Machine Co.	20 O. G. 372
"	Antoine Bonnaz		83910	10 Nov. 1868	Cornley v. Marckwald	24 O. G. 498
"	Chabot			12 May 1868	Chabot v. Button Hole Co.	9 Phila. 373
"	Alexander Douglass		Ex	5 Oct. 1872	Wooster v. Seidenberg	13 Blatch. 88, 10 O. G. 244, 2 Ban & Ard. 91
"	"			"	Wooster v. Taylor	12 Blatch. 304, 8 O. G. 644, 1 Ban & Ard. 594
"					Ellithorpe v. Robertson	4 Blatch. 307, 2 Fish. 83

Sewing Machines	William L. Fish	123625	13 Feb. 1872	Fish v. Domestic S. M. Co.	22 O. G. 1207, 12 Fed. Rep. 495
"	W. P. N. Fitzgerald		19 Dec. 1854	Grover & Baker S. M. Co. v. Sloat	2 Fish. 112
"	James E. A. Gibbs	21129	10 Aug. 1858		
"	"	1206	21 Feb. 1860	Wilcox & Gibbs S. M. Co. v. Frame	24 O. G. 1272
"	"	Ri 2655	18 June 1867		
"	William O. Grover et al.	Ri	15 June 1858	Grover & B. S. M. Co. v. Williams	2 Fish. 133
				Florence S. M Co. v. G. & B. S. M. Co.	110 Mass. 70
"	Henry W. Fuller			Fuller v. Yentzer	94 U. S. 288, 11 O. G. 551, 6 Biss. 203
	"			"	94 U. S. 299, 11 O. G. 597
"	David Haskell	29785	28 Aug. 1860	Haskell v. Shoe M. Manuf. Co.	15 O. G. 509, 3 Ban & Ard. 553
"	Abial C. Herron		15 June 1858	Ex parte Herron	1 O. G. 608
"	Elias Howe, Jr.		10 Sept 1846	Howe v. Morton	1 Fish. 586
"	"		"	Howe v. Underwood	1 Fish. 160
"	"		"	Howe v. Williams	2 Cliff. 245, 2 Fish. 395
"	"		"	Howe v. Wooldredge	94 Mass. 18
"	Albert F. Johnson			Thomas v. Shoe M. Manuf. Co.	16 O. G. 541, 3 Ban & Ard. 557
"	A. J. Johnson		22 Jan. 1858	Ex parte Johnson	1 O. G. 631
"	William H. Johnson	Ri	26 Feb. 1856	Johnson v. Root	1 Fish. 351
"	"		"	"	2 Cliff. 108, 2 Fish. 291
"	Lawyer	101140	22 Mar. 1870	Raymond v. Singer Manuf. Co.	11 Fed. Rep. 427
"	Henry H. Low		6 Mar. 1858	Ex parte Low	1 O. G. 203
"	L. B. Miller	214515		Singer M'f'g Co. v. Henry Stew-	20 O. G. 524, 8 Fed. Rep. 920
"	John Myers et al.	Ex	23 May 1868	Myers v. Dunbar [art M'f'g Co.	12 Blatch. 380, 8 O. G. 321, 1 Ban & Ard. 565
"	"		"	Myers v. Frame	8 Blatch. 446, 4 Fish. 493
"	"		"	Peek v. Frame	9 Blatch. 194, 5 Fish. 113
"	"		"	"	5 Fish. 211
"	Charles Parham		4 Feb. 1873	Cushman v. Parham	9 O. G. 1108
"	"	Ex	21 Nov. 1868	Parham v. Sewing Machine Co.	4 Fish. 468
"	William Randel	166810	17 Aug. 1875	Wright v. Randel	21 O. G. 493, 8 Fed. Rep. 592
"	Thomas J. W. Robertson		22 Nov. 1859	Dibble v. Augur	7 Blatch 86
"	"		"	Dibble v. Sibley	7 Blatch 209
"	Francis A. Ross et al.	Ri	26 Feb. 1861	Ross v. Wolfinger	5 O. G. 117
"	Glover Sanford et al.		10 Apr. 1866	Sanford v. Merrimac Hat Co.	4 Cliff. 404, 10 O. G. 466
"	"		"	Sanford v. Messer	1 Holmes 149, 2 O. G. 470, 5 Fish. 411
"	Frederick E. Schmidt	197528	27 Nov. 1877	Schmidt v. Freese	12 Fed. Rep. 563
"	"	219656	16 Sept. 1879	"	21 O. G. 1876, 12 Fed. Rep. 563
"	"		"	Shook v. Singer Manuf. Co.	61 Ind. 520
	Isaac M. Singer		13 Apr. 1852		
	"		10974 30 May 1854		
	"		10975 30 May 1854		
"	"	Ri	3 Oct. 1854	Singer v. Walmsley	1 Fish. 558
	"		14 Nov. 1856		
	"	Ri	12 Jan. 1858		
				Singer Manuf. Co. v. Harsen	8 Biss. 151, 3 Ban & Ard. 246
				Singer Manuf. Co. v. Riley	11 Fed. Rep. 706
				Singer Manuf. Co. v. Strange	6 Fed. Rep. 279
"	"		12 Aug. 1851	Vose v. Singer	86 Mass. 226
"	"		4 Nov. 1856	Singer v. Braunsdorf	7 Blatch. 521
"	Singer Manuf. Co.	Ri 4196		Singer Manuf. Co. v. Goodrich	15 Fed. Rep. 455
"	Chas. & And. Spring		10 May 1859	Spring v. Domestic S. M. Co.	22 O. G. 1445, 13 Fed. Rep. 446
"				Stanford v. Hat Co.	10 O. G. 466, 2 Ban & Ard. 408
"	Straw Sewing Machine Co.	Ri 7985	11 Dec. 1877	Straw S. M. Co. v. Eames	18 Blatch. 520, 19 O. G. 359, 6 Fed. Rep. 181
"	D. A. Sutherland et al.	Ri 7558	13 Mar. 1877	Smith v. Merriam	19 O. G. 601, 6 Fed. Rep. 713

Sewing Machines	D. A. Sutherland et al.	Ri	7556	13 Mar. 1877	Smith v. Merriam	6 Fed. Rep. 903
"	Interference				Wild v. Smith	15 O. G. 513
"	George A. S. Whiting				Whiting v. Graves	13 O. G. 455, 3 Ban & Ard. 255
"	Allen B. Wilson			12 Nov. 1850	Burdell v. Denig	2 Fish. 588
"	"			"	"	92 U. S. 716
"	"	Ri	346	22 Jan. 1856	Florence S. M. Co. v. Singer Mfg. Co.	8 Blatch. 113, 4 Fish. 329
"	"	Ri	414	9 Dec. 1856	"	8 Blatch. 177, 4 Fish. 348
"	"	"		"	"	2 Fish. 251
"	"	"		"	Potter v. Fuller	2 Blatch. 238, 1 Fish. 382
"	"	"		"	Potter v. Holland	4 Blatch. 206, 1 Fish. 327
"	"	"		"	"	3 Fish. 428
"	"	"		"	Potter v. Mack	2 Fish. 465
"	"	"		"	Potter v. Muller	1 Bond 601
"	"	"		"	"	2 Fish. 102
"	"	Ex		12 Nov. 1864	Potter v. Wilson	1 Abb. U. S. 89, 3 Fish. 112
"	"			"	Potter v. Crowell	3 Fish. 472
"	"			"	Potter v. Davis S. M. Co.	5 Blatch. 160, 2 Fish. 381
"	"			"	Potter v. Dixon	3 Fish. 474
"	"			"	Potter v. Empire Machine Co.	1 Biss. 515, 3 Fish. 82
"	"			"	Potter v. Schenck	2 Fish. 163
"	"			"	Potter v. Stevens	1 Lowell 87, 3 Fish. 77
"	George H. Wooster	Ri	6565	27 July 1875	Potter v. Whitney	22 O. G. 1132
"	"	Ri	6566	27 July 1875	Wooster v. Blake	23 O. G. 2513
"	"	"		"	Wooster v. Singer Manuf. Co.	2 Fish. 565
Shaping Irregular Wood	Warren Hale et al.	Ri		10 Feb. 1863	Hale v. Stimpson	103 U. S. 797, O. G. 1067, 2 Ban & Ard. 637
Shawl Straps	George Crouch	Ri	4289	7 Mar. 1871	Crouch v. Roemer	6 O. G. 187, 1 Ban & Ard. 145
"	"	"		"	Crouch v. Speer	1 O. G. 573
Shearing Iron Bands	Application				Ex parte Cornell	8 O. G. 597
" Machine	"				Ex parte Hahn	9 O. G. 1018, 2 Ban & Ard. 264
" Sheep	William Earle Jr. et al.	Ri		23 Dec. 1873	Earle v. Harlow	10 O. G. 4, 2 Ban & Ard. 263
" "	"	"		"	Sweetzer v. Helms	15 Blatch. 192, 3 Ban & Ard. 128
Sheet Metal Roofs	Asa Johnson et al.	Ri	4870	16 Apr. 1872	Johnson v. Flushing & N. S. R. R. Co.	105 U. S. 539, 22 O. G. 329
" "	"	"		"	Johnson v. Railroad Co.	5 O. G. 147
Shells, Percussion	Ethan Allen	"	1948	9 May 1865	Ex parte Allen	
" "	"	Ri	1949	9 May 1865	"	
" "	William H. Hubbell	Ri		19 Jan. 1858	Hubbell v. U. S.	5 N. & H. 1
" "	"			7 Jan. 1862	"	
" "	"			21 Jan. 1860	"	
Shingle Machine	William Earle			28 Dec. 1822	Earle v. Sawyer	4 Mason 1, 1 Robb 491
"	H. H. Evarts		11858		Ex parte Evarts	5 O. G. 420
"	"			1 Oct. 1868	Evarts v. Ford	5 O. G. 58, 6 Fish. 587
"	Joseph S. Raymond			5 Aug. 1837	Peck v. Bacon	18 Conn. 377
Shot, Process of Making	Application				Ex parte Wintherlich	16 O. G. 404
" "	"				"	16 O. G. 808
Shovels	Interference				Hubbard v. Myers	16 O. G. 1051
"	P. A. Sabbaton		22514	14 Jan. 1859	Ex parte Sabbaton	2 O. G. 703
Show Case Corner Sockets	Matthias Terhune	Ri	5748	27 Jan. 1874	Terhune v. Phillips	93 U. S. 592
Shower Baths	Ephraim Larrabee			2 Jan. 1849	Larrabee v. Cortlan	1 Taney 180, 3 Fish. 5
Shutter Fasteners	Shedd		166819		Shedd v. Washburn	9 Fed. Rep. 904
" Hinges	Harvey Lull et al.		10477	31 July 1854	Lull v. Clark	22 O. G. 1535, 13 Fed. Rep. 456
Shuttles	Application				Ex parte Eaton et al.	4 O. G. 525
"	"				Ex parte Freese	17 O. G. 1095
Sleves	Robert J. Mann	Ri	4637	7 Feb. 1871	Dayton v. Wright	11 O. G. 197, 2 Ban & Ard. 449

Sieves	Robert J. Mann	106597	23 Aug. 1870	Adams & Westlake Manuf. Co. v. St. Louis Wire Goods Co.	12 O. G. 940, 3 Ban & Ard. 77
Sign, Design for	"	Ri 4637	7 Feb. 1871		
Sink Cleaning Apparatus	Application		28 Jan. 1868	Ex parte Fairchild	3 O. G. 323
" "	Louis Strauss, Wm. Painter		5 Aug. 1873	Odorless Excav. Co. v. McCaulay	2 Ban & Ard. 570
	" et al.		6 Aug. 1874		
	Louis Strauss, Wm. Painter		28 Jan. 1868, 5 Aug. 1873	Odorless Ex. Co. v. Lauman	12 Fed. Rep. 788
Skates	Application			Ex parte Jenkins	4 O. G. 351
"	Barney & Berry	77862		Jenkins v. Barney	3 O. G. 119
"	Charles T. Day	Ri 8590	18 Feb. 1879	Spaeth v. Gibson	23 O. G. 1782
"	Oliver Edwards	Ri 7524	20 Feb. 1874	Barney v. Kellogg	17 O. G. 1096
"	George B. Turrell	Ri 7151	30 May 1876	Turrell v. Bradford	23 O. G. 1623
"	"	"	"	Turrell v. Spaeth	14 O. G. 377, 3 Ban & Ard. 458
"			6 Apr. 1875	"	8 O. G. 986, 2 Ban & Ard. 185
"			"	"	9 O. G. 1163, 2 Ban & Ard. 315
" Parlor	James L. Plimpton	55091	1866	Plimpton v. Winslow	3 Fed. Rep. 333
" "	"	"	"	"	14 Fed. Rep. 919
" Fastenings	Edward Wehr	23344	24 Mar. 1859	Ex parte Behr & Mongel	3 O. G. 292
Skewers	Application			Ex parte Atwood	17 O. G. 570
Skirt Hoops	L. A. Osborn & I. J. Vincent		22 June 1858	Doughty v. Day	9 Blatch. 262, 5 Fish. 224
Skirts, Hoop	S. Peberdy [bert	29197	30 Nov. 1858	Ex parte Peberdy	2 O. G. 644
" Springs for	T. B. DeForrest & T. S. Gil-		18 Feb. 1868	Young v. Lippman	9 Blatch. 277, 2 O. G. 249, 342 5 Fish. 230
" Machinery for	Thomas B. DeForrest		4 Nov. 1862		
	Joseph Baird		9 Dec. 1862		
	Jeddiah Wilcox	Ri	4 Aug. 1863	Wilcox v. Komp	7 Blatch. 126
	Chauncey L. Olmstead		31 Oct. 1865		
Skirts, Skeleton	Samuel H. Doughty		1 Aug. 1866	U. S. v. Doughty	7 Blatch. 424
" "	Sam'l H. Doughty et al.	Ri	27 Dec. 1859	Doughty v. Manuf. Co.	4 Fish. 318
" "	"	"	"	Doughty v. West	2 Fish. 553
" Panniers, &c., Woven Tape	"			"	6 Blatch. 429, 3 Fish. 580
Skirt Protector	S. H. Doughty et al.			Ex parte Woven Tape Skirt Co.	19 N. Y. Supr. 111
" "	Thomas B. DeForrest	61172	15 Jan. 1867	Day v. Combination Rubber Co.	6 O. G. 1347, 2 Fed. Rep. 570
" "	"	"	"	Day v. Schwab	17 O. G. 1348, 2 Fed. Rep. 544
" "	Helen M. Macdonald	155534	29 Sept. 1874	Macdonald v. Blackmer	9 O. G. 746, 4 Ban & Ard. 78
" "	"	"	"	Macdonald v. Chase	6 O. G. 359
" "	"	"	"	Macdonald v. Shepard	4 Fed. Rep. 228
" "	"	"	"	"	4 Ban & Ard. 343
" "	"	"	"	Macdonald v. Sidenberg	18 O. G. 193
" "	"	"	"	"	4 Ban & Ard. 586
Slaughtering	Application			Ex parte Knott	8 O. G. 238
Sled Runners	Lockwood et al.			Lockwood v. Lockwood	33 Iowa 509
Sleeve Supporters	J. P. Lindsay	202735	23 Apr. 1878	Lindsay v. Stein	21 O. G. 1613, 10 Fed. Rep. 907
Slicing, Grating & Sifting Mach.	"			Ex parte Shepard	3 O. G. 522
Sluice Fork	Lewis Tesse et al.			Tesse v. Huntingdon	23 How. 2
"	"			Tesse v. Phelps	1 McArthur 17
"	"			"	1 McArthur 48
Smoothing Iron				Shepherd v. Jenkins	73 Me. 510
Smut Machine	J. W. Howlett et al.		9 May 1846	Cansler v. Eaton	2 Jones Eq. 499
Snap Hooks				Fitch v. Bragg	16 Fed. Rep. 243
Soap	Isabella Eames et al.	Ri 5007	30 July 1872	Buchan v. McKesson	18 Blatch. 485, 19 O. G. 222, 7 Fed. Rep. 100
"	Parsons	56259	10 July 1866	Parsons v. Colgate	15 O. G. 600
" Compound Chemical	Henry Warren		9 July 1864	Warren v. Cole	15 Mich. 265
	Isaac Rorabach		3 Mar. 1857	Lindsay v. Rorabach	4 Jones Eq. 124

Soap, Composition for	Robert Eastman	118140	29 Aug. 1871	Eastman v. Hinckel	5 Ban & Ard. 1
Soda Waters and Syrups	Horace L. Bowker	193178	24 July 1877	Bowker v. Dows	15 O. G. 510, 3 Ban & Ard. 518
" Apparatus	John H. Blaisdell	40611	8 Dec. 1863	Blaisdell v. Dows	4 Ban & Ard. 489
" "	"	"	"	Blaisdell v. Puffer	4 Ban & Ard. 500
" "	"	"	"	Blaisdell v. Tufts	15 O. G. 881, 3 Ban & Ard. 521
" "	Matthews	Ri 9028	6 Jan. 1880	Matthews v. Spangenberg	4 Fed. Rep. 350
" "	"	"	"	"	23 O. G. 92
" "	"	"	"	"	23 O. G. 1624
" " Tubes for	5 Patents not named			Matthews v. L. & G. Manuf. Co.	18 Blatch. 84, 17 O. G. 1284, 2 Fed. Rep. 232
" " Discharge	Application			Ex parte Aiken	2 O. G. 274
Solar Camera	David Woodward	Ri		Woodruff v. Barney	1 Bond 528, 2 Fish. 244
" Plate Holder for	Albert S. Southworth	Ri	25 Sep. 1860	Wing v. Richardson	2 Cliff. 449, 2 Fish. 535
" " "	"		"	Wing v. Schoonmaker	3 Fish. 607
" " "	"		"	Wing v. Warren	2 O. G. 342, 5 Fish. 548
" " "	"		"	Ormsbee v. Wood	3 Fish. 372
Soldering Apparatus	Isaac Kaylor		6 Jun. 1871	Cutting v. Kaylor	2 O. G. 704
" Irons	Application			Ex parte Hollingsworth	3 O. G. 583
" "	Barker Patent	Ri 8781	1 July 1871	McMurray v. Mallory	5 Fed. Rep. 593
" "	Bostwick "	Ri 8466	29 Oct. 1878		
" "	Louis McMurray et al.	115760	6 Jun. 1871	McMurray v. Miller	16 Fed. Rep. 471
" Machines	Application			Ex parte Brooks	6 O. G. 296
Sorghum	Hoover			Hunt v. Hoover	24 Iowa 231
" Filter	Davidson			Hall v. Orvis	35 Iowa 366
Spark Arrester	George H. Griggs	120637	7 Nov. 1871	Hike v. Prov. & W. R. R. Co.	6 O. G. 575
"	"	Ri 5050	10 Sept. 1872	Pike v. Prov. & W. R. R. Co.	1 Holmes 445, 1 Ban & Ard. 560
	"	Ri 5051	"		
Speaking Tube Whistles	Thomas J. Woolcocks		24 May 1870	Woolcocks v. Many	9 Blatch. 139, 5 Fish. 72
Spectacles	Application			Ex parte King	2 O. G. 618
Spelling Blocks	Samuel L. Hill	Ri		Hill v. Houghton	6 O. G. 3, 1 Ban & Ard. 291
Spindles	Application			Ex parte Mayer	13 O. G. 912
Spindle Bolsters	"			Ex parte Richardson	7 O. G. 1053
	Wm. T. Carroll	Ri 6386			
Spinning Frames	Knight	108270		Draper v. Wattles	16 O. G. 629, 3 Ban & Ard. 618
	Marsh	118622			
" Fliers	Application			Ex parte Cowper	16 O. G. 176
" Rings	"			Ex parte Wilson	16 O. G. 95
" "				Carroll v. Morse	9 O. G. 453
" "	Pearl	Ri 6036	1 Sept. 1874	Pearl v. Appleton Co.	3 Fed. Rep. 153
Splint Cutting Machine	Interference			Ex parte Russell & Scow	5 O. G. 149
Spoons, Metal	Application			Ex parte Perkins	16 O. G. 1098
" Wooden	"			Ex parte Shippen	8 O. G. 727
" and Forks	Florean Grosjean	Ri	16 July 1867	Grosjean v. Peck	11 Blatch. 54
" " Handles	Application			Ex parte Beattie	16 O. G. 266
" " "	John Gorham et al.		16 July 1861	Gorham Manuf. Co. v. White	7 Blatch. 513, 14 Wall. 511, 6 Fish. 94
" "	Robert Wallace	220003	23 Sept. 1879	Wallace v. Noyes	23 O. G. 435, 13 Fed. Rep. 172
	"	220002	"		
Springs, Car	James C. Pickles et al.	Ri 6521	9 Mar. 1875	Miller v. Pickering	16 Fed. Rep. 540
Spring Balance	Application			Ex parte Chatillon	2 O. G. 115
"	Jirah Vaughan			Vaughan v. Porter	16 Vt. 266
Spring Bed Bottom	Sidney B. Andrews	125250	2 Apr. 1872	Harris v. Allen	15 Fed. Rep. 106
" "		181498	21 Nov. 1876	McKee v. Eaton	26 Kans. 226
" "	Herman W. Ladd	191244	29 May 1877	Ladd v. Tucker Manuf. Co.	4 Ban & Ard. 344
Spring Mattresses	Samuel P. Kittle	Ri	17 Oct. 1865	Kittle v. Frost	9 Blatch. 214, 5 Fish. 213
" "	Application			Ex parte Perkins	2 O. G. 469

Squares, Bevel		Application			Ex parte Fairbanks & Robinson	3 O. G. 65
" Try		Interference			Disston v. Traut	1 O. G. 305
" "			229283	29 Jun. 1880	Starrett v. Athol Machine Co.	14 Fed. Rep. 910
			Ri 0419			
		Thomas A. Jebb et al.		31 May 1881		
Starch Apparatus		John A. Owens		26 May 1868	N.Y. Grape S. Co. v. American Grape S. Co.	10 Fed. Rep. 835
		J. J. Gilbert		8 Sep. 1868		
		Colbert Gilbert		15 Apr. 1878		
Stave Machine		William Sisson		24 Sept. 1861	May v. Chaffee	2 Dillon 385, 5 Fish. 160
"		"		"	Sisson v. Gilbert	9 Blatch. 185, 5 Fish. 109
					Cutting v. Myers	4 Wash. 220, 1 Robb 159
Steamboats						
"	Staging	A. John Bell		22 Jan. 1861	Converse v. Cannon	2 Woods 7, 9 O. G. 105
"	Hulls	Ross & Thos. Winans	21917	26 Oct. 1858	Ex parte Winans	2 O. G. 440
Steam Boilers		Application			Ex parte Fitzgibbons	10 O. G. 375
"		Henry W. Rice	Ri 6422	4 May 1875	Heald v. Rice	104 U. S. 737, 21 O. G. 1443
"	Furnace	Gideon Bantz		6 Feb. 1872	Bantz v. Eisas	6 O. G. 117, 1 Ban & Ard. 351
"	Covering for	John Ashcroft	55598	19 Jun. 1866	Chalmers S. P. M. Co. v. Cramp	5 Ban & Ard. 66
"	"	"	"	"	Chalmers S. P. M. Co. v. Pierce	9 Fed. Rep. 152
"	"	Clarence A. Evans	98865	18 Jan. 1870	Evans v. Kelly	9 Biss. 251
"	"	U. S. & F. S. Felting Co.	Ri 4134	27 Sep. 1870	U. S. & F. S. Felting Co. v. Haven	3 Dillon 131, 9 O. G. 253, 2 Ban & Ard. 164
		John Riley	114711	9 May 1871		
		U. S. & F. S. Felting Co.	Ri 4134	27 Sep. 1870	U. S. Felting Co. v. Manuf. Co.	9 O. G. 202, 2 Ban & Ard. 167
"	"	John Riley	114711	9 May 1871		
		"	108055	4 Oct. 1870		
Steam Engines		Henry & F. J. L. Blandy	25650	3 Aug. 1858	Ex parte H. & F. J. L. Blandy	2 O. G. 174
"		"	"	"	Blandy v. Griffith	3 Fish. 609
"		"	"	"	"	6 Fish. 434
"		Timothy Clark	Ex	21 Aug. 1861	Clark P. S. & F. R. Co. v. Copeland	2 Fish. 21
"		George H. Corliss	Ri	20 July 1869	Corliss v. W. & W. Manuf. Co.	2 Fish. 199
"		John B. Emerson	Ri	8 Mar. 1834	Hogg v. Emerson	11 How. 587, 2 Blatch. 1
"		"		"	"	6 How. 437, 2 Robb 655, 2 Blatch. 1
"		William L. Gould		24 Jan. 1860	Gould v. Rees	15 Wall. 187, 2 O. G. 624, 6 Fish. 106
"	Axle & Journal Boxes	Isaac Babbitt			Roberts v. Ward	4 McLean 565
"	"	Thomas H. King	202034	2 Apr. 1878	Hunt v. King	17 O. G. 200
"	"	T. V. Le Roy	221737	18 Nov. 1879	Hopkins v. Le Roy	18 O. G. 859
"	"	John A. Montgomery	24947	2 Aug. 1859	Ex parte Montgomery	4 O. G. 132
"	Condensers	Horatio Allen	Ri	8 May 1868	Ex parte Allen	2 O. G. 89
"	"	Application			Ex parte Hamilton	13 O. G. 122
"	Cut off	Frederick E. Sickels		20 May 1842	Packet Co. v. Sickels	10 How. 419
"	"	"		"	"	19 Wall. 611
"	"	"		"	Sickels v. Tileston	4 Blatch. 109
"	"	"		"	Sickels v. Gloucester Manuf. Co.	3 Wall. Jr. 186, 1 Fish. 222
"	"	"		"	Sickels v. Youngs	3 Blatch. 293
"	"	"		19 Sep. 1845	Sickels v. Borden	3 Blatch. 535
"	"	"		"	Sickels v. Falls Co.	4 Blatch. 508, 2 Fish. 202
"	"	"		"	Sickels v. Mitchell	3 Blatch. 548
"	"	"		19 Oct. 1844	Sickels v. Evans	2 Cliff. 203, 2 Fish. 417
		"		19 Sep. 1845		
"	"	Robt. L. & F. B. Stevens		25 Jan. 1840	Sherman v. Champlain Co.	31 Vt. 162
		Frederick E. Sickels		20 May 1852		
"	Joints	William S. Gale		21 July 1857	Poillon v. Schmidt	6 Blatch. 293, 3 Fish. 476
"	Gauge	Application			Ex parte Keyes	3 O. G. 268
"	"	George H. Crosby	145726	23 Dec. 1873	Crosby S. G. & V. Co. v. Ashcroft	17 Fed. Rep. 85
"	"	Oscar T. Earle	Ri	14 Jun. 1870	Dalton v. Nelson [Manuf. Co.	13 Blatch. 357, 9 O. G. 1112, 2 Ban & Ard. 225

Steam Engines, Gauge	U. S. Steam Gauge Co.	Ri	5 Mar. 1872	U. S. Steam Gauge Co. v. Amer.	1 Holmes 309, 5 O. G. 208, 1 Ban & Ard. 30
" Generators	Alexander B. Latta	23589	12 Apr. 1859	Ex parte Latta [Steam Gauge Co	3 O. G. 349
" "	"	"	"	Latta v. Shawk	1 Bond 259, 1 Fish. 465
" Heaters and Filters	E. R. Stillwell	93244	3 Aug. 1869	S. & B. Manuf. Co. v. Cooke Co.	7 O. G. 829
" "	"	Ri 2160	23 Jan. 1869		
" "	"	Ri 3618	24 Aug. 1869		
"		93244	3 Aug. 1869	S. & B. Manuf. Co. v. Cin. Gas Co	1 Ban & Ard. 610
" Injectors	James Gresham	57057	7 Aug. 1866	Nathan v. N.Y. Elevated R.R.Co.	2 Fed. Rep. 225
" Pistons	Dunbar		14 Aug. 1860	Labaree v. Peoria P. & J.R.R.Co.	3 Ban & Ard. 160
" Valves, Collapse	Mason et al.		Jun. 1876	Mason v. Stacey	3 C. L. B. 1100
" Valve Gear	Elon A. Marsh	236052		Marsh v. Nichols	15 Fed. Rep. 914
" " Safety	Edward H. Ashcroft		9 Nov. 1869	Ashcroft v. Boston & L. R. R. Co.	1 Holmes 366, 5 O. G. 725
" " "	"	"	"	"	97 U. S. 189, 13 O. G. 865, 1 Ban & Ard. 215
" " "	George W. Richardson	58294	25 Sept. 1866	Consolidated S. V. Co. v. Crosby	7 Fed. Rep. 768
" " "	"	85963	17 Jan. 1869	S. V. Co.	
" " "	"	"	"	Consolidated S. V. Co. v. Kunkle	23 O. G. 630, 14 Fed. Rep. 732
" " Governors	W. A. Cogswell et al.			Cogswell v. Burke	1 O. G. 380
" " "	Junius Judson	Ri	10 Jan. 1854	Judson v. Cope	1 Bond 327, 1 Fish. 615
" " "	"		"	Judson v. Moore	1 Bond 285, 1 Fish. 544
" " "	"		"	Snow v. Judson	38 Barb. 210
" " Slide	Application			Ex parte Gillies	10 O. G. 415
" " Stop	"			Ex parte McMurray	8 O. G. 943
" " "	Albin Warth		19 Apr. 1870	Meissner v. Devoe Manuf. Co.	9 Blatch 363, 3 O. G. 545, 5 Fish. 285
" Whistles	Application			Ex parte Jove	17 O. G. 801
" Ejectors	George W. Glass	92718	20 July 1869	Scaife v. Fulton	9 O. G. 1164, 2 Ban & Ard. 235
" Lubricators	Interference			Garratt v. Seibert	2 O. G. 469
" "	"			"	7 Pac. L. R. 116, 22 Pitts L. J. 18
" "	Nicholas Seibert	94780	14 Sept. 1869	Ex parte Seibert	16 O. G. 262
" "	"	111881	14 Feb. 1871	Garratt v. Seibert	68 U. S. 75, 15 O. G. 383
" "	"	Ri 138243	3 Jun. 1879	Seibert C.O.C.Co.v.HarperS.L.Co	4 Fed. Rep. 328
" "	John Gates			Seibert C.O.C.Co.v.Phillips L.Co.	10 Fed. Rep. 677
" "	Charles H. Parshall	191171	22 May 1877	Detroit Lubricator Manuf. Co. v.	9 Fed. Rep. 293
" "	William T. Garratt	Ri 5328	18 Mar. 1873	Garratt v. Seibert [Penchard	11 C. L. N. 133
" "	Hiram Taylor		23 June 1868	Pelton v. Waters	7 O. G. 425, 1 Ban & Ard. 599
" Packing	Interference			Reisinger v. Clark	2 O. G. 339
" "	Green S. Cox		2 Oct. 1849	Matthews v. Skates	1 Fish. 603
" "	Joseph H. Tuck		25 June 1855	Tuck v. Bramhill	6 Blatch. 95, 3 Fish. 400
" "	Nathaniel Jenkins	Ri 3579	3 Aug. 1879	Clarke v. Johnson	16 Blatch. 495, 17 O. G. 1401
" "	"	"	"	"	18 Blatch. 450, 18 O. G. 1276, 4 Fed. Rep. 437
" "	"	"	"	Jenkins v. Walker	1 Holmes 120, 1 O. G. 359, 5 Fish. 347
" "	"	"	"	Nelson v. McMann	16 Blatch. 139, 16 O. G. 761, 4 Ban & Ard. 203
" "	"		6 Oct. 1869	Jenkins v. Johnson	9 Blatch. 516, 5 Fish. 433
" "	"	Ri 3579	3 Aug. 1879		
" "	Application			Ex parte Mayall	4 O. G. 210
Steam Heating Apparatus	Hooten			Butch v. Boyer	8 Phila. 57
Steel, Manufacture of	Interference			Thomas v. Reese	17 O. G. 195
" " from Iron Sponge	"			Slade v. Blair	15 O. G. 830
" " "	"			"	17 O. G. 261
" "	Stephen Barker	179393	4 July 1876	Ex parte Leighton	14 O. G. 199
Stencil Plates	Samuel W. Reese		1 Feb. 1871	Wright v. Reese	11 O. G. 329
Stereoscopes	Antonio Quirolo	Ri 6557	27 July 1875	Quirolo v. Ardito	17 Blatch. 400, 1 Fed. Rep. 610
Stills	Phares Bernard		17 Nov. 1810	Bellas v. Hayes	5 S. & R. 427
Still-water Dam	Wm. H. Cammeyer	80472	28 July 1868	Cammeyer v. Newton	98 U. S. 225, 11 O. G. 287, 12 Blatch. 122, 5 O. G. 783, 1 Ban & Ard. 294

Stone Breaker	Eli W. Blake		9 Jan. 1866	Blake v. Eagle Works M'f'g Co.		3 Biss. 77, 4 Fish. 591
" "	"	"	"	Blake v. Greenwood Cemetery		14 Blatch. 342, 3 Ban & Ard. 112
" "	"	"	"	"		13 O. G. 1046
" "	"	"	"	Blake v. Rawson		1 Holmes 200, 3 O. G. 122, 6 Fish. 74
" "	"	"	"	Blake v. Robertson		11 Blatch 237, 6 O. G. 297, 6 Fish. 509
" "	"	"	"	Blake v. Stafford		6 Blatch. 195, 3 Fish. 294
" "	"	"	"	Blake v. Greenwood Cemetery		16 Fed. Rep. 676
" "	Application		"	Ex parte Blake		1 O. G. 605
" Cutter	George J. Wardwell			Steam S. Cutter Co. v. Sheldon		10 Blatch. 1, 5 Fish. 477
" "	"	"	"	"		15 O. G. 608
" "	"	"	"	Steam S. Cut. Co. v. Shortsleeves		16 Blatch. 381, 4 Ban & Ard. 364
" "	"	"	"	Steam S. Cut. Co. v. WindsorM.Co		18 Blatch. 291, 5 Ban & Ard. 586
" "	"	"	"	"		17 Blatch. 24, 4 Ban & Ard. 445
" "	"	"	"	"		18 Blatch. 47
" Channelling Machine	George J. Wardwell			Steam S. Cutter Co. v. Sheldon		10 Blatch. 1, 5 Fish. 477
" Dresser	Enyre			Wheeler v Billings		38 N. Y. 263
Stoves	Application			Ex parte Cowper		16 O. G. 499
"	"			Ex parte Gasser		17 O. G. 507
"	"			Ex parte Palmer		6 O. G. 506
"	Interference			Ex parte Spear		5 O. G. 201
"				Dwyer v. Dickey		10 O. G. 583
"	Darius Buck			Paris v. Busey		8 O. G. 853
"	"		20 May 1839	Buck v. Cobb		9 Law Rep. 545
"	"		"	Buck v. Gill		4 McLean 174, 2 Robb 510
"				Buck v. Hermance		1 Blatch. 398
"	Esek Busey		180001 18 July 1876	Bridge v. Excelsior Manuf. Co.		105 U. S. 618, 21 O. G. 1955
"	"		"	"		17 O. G. 259
"				Carter v. Perry		8 O. G. 518
"	Carrington Wilson		10 Oct. 1834	Wilson v. James		3 Blatch. 227
"	Porter Dodge		22787 1 Feb. 1859	Henry v. Stove Co.		9 O. G. 408, 2 Ban & Ard. 221
"	"		" "	Henry v. Francestown Soapstone Co.		17 O. G. 569, 2 Fed. Rep. 78
"	Giles F. Filley			Stone v. Edwards		35 Tex. 556
"				Rathbone v. Orr		5 McLean 131
"	Elisha Foote		26 May 1842	Silsby v. Foote		14 How. 218, 1 Blatch. 445
"	"		"	"		20 How. 378, 2 Blatch. 260
"	John B. Gale	RI 1988	6 June 1865	Gold & Silver Ore Co. v. U. S. Ore Co.		6 Blatch. 307, 3 Fish. 489
"	William Hailes et al.	RI	3 Feb. 1863	Hailes v. Van Wormer		7 Blatch. 443
"	"		11 Aug. 1863	"		20 Wall. 353, 5 O. G. 89
"	"	"	"			
"	J. G. Hathaway		1837	Hathaway v. Roach		2 W. & M. 63
"	"		"	Dudley v. Mayhew		3 N. Y. 9
"	Elizabeth Hawks		1867	Hawks v. Swett		11 N. Y. Supr. 146, 6 T. & C. 529
"	"		"	Marston v. Swett		6 T. & C. 534, 11 N. Y. Supr. 153, 66 N. Y. 206
"	"		"	"		82 N. Y. 526
"	Joseph C. Henderson	RI 3523	29 June 1869	Henderson v. Cleveland S. Co.		12 O. G. 94, 3 Ban & Ard. 604
"	Abner B. Hutchins	177334	16 May 1876	Sharp v. Reissner		23 O. G. 1530, 15 Fed. Rep. 919
"	Dennis G. Littlefield	RI	30 May 1870	Perry v. Littlefield		17 Blatch. 272, 17 O. G. 51, 18 O. G. 571, 2 Fed. Rep. 464
"	"		15 Apr. 1851	Perry v. Corning		6 Blatch. 134
"	"		30 Dec. 1852	"		7 Blatch. 195
"	"	"	"			
"	Isaac Orr		12 Nov. 1842	Orr v. Badger		7 Law Rep. 465
"	"		"	Orr v. Littlefield		1 W. & M. 13, 2 Robb 323
"	"		"	Orr v. Merrill		1 W. & M. 376, 2 Robb 331

Stoves	John S. Perry et al.	Ri	6782	9 Nov. 1875	Perry v. Co-Operative Foundry Co.	12 Fed. Rep. 149
"	"	Ri	9252	15 Jun. 1880	"	22 O. G. 1624, 12 Fed. Rep. 436
"	"	Ri	9247	8 Jun. 1880		
"	"	Ri	9252	15 Jun. 1880		
"	Peterson et al.				Peterson v. Wooden	3 McLean 248, 2 Robb 116
"	Lewis Rathbone et al.			21 Nov. 1865	Hailes v. Albany Stove Co.	16 Fed. Rep. 240
"	David Root			9 Sep. 1845	Root v. Ball	4 McLean 177, 2 Robb 513
"	Henry Stanley	Ri		28 Nov. 1836	Stanley v. Whipple	2 McLean 35, 2 Robb 1
"	"			4 Jan. 1845	Ruggles v. Eddy	12 O. G. 716, 2 Ban & Ard. 627
"	"	Ex		4 Jan. 1859	"	10 Blatch. 52, 5 Fish. 581
"	"	"		"	"	11 Blatch. 524, 1 Ban & Ard. 92
"	David Stuart et al.			18 May 1868	Stuart v. Shantz	2 O. G. 524, 6 Fish. 35, 9 Phila. 376
"	Elisha Vance			6 Feb. 1849	Vance v. Campbell	1 Black 427, 1 Fish. 483
"	John S. Perry et al.	Ri	7456	26 May 1874	Perry v. Perry	14 O. G. 599, 3 Ban & Ard. 485
" Design for					Foote v. Silsby	1 Blatch. 545
" Draft of	William Steele			19 Oct. 1858	Brammer v. Jones	2 Bond 100, 3 Fish. 340
" Machine	Application				Ex parte Beach	3 O. G. 607
" Plates	Lucius H. Couse				Couse v. Johnson	16 O. G. 719, 4 Ban & Ard. 501
" Coal Oil					National Bank v. Peck	8 Kans. 660
" "	John A. Frey	Ri	7751	19 Jun. 1877	Reisner v. Armess	12 O. G. 842, 3 Ban & Ard. 148
" "	"	"		"	"	13 O. G. 870, 3 Ban & Ard. 176
" "	"	"		"	Reissner v. Sharp	16 Blatch. 383, 16 O. G. 355, 4 Ban & Ard. 366
Stove Pipe Drums	Application			3 Oct. 1871	Ex parte Hobson	1 O. G. 141
" Elbows	"				Ex parte Goodale	2 O. G. 589
" "	Frederick Holtge				Hoeltge v. Hoeller	2 Bond 386
Straw Board	Judd M. Cobb		111611	7 Feb. 1874	Ex parte Cobb	5 O. G. 751
" Cutter	J. D. Burdick				Stevens v. Pierpont	42 Conn. 360
" "	Butler			1879	State v. Butler	3 Lea 222
" "	Warren Gale				Gale v. Nourse	81 Mass. 300
" "	T. H. & T. D. Willson			23 Feb. 1858	Ex parte Willson	1 O. G. 185
Sugar, Cleaning and Bleaching	Gustavus A. Jasper			27 Jan. 1873	Union Sugar Refin. v. Matthiessen	2 Cliff. 304
" "	"			"	"	3 Cliff. 639, 2 Fish. 600
" "	Union Sugar Refinery			27 Jan. 1873	"	3 Cliff. 146
Sugar Clarifying	R. A. Stewart		22590		Ex parte Stewart	4 O. G. 665
" "	"		"		"	5 O. G. 1
" Draining	David M. Weston	Ri	2845	14 Jan. 1868	Weston v. Nash	1 Holmes 488, 7 O. G. 1096, 2 Ban & Ard. 40.
Sulphate of Alumina	Eastwick				Damon v. Eastwick	22 O. G. 1709, 14 Fed. Rep. 40
Sun Dial and Compass	Application				Ex parte Sullivan	16 O. G. 359
Surcingle	Interference				Chase v. Witter	9 O. G. 593
Surgical Instruments	Application				Ex parte Buchanan	16 O. G. 1049
" Operations	Wm. T. G. Morton			12 Nov. 1846	Morton v. N. Y. Eye Infirmary	5 Blatch. 116, 2 Fish. 320
Surveying Instruments	Hoffman		197369	20 Nov. 1877	Hoffman v. Young	2 Fed. Rep. 74
" "	"		"	"	"	18 O. G. 794
Suspenders	Charles H. Cleveland			8 Oct. 1867	Cleveland v. Towle	3 Fish. 525
"	Dawson				Dawson v. Follen	2 Wash. C. C. 311, 1 Robb 9
Suspender Ends	Thomas J. Flagg			14 Sep. 1869	Fisk v. Church	1 O. G. 634, 5 Fish. 540
" Straps	Application				Ex parte Wattles	3 O. G. 291
" "	Benjamin F. Greely				Greely v. Commissioner	1 Holmes 284, 4 O. G. 612, 6 Fish. 575
Suspension Rings for Cards	Josephine Carey et al	Ri	5067	24 Sep. 1872	Griffith v. Holmes	20 O. G. 449, 8 Fed. Rep. 154
Swaging Metals	Application				Ex parte Hammond	2 O. G. 57
Syringes	C. H. & H. E. Davidson	Ri		25 Apr. 1865	Morey v. Lockwood	8 Wall. 230
"	F. B. & B. H. Richardson			8 May 1860	Richardson v. Lockwood	4 Cliff. 128
"	Francis B. Richardson	Ri		20 Jun. 1865	"	4 O. G. 808, 6 Fish. 454
Table Beverages	James J. Rogers			10 July 1877	Rogers v. Beecher	18 O. G. 793, 3 Fed. Rep. 639

Table Beverages	James J. Rogers			10 July 1877	Rogers v. Ennis	15 Blatch. 47, 14 O. G. 601, 3 Ban & Ard. 86
" Trays	Nathaniel Waterman			12 May 1863	Doherty v. Haynes	4 Cliff. 291, 6 O. G. 118, 1 Ban & Ard. 289
Tags	Application				Ex parte Golding	8 O. G. 141
Tailors' Pressing Machine	Levi B. Storrs				Storrs v. Howe	4 Cliff. 388, 10 O. G. 421, 2 Ban & Ard. 420
" Shears	Rochus Heinrich			27 Feb. 1839	Heinrich v. Luther	6 McLean 345
Tanks for Asphaltum Cement	New	Ri	6683	5 Oct. 1875	New v. Warren	22 O. G. 587
	"	Ri	6684	"		
Tanning Composition	Keith et al.		78672		Keith v. Hobbs	69 Mo. 84
" Bark Extract	S. W. Pingree			28 Mar. 1865	Bridge v. Brown	1 Holmes 53
" "	"			24 Oct. 1865	"	1 Holmes 205, 3 O. G. 121, 2 Fish. 236
" Machinery	Lewis G. England			19 Jun. 1847	England v. Thompson	3 Cliff. 271
" Vats	"			24 Dec. 1850		
Tax Book	Application				Ex parte Musser	16 O. G. 858
Telegraph	"				Ex parte Edison	7 O. G. 423
"	"				Ex parte Anders	13 O. G. 964
"	Interference				Warner v. Anders	11 O. G. 109
"	Samuel F. Day	Ri		23 Mar. 1869	Day v. Telegraph Co.	7 Blatch. 345, 1 O. G. 558, 5 Fish. 268
"	Gold and Stock Tel. Co.	Ri	3819	25 Jan. 1870	Gold & Stock Tel. Co. v. Wiley	17 Fed. Rep. 234
"	Samuel F. B. Morse			18 Aug. 1838	Smith v. Ely	15 How. 137, 5 McLean 76
"	"				O'Reilly v. Morse	15 How. 62
"	"				Morse v. O'Reilly	6 Penn. L. J. 501
"	"	Ri		13 Jun. 1848	Smith v. Downing	1 Fish. 64
"	"	Ri		"		
"	"	Ri		20 Jun. 1854	Clum v. Brewer	2 Curt. 506
"	"				Smith v. Clark	3 Am. L. J. 155
"	"				Smith v. Seldner	1 Blatch. 475
"	"				French v. Rogers	1 Fish. 133
"	"				West. Tel. Co. v. Magnetic Tel. Co.	21 How. 456
"	"				Western Tel. Co. v. Penniman	21 How. 460
"	West. Union Tel. Co. et al.	Ri	4588	10 Oct. 1871	Page v. Holmes B. A. Tel. Co.	18 Blatch. 118, 2 Fed. Rep. 330
"	"			"	"	17 Blatch. 484, 17 O. G. 737, 1 Fed. Rep. 304
"	Interference				Brookfield v. Brooke	4 O. G. 81
"	Priscilla W. Page, Adx.	Ri	4589	"		
	Gamewell Fire Alarm	Ri	8891	9 Sept. 1879	Gamewell Fire Alarm Tel. Co. v. Chilicothe	7 Fed. Rep. 351
	" Tel. Co.	Ri	8896	16 Sept. 1879		
	West. Excelsior Mnf. Co.	Ri	6954	29 Feb. 1876	Western E. Manuf. Co. v. Ansonia B. & C. Co.	9 Fed. Rep. 706
	"	Ri	6955	"		
"	George B. Simpson			21 May 1867	Colgate v. G. & S. Tel. Co.	16 Blatch. 503, 16 O. G. 583
"	"			"	Colgate v. Int. Ocean Tel. Co.	17 Blatch. 308, 17 O. G. 194
"	"			"	Colgate v. West. Union Tel. Co.	15 Blatch. 365, 14 O. G. 943
"	"			"	"	17 O. G. 194, 4 Ban & Ard. 562
"	"			"	Colgate v. G. & S. Tel. Co.	17 O. G. 193, 4 Ban & Ard. 559
"	"			"	Colgate v. Law Tel. Co.	5 Ban & Ard. 437
"	Application				Ex parte Gordon	6 O. G. 543
"	"				"	2 O. G. 29
Telephone	"				Ex parte Gower	15 O. G. 828
"	Interference				Berlinger v. Gower	15 O. G. 1055
"	"				Bell v. Gray	15 O. G. 776
"	"				Gray v. Bell	15 O. G. 385
"	"				Rogers v. Baer	16 O. G. 908
"	Alex. Gorham Bell		174465	7 Mar. 1876	Amer. Bell Tel. Co. v. Ghegan	23 O. G. 537
"	"		186787	30 Jan. 1877		
"	"		"	"	Amer. Bell Telephone v. Dolbear	17 Fed. Rep. 604
"	"		"	"	Amer. Bell Tel. Co. v. Dolbear	23 O. G. 535

Telephone	Alex. Gorham Bell	186787	30 Jan. 1877	Amer. Bell Tel. Co. v. Spencer	20 O. G. 299, 8 Fed. Rep. 509
"	Edw. Crehore and others	Ri		U.S.AnnunciatorCo.v.Sanderson	3 Blatch. 184
"	John H. Irwin	209266	22 Oct. 1878	Irwin v.MetropolitanT. & T.Co.	20 O. G. 1452, 9 Fed. Rep. 517
"	"	225388	9 Mar. 1880		
Tenoning	Interference			Rees v. Richards	7 O. G. 36
Threading Spool Machine	Hezekiah Conant	28415	13 Dec. 1859	Willimantic L. Co. v. Clark T. Co.	4 Ban & Ard. 128
Threshing Machine	Interference			Workman & McNaught	16 O. G. 216
" "	E. Warren			Goddard v. Lyman	31 Mass. 268
" "	"			Hereth v. Merchant's Nat. Bank	34 Ind. 381
" "	"			Hereth v. Meyer	33 Ind. 511
" "	Harmon		5 Aug. 1829	Harmon v. Bird	22 Wend. 113
" "	James Hyde			Van Ostrand v. Reed	1 Wend. 424
" "				Burke v. Partridge	58 N. H. 349
" "	J. A. & Hiram A. Pitts		29 Dec. 1837	Pitts v. Hall	3 Blatch. 201
" "	"	"	"	Pitts v. Jameson	15 Barb. 310
" "	"	"	"	Pitts v. Wemple	1 Biss. 87, 2 Fish. 10
" "	"	"	"	"	6 McLean 558
" "	"	"	"	Pitts v. Whitman	2 Story 609, 2 Robb 189
" " Flax	Application			Ex parte Lee & Smith	5 O. G. 58
" and Winnowing Mach.	Seth Ballou		Dec. 1822	Burrall v. Jewett	2 Paige 134
Timber Framing Machine	Hockholzer et al.			Hockholzer v. Eager	2 Saw. 361
Tobacco	Charles Siedler	Ri 7362	24 Oct. 1876	Lorillard v. Dohmer	20 O. G. 1857, 9 Fed. Rep. 509
"	"	"	"	Lorillard v. McDowell	21 O. G. 640, 2 Ban & Ard. 531
"	"	"	"	Lorillard v. Ridgway	16 O. G. 1231
"	Isaac Eppinger		17 June 1873	Eppinger v. Richey	14 Blatch. 307, 12 O. G. 714, 3 Ban & Ard. 69
"	Miller	Ri 8060	29 Jan. 1878	L. & M. Tobacco Co. v. Miller	1 McCrary 31, 17 O. G. 793, 1 Fed. Rep. 203
"	"	"	"	Miller v. Foree	21 O. G. 947, 9 Fed. Rep. 603
"	"	"	"	Miller v. L. & H. Tobacco Co.	19 O. G. 1138, 7 Fed. Rep. 91
"	Christian Worley et al.	181512	22 Aug. 1876	Worley v. Tobacco Co.	104 U. S. 310, 21 O. G. 559
" Purifying	Application			Ex parte Wohltman	16 O. G. 723
" Preparing	Kimball		30 Jan. 1874	Kimball v. Hess	15 Fed. Rep. 393
" Furnace for Curing	Jackson C. Millner	Ri 9108		Millner v. Schofield	4 Hughes 258
" " "	"	"		Millner v. Voss	4 Hughes 262
" Sweating Apparatus	Abraham Robinson	216293	10 June 1879	Robinson v. Sutter	19 O. G. 127, 8 Fed. Rep. 828
" " "	Application			Ex parte Huck	16 O. G. 1052
	"			Ex parte Culp	5 O. G. 427
Tobacco Package				Crossley v. Leger	16 O. G. 722
Tobacco Cutter	Interference				
Tool Grinders	William Hovey		23 Sept. 1845	Hovey v. Stevens	1 W. & M. 290, 2 Robb 749
" "	"		"	"	3 W. & M. 17, 2 Robb 567
" Handles	Application			Ex parte Johnson	18 O. G. 1052
" "	William W. Draper	Ri 4333		Ex parte Draper	3 O. G. 3
Torpedoes	Edward A. L. Roberts		25 Apr. 1865	Roberts v. Reed Torpedo Co.	3 Fish. 629
" Manufacturing		159965		Lilliendahl v. Delwiller	18 Fed. Rep. 176
" "		167814			
Toys	Application			Ex parte Hill	16 O. G. 765
"	Horatio H. Abbe et al.	Ri	14 Sept. 1875	Abbe v. Clark	13 O. G. 274, 3 Ban & Ard. 211
" India Rubber				N. Y. Rubber Co. v. Chaskel	9 O. G. 923
Toy Pistols	Glover S. Hastings		23 Dec. 1873	Case v. Hastings	7 O. G. 557
Trade Mark	Application			Ex parte Alden	15 O. G. 389
"	"			Ex parte American L. Oil Co.	8 O. G. 687
"	"			Ex parte American Sardine Co.	3 O. G. 495
"	"			Armistead v. Blackwell	1 O. G. 603
"	"			Ex parte Boehm	8 O. G. 319
"	"			Ex parte Block & Co.	14 O. G. 235

Trade Mark	Application			Ex parte Caire	15 O. G. 248
"	"			Clemens v. Belford (Mark Twain)	14 Fed. Rep. 728
"	"			Ex parte Cigar M. Assoc'n	10 O. G. 958
"	"			Ex parte Coats	16 O. G. 544
"	"			Ex parte Cochrane, McLean & Co.	2 O. G. 520
"	"			Coe v. Bradley	9 O. G. 541
"	"			Ex parte Cohn	16 O. G. 680
"	"			Ex parte Consol'd Fruit Jar Co.	14 O. G. 269
"	"			"	16 O. G. 679
"	"			Dausman & D. T. Co. v. Ruffner	15 O. G. 559
"	"			Ex parte Davids & Co.	16 O. G. 94
"	"			Ex parte Dole Bros.	12 O. G. 939
"	"			Duke v. Green	16 O. G. 1004
"	"			Ex parte Dundas, Dick & Co.	9 O. G. 538
"	"			Duwel v. Bohmer	14 O. G. 270
"	"			Ex parte Eagle Pencil Co.	10 O. G. 981
"	"			Fairbanks v. Jacobus	14 Blatch. 337, 3 Ban & Ard. 108
"	"			Filley v. Child	16 Blatch. 376, 16 O. G. 281, 4 Ban & Ard. 353
"	"			Ex parte Glines	8 O. G. 435
"	"			Ex parte Gordon	12 O. G. 517
"	"			Ex parte Graham	2 O. G. 618
"	"			Ex parte Hall & Co.	13 O. G. 229
"	"			Ex parte Halliday Bros.	16 O. G. 500
"	"			Hanford v. Westcott	16 O. G. 1181
"	"			Ex parte Hankinson	8 O. G. 89
"	"			Harrington v. Libby	14 Blatch. 128, 12 O. G. 144, 4 A. L. T. 47
"	"			Hartell v. Viney	2 W. N. 602
"	"			Hilsen v. Libby	44 N. Y. Supr. 12
"	"			Hoosier Drill Co. v. Ingels	14 O. G. 785
"	"			Ex parte Imbs	10 O. G. 463
"	"			Ex parte India Rubber Comb Co.	8 O. G. 905
"	"			Ex parte Johnson & Co.	2 O. G. 315
"	"			Josselyn v. Swezey	15 O. G. 702
"	"			Ex parte Kane & Co.	9 O. G. 105
"	"			Ex parte Kidd & Co.	5 O. G. 337
"	"			Kinney v. Allen	1 Hughes 106, 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 258
"	"			Ex parte Knapp	16 O. G. 318
"	"			Lantz Bros. v. Shultz & Co.	9 O. G. 791
"	"			Ex parte Lissner	13 O. G. 455
"	"			Manufac. Co. v. Trainer	101 U. S. 51, 17 O. G. 1217
"	"			Ex parte Marsching	15 O. G. 294
"	"			Ex parte McElwee	13 O. G. 963
"	"			McElwee v. Blackwell	15 O. G. 658
"	"			Moorman v. Hoge	2 Saw. 78
"	"			Morrison v. Case	9 Blatch. 548, 2 O. G. 544
"	"			Ex parte O'Donnell	14 O. G. 379
"	"			Ex parte Orcutt & Son	8 O. G. 277
"	"			Osgood v. Rockwood	11 Blatch. 310
"	"			Ex parte Pace, Talbot & Co.	16 O. G. 909
"	"			Ex parte Parker	13 O. G. 323
"	"			Ex parte Peper	16 O. G. 678
"	"			Popham v. Wilcox	4 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 206
"	"			Ex parte Richardson	8 O. G. 120
"	"			Ex parte Roach	10 O. G. 333

Trade Mark	Application				
"	"			Roberts v. Sheldon	18 O. G. 1277
"	"			Rodgers v. Philp	1 O. G. 29
"	"			Ex parte Rohland	10 O. G. 980
"	"			Ex parte Rothschild	7 O. G. 220
"	"			Ex parte Rowe & Post	9 O. G. 496
"	"			Ex parte Safety Powder Co.	16 O. G. 136
"	"			Seabury v. Grosvenor	14 O. G. 699
"	"			Ex parte Simpson & Sons	10 O. G. 833
"	"			Simpson v. Wright	15 O. G. 249, 293
"	"			Smith v. Reynolds	10 Blatch. 85, 3 O. G. 213
"	"			"	13 Blatch. 458
"	"			"	10 Blatch. 100, 3 O. G. 216
"	"			Ex parte Smith	16 O. G. 764
"	"			"	16 O. G. 679
"	"			Societé, etc. v. Baxter	14 O. G. 679
"	"			Sternberger v. Thalheimer	3 O. G. 120
"	"			Ex parte Sullivan & Burke	16 O. G. 765
"	"			Ex parte Thomas	14 O. G. 821
"	"			Ex parte Thompson, Develin & Co.	16 O. G. 137
"	"			Ex parte Tolle	2 O. G. 415
"	"			Tomlinson v. Battel	4 Abb. Pr. 266
"	"			Tucker Manuf. Co. v. Boyington	9 O. G. 455
"	"			Ex parte Vidward & Sheehan	8 O. G. 143
"	"			Ex parte Volta Belt Co.	8 O. G. 144
"	"			Ex parte Warburg & Co.	13 O. G. 44
"	"			Ex parte Weaver	10 O. G. 1
"	"			Ex parte Weisert Bros.	16 O. G. 680
Transplanter	Interference			Springer v. Stanton	2 O. G. 2
Travelling Bags	William Roemer	56801	31 July 1866	Roemer v. Simon	95 U. S. 214, 12 O. G. 796, 5 O. G. 555, 1 Ban & Ard. 138, 2 Ban & Ard. 72
" Handles	James S. Topham		6 Feb. 1872	Langowitz v. Topham	9 O. G. 742
Treating Moss	Samuel Barker		7 Apr. 1857	Muscan Hair Co. v. Amer. Hair [Mfg. Co.	4 Blatch. 174, 1 Fish. 320
Trunks	Herman Vogler	Ri	6 Oct. 1874	Vogler v. Semple	7 Biss. 382, 11 O. G. 923, 2 Ban & Ard. 556
"	Maier	72986		Maier v. Brown	17 Fed. Rep. 736
" Fastenings	John J. Cowell		10 Dec. 1878	Cowell v. Sessions	17 Fed. Rep. 450
"	"		"		
"	Eliakim Rice		27 Mar. 1877		
" Protectors	William Gould et al.	Ri 7149	30 May 1876	Gould v. Ballard	13 O. G. 1081, 3 Ban & Ard. 324
Trusses	Stagnor			Higgins v. Strong	4 Blackf. 182
"				Elastic Truss Co. v. Page	16 O. G. 1045, 4 Ban & Ard. 328
Tug Clips	John B. Welpton	125237	2 Apr. 1872	Ex parte Welpton	3 O. G. 440
Turning Short Curves	James Stimpson		22 Aug. 1831	Stimpson v. West Chester R. R. Co.	4 How. 380, 2 Robb. 335
" "	"		26 Sept. 1835	Phil. & Trent. R. R. Co. v. Stimpson	14 Pet. 448, 2 Robb 46
" "	"	Ex	23 Aug. 1845	Stimpson v. Balt. & Sus. R. R. Co.	10 How. 329
" "	"		"	Stimpson v. Railroads	1 Wall. Jr. 164, 2 Robb 46
Type Blocks	Daniel A. Draper		18 May 1869	Draper v. Hudson	1 Holmes 208, 3 O. G. 354, 6 Fish. 327
" Printing	David D. Bruce	139365	27 May 1873	Bruce v. Marder	22 O. G. 1039, 10 Fed. Rep. 750
" "	Thomas S. Hudson		5 Jun. 1866	Hudson v. Draper	4 Cliff. 178, 4 Fish. 256
" Writer	Interference			Hammond v. Pratt	16 O. G. 1235
" "	Brainard	149092	31 Mar. 1874	Brainard v. Pulsifer	7 Fed. Rep. 349
Umbrella Frame Machine	John C. Hurcombe	149480	7 Apr. 1874	Odiorne v. Denney	13 O. G. 965, 3 Ban & Ard. 287
" Ribs, Tempering	A. Stewart Black			American Manuf. Co. v. Lane	14 Blatch. 438, 15 O. G. 421, 3 Ban & Ard. 268
Vapor Burners	Ward			Jeffries v. Wiester	2 Saw. 135
"	Watkins	Ri 7706	29 May 1877	Watkins v. Cincinnati	20 O. G. 1588, 8 Fed. Rep. 325

Vapor Burners	Christoph Wintergerst	Ri	8784	1 July 1879	Doane & W. Manuf. Co. v. Smith	15 Fed. Rep. 459
Vault Covers	Elizabeth W. Lake	Ex		12 Nov. 1860	Lake v. Fitzgerald	6 Fish. 420
"	"			27 Aug. 1867	"	
Velocipedes	Henry M. Richardson et al.	Ri	7972	27 Nov. 1877	Pope Manuf. Co. v. Marqua	15 Fed. Rep. 400
"	"	Ri	8252	28 May 1878	"	
Veneers	Burnap				Burr v. Gregory	2 Paine 426
Vent Plugs	Hicks		63635		Ex parte Hicks	16 O. G. 546
Ventilators, &c.	George Hayes	Ri	8597	25 Feb. 1879	Hayes v. Bickelhoupt	19 O. G. 177
"	"	Ri	8674	15 Apr. 1879	"	
"	"	Ri	8675	15 Apr. 1879	"	
"	"	Ri	8676	15 Apr. 1879	"	
"	"	Ri	8688	14 Mar. 1870	"	
"	"	Ri	8689	29 Apr. 1879	"	
"	"			"	Hayes v. Bockel	11 Fed. Rep. 87
"	"			"	Hayes v. Dayton	18 O. G. 1406, 18 Blatch. 420, 8 Fed. Rep. 702
"	"			"	Hayes v. Leton	5 Fed. Rep. 521
"	"			"	Hayes v. Seton	12 Fed. Rep. 120
"		Ri		15 Feb. 1881	Tillinghast v. Hicks	23 O. G. 739, 13 Fed. Rep. 388
Vessels, Ballasting	Demartini et al.		126938	21 May 1872	American B. L. Co. v. Barnes	21 O. G. 1829, 9 Fed. Rep. 465
" "	"		"	"	American B. L. Co. v. Cotter	21 O. G. 1030, 11 Fed. Rep. 728
" Defensive Armor for	Charles W. S. Heaton			14 Apr. 1863	Heaton v. Quintard	7 Blatch. 73
" "	"			"	Webb v. Quintard	9 Blatch. 352, 1 O. G. 525, 5 Fish. 276
" Gaffs for	John Brown				Brown v. Duchesne	19 How. 183
" Propelling	Application				Ex parte Franklin	4 O. G. 105
" Sails for					Gardner v. Howe	2 Cliff. 462
" Topsail Yards for	Frederick Howes			20 June 1854	Howes v. Nute	4 Cliff. 173, 4 Fish. 273
" Boom Travelers for	Wm. Woodbury				Kempton v. Bray	99 Mass. 350
" Towing	Sullivan			4 Dec. 1816	Sullivan v. Redfield	1 Paine 441, 1 Robb 477
Wadding	Wm. Fuzzard et al.	R		5 Apr. 1864	Fuzzard Manuf. Co. v. Dickinson	6 Blatch. 80, 3 Fish. 289
Wagons	John Henry Wood		73684	21 Jan. 1868	Del. C. & I. Co. v. Packer	1 Fed. Rep. 851
"	Knapp			29 Sept. 1874	Knapp v. Joubert	7 Fed. Rep. 219
" Coal	John Henry Wood		73684	21 Jan. 1868	Delaware C. & I. Co. v. Packer	24 O. G. 1273
" "		Ri	9368	21 Aug. 1880	Wood v. Packer	17 Fed. Rep. 650
" Axle Cutters	Application				Ex parte Gokey	15 O. G. 295
" Gearing	"				Ex parte Clark & Osborn	5 O. G. 667
" "	Edgar Huson	Ri	6660	28 Sept. 1875	Halsey v. Garlick	12 O. G. 1026
" Neaps	Waller				Dart v. Woodhouse	40 Mich. 399
" Reach	E. V. Flood			15 Oct. 1867	Flood v. Hicks	2 Biss. 169, 4 Fish. 156
" "	Philip Hicks				Hicks v. Kelsey	18 Wall. 670, 5 O. G. 94
" Running Gear	Moses T. Jackson		180886	8 Aug. 1876	Grier v. Castle	24 O. G. 1176
" Seat	J. G. & J. S. Armstrong				Ex parte Armstrong	2 O. G. 704
Washboards	Mrs. P. Duff et al.	Ri	6673	5 Oct. 1875	Duff v. Sterling Pump Co.	23 O. G. 1622
"	Orin Rice	"		30 Oct. 1849	Wayne v. Holmes	2 Fish. 20, 1 Bond 27
"	"	"		"	Wayne v. Winter	6 McLean 344
"		Ri	6673		Duff v. Calkins	25 O. G. 601
Washing Machines	John Allender	Ri		22 July 1865	Eureka Co. v. Bailey Co.	11 Wall. 488
"	Parker				Cross v. Huntly	13 Wend. 385
Washing Shavings in Breweries	Edwin D. Brainard	Ri	8099	26 Feb. 1878	Brainard v. Cramme	22 O. G. 769, 12 Fed. Rep. 621
Watches	Application				Ex parte Birun	5 O. G. 521
"	"				Ex parte Bigelow	2 O. G. 273
"					Ex parte Sarratt	5 O. G. 148
"	Jules Jurgensen	Ri	2775	11 Apr. 1871	Jergensen v. Magnin	9 Blatch. 294, 5 Fish. 237
Watch Cases, Design for			12775	21 Feb. 1882	Margot v. Schnotzer	15 Fed. Rep. 118
" Spring for	Application				Ex parte Corban	2 O. G. 30

Watch Chain Machine		Keplinger			4 May 1820	Keplinger v. DeYoung	10 Wheat. 358, 1 Robb 458
Watchman's Time Detector		Jacob E. Buerk	Ri		8 Mar. 1870	Buerk v. Imhaeuser	14 Blatch. 19, 10 O. G. 907, 2 Ban & Ard. 452
"	"	"			"	"	11 O. G. 112, 2 Ban & Ard. 465
"	"	"			"	"	5 O. G. 752
"	"	"			"	Buerk v. Valentine	9 Blatch. 479, 2 O. G. 295, 5 Fish. 479
"	"	"			"	Imhaeuser v. Buerk	101 U. S. 647, 17 O. G. 795, 1 Ban & Ard. 337
Water Closet		Application				Ex parte Hogan	16 O. G. 907
"		Earth Closet Co.	Ri	4137	4 Oct. 1870	Earth Closet Co. v. Fenner	5 Fish. 15
"		Stockton		155814	13 Oct. 1874	Stockton v. Maddock	10 Fed. Rep. 132
"		William S. Carr			4 Aug. 1868	Ex parte Carr	5 O. G. 30
"		William S. Carr	Ri	978	12 June 1880	Blake v. McN. & H. Manuf. Co.	19 O. G. 219, 7 Fed. Rep. 821
"		Fred'k A. Bartholomew		21734	12 Oct. 1858		
"	Cock	Fred'k A. Bartholomew			20 June 1854	Bartholomew v. Sawyer	4 Blatch. 347, 1 Fish. 516
"	Receiver	William Smith			2 Aug. 1870	Smith v. Prior	2 Saw. 461
"	"	"			"	Smith v. O'Connor	2 Saw. 461, 4 O. G. 633, 6 Fish. 469
Water Works		Birdsill Holly	Ri	5132	5 Nov. 1872	Holly v. Vergennes Machine Co.	1 Blatch. 327, 18 O. G. 1177, 4 Fed. Rep. 74
Waterproofing Cellars		New	Ri	7920	23 Oct. 1871	New v. Lawrence	3 Fed. Rep. 714
Weather Strips		Application				Ex parte McIntire	9 O. G. 360
"		J. Johnson & E. O. Marlow		104321	14 June 1870	Wilson v. Marlow	66 Ill. 385
"		Joseph Chadwick				Morrow v. Brown	31 Ind. 378
"		Interference				Quimby v. Randall	14 O. G. 748
Weaver's Harness		Joseph S. Winsor	Ri		11 Feb. 1873	Kendall v. Winsor	6 R. I. 453
"	"	"			"	"	21 How. 322
"	"	"			"	Kendrick v. Emmons	9 O. G. 201, 2 Ban & Ard. 208
"	"	"			"	"	1 Holmes 334, 4 O. G. 398, 6 Fish. 462
Wells		Nelson W. Greene	Ri	4372	9 May 1871	Andrews v. Carman	13 Blatch. 307, 9 O. G. 1011, 2 Ban & Ard. 277
" Mode of Sinking		Byron Mudge			25 Oct. 1865	Peck v. Collins	103 U. S. 660, 19 O. G. 1137
" "		"			"	"	70 N. Y. 376
" Artesian and Driven		Nelson W. Green	Ri	4732	8 May 1871	Andrews v. Creagan	19 O. G. 1146, 7 Fed. Rep. 477
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Cross	19 O. G. 1705, 8 Fed. Rep. 269
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Denslow	14 Blatch. 182, 2 Ban & Ard. 587
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Hovey	16 Fed. Rep. 387
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Spear	4 Dillon 472, 3 Ban & Ard. 82
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Wright	13 O. G. 969, 3 Ban & Ard. 329
" "		"	"		"	Green v. French	21 O. G. 1351, 11 Fed. Rep. 541
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Eames	23 O. G. 1124, 15 Fed. Rep. 109
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Long	12 Fed. Rep. 871
" "		"	"		"	Green v. French	16 O. G. 215, 4 Ban & Ard. 169
" "		"	"		"	Green v. Gardner	22 O. G. 683
" "		"	"		"	Andrews v. Spear	2 Ban & Ard. 602
" "	Valves for	M. T. & M. C. Chapman			4 Mar. 1873	Chapman v. Morrison	8 O. G. 1031
" Oil		Application				Ex parte Lytle	1 O. G. 358
" "		Edward A. L. Roberts		47458	25 Apr. 1865	Roberts v. Schreiber	18 O. G. 125, 2 Fed. Rep. 855
" "		"	Ri	6258	6 Jan. 1875		
" "		"			20 Nov. 1866	Roberts v Dickey	4 Brews. 260, 1 O. G. 4, 4 Fish. 532
" "	Packers	"			"	Roberts v. Roter	5 Fish. 295
		Interference				Redmond v. Parham	16 O. G. 359
		H. H. Doubleday	Ri		6 Feb. 1877		
" "	"	H. H. Bliss	Ri		3 July 1877	Consolid'd O.W. P. Co. v. Eaton	12 Fed. Rep. 865
		H. H. Doubleday	Ri		25 July 1876		
		Alonzo H. Fowler	Ri		12 Nov. 1878		
" "	Pump	Wm. Shoup et al.				Shoup v. Henrici	9 O. G. 1162, 2 Ban & Ard. 249
" "	Torpedoes					Roberts v. Walley	24 Fed. Rep. 167
" "	Valve Cup for	Application				Ex parte Shalters	15 O. G. 970

Wells, Tubes	Samuel F. Craig			11 Jun. 1867	Craig v. Smith	100 U. S. 226, 17 O. G. 145
"	"			"	"	4 Dillon 349, 1 Ban & Ard. 556
"	"			"	"	2 Cent. L. J. 256
"	M. J. Dickerson et al.		50919	14 Nov. 1865	Doubleday v. Roess	22 O. G. 861, 11 Fed. Rep. 837
Window Cleaner	William H. Park				David v. Park	103 Mass. 501
" Screen	Wm. C. Gayton	Ri		3 Sept. 1878	Perfection W. C. Co. v. Bosley	9 Biss. 385, 2 Fed. Rep. 574
" Shades	Adjustable W. Screen Co.	Ri			Adjust. W. S. Co. v. Broughton	1 Ban & Ard. 327
" "	Hartshorn	Ri	2756	27 Aug. 1867	Hartshorn v. Eagle Shade Roller Co.	18 Fed. Rep. 90
" Spring Catch	Campbell			31 Oct. 1876		
Winding and Doubling Machine	Franklin Babcock	Ri	9301	20 July 1880	Babcock v. Judd	15 Fed. Rep. 160
Winnowing Machines	"				Ex parte Unsworth	15 O. G. 882
Wire, Manufacture of	Benj. D. Saunders	Ri		10 Apr. 1855	Sanders v. Logan	2 Fish. 167
" Grating	Interference				Kenerson v. Brown	16 O. G. 857
" Staples	Henry Jenkins	Ex		6 Mar. 1861	Chase v. Walker	3 Fish. 120
" "	Byron Boardman	Ri		6 Mar. 1866	Ex parte Boardman	1 O. G. 304
" Solder	"			"	Rogers v. Sargent	7 Blatch. 507
" Tempering	Application				Ex parte McMurray	8 O. G. 473
" "	Henry Waterman	Ri	1874		Ex parte Waterman	2 O. G. 247
" "	"			24 Aug. 1858	Waterman v. Thompson	2 Fish. 461
Wheels	"	Ex		20 Aug. 1872	Waterman v. Wallace	13 Blatch. 122, 2 Ban & Ard. 126
" Car	Application				Ex parte Rouse & Stoddard	7 O. G. 169
" "	Anson Atwood	Ri	468	1857	Atwood v. Portland Co.	10 Fed. Rep. 283
" "	Eben A. Lester				Lester v. Palmer	86 Mass. 145
" "	Wm. McMahon				McMahon v. Tyng	96 Mass. 167
" "	Charles Needham				Needham v. Washburn	7 O. G. 642, 1 Ban & Ard. 537
" "	Trescott et al.				Sizer v. Many	16 How. 98
" "	Asa Whitney	Ex		25 Apr. 1862	Mowry v. Whitney	14 Wall. 620, 1 O. G. 492, 5 Fish. 496, 2 Bond 45, 3 Fish. 149, 4 Fish. 141, 207
" "	"			"	"	14 Wall. 434, 1 O. G. 499, 5 Fish. 513
" "	George Wolf et al.			17 Mar. 1838	Many v. Jagger	1 Blatch. 372
" "	"			"	Many v. Sizer	1 Fish. 17
" "	"			"	"	1 Fish. 31
" Friction	William H. Andrews			15 Mar. 1870	Delmater v. Woodruff	11 Fed. Rep. 414
" Hubs for	Elisha Hall et al.	Ri	5366	22 Apr. 1873	Hall v. Jones	14 O. G. 378, 3 Ban & Ard. 455
" Marking	Horace Holt	Ri	6714	26 Oct. 1875	Holt v. Keeler	22 O. G. 1291, 13 Fed. Rep. 464
" Paddle	Application				Ex parte Reynolds	6 O. G. 295
" Wind	Addison P. Brown			9 Mar. 1869	Continental Co. v. Empire Co.	8 Blatch. 295, 4 Fish. 428
" "	Eclipse Windmill Co.	Ri	8828	29 July 1879	Eclipse Windmill Co. v. May	17 Fed. Rep. 344
" "	"	Ri	9493	7 Dec. 1880		
" "	Palmer C. Perkins	Ri	8443	8 Oct. 1878		
" Locomotive, Att. Tires to	Edward Mellon		58447	2 Oct. 1866	Railroad Co. v. Mellon	104 U. S. 112, 20 O. G. 1891
" "	Thomas D. Simpson			30 Sept. 1845	Simpson v. Mad River R. R. Co.	6 McLean 603
" Water	Zebulon & Austin Parker			19 Oct. 1829	Parker v. Haworth	4 McLean 370, 2 Robb 725
" "	"			"	Parker v. Hulme	1 Fish. 44
" "	"			"	Parker v. Sears	1 Fish. 93
" "	"			"	Parker v. Stiles	5 McLean 44
" "	"			"	Parker v. Banker	6 McLean 631
" "	"			"	Parker v. Bigler	1 Fish. 285
" "	"			"	Parker v. Brant	1 Fish. 58
" "	"			"	Parker v. Corbin	4 McLean 462, 2 Robb 736
" "	"			"	Parker v. Ferguson	1 Blatch. 407
" "	"			"	Parker v. Hallock	2 Fish. 543 (note)
" "	"			"	"	4 McLean 61
" "	"			"	Parker v. Hawk	2 Fish. 58

Wheels	Water	Zebulon & Austin Parker			19 Oct. 1829	Merchant v. Lewis	1 Bond 172
"	"	"				Phelps v. Comstock	4 McLean 853
"	"	" [McKelvey			"	Wintermute v. Redington	1 Fish. 239
"	"	Zebulon Parker & Robt.	Ri		27 Jun. 1840	Case v. Redfield	4 McLean 2 Robb 741
"	"	Boyce				Bryce v. Dorr	3 McLean 582, 2 Robb 302
"	"	Samuel B. Howe			26 July 1838	Rheem v. Holliday	16 Penn. 347
"	"	John Haseltine		14535	25 Mar. 1856	Ex parte Haseltine	8 O. G. 45
"	"	Gideon Hotchkiss			6 Nov. 1832	Hotchkiss v. Oliver	5 Denio 314
"	"	"				Black v. Stone	33 Ala. 327
"	"	Reuben Rich			8 July 1842	Rich v. Close	8 Blatch. 41, 4 Fish. 279
"	"	Howe				Holliday v. Rheem	18 Penn. 465
"	"	James Leffel	Ri		July 1863	Blakeney v. Goode	30 Ohio St. 350
"	" [chines	A. M. Swain	Ri	5154	19 Nov. 1872	Swain Manuf. Co. v. Ladd	11 O. G. 153, 2 Ban & Ard. 488
"	" for Sewing Ma-	Isaac Hyde	Ri	5590	7 Oct. 1873	Backus W. M. Co. v. Tuerk	17 Fed. Rep. 350
"	" Mode of letting	Thomas Key			18 Jan. 1826	Hiatt v. Twomey	1 Dev. & Bat. Eq. 315
Whips	[Water on	Henry A. Strong et al.			18 Dec. 1866	Strong v. Noble [Whip Co.	6 Blatch. 477, 3 Fish. 586
Whip Stocks		David C. Hull	Ri	5651	11 Nov. 1873	American Whip Co. v. Hampden	4 Fed. Rep. 536
" Tips		Clark R. Shelton	Ri	7382		"	1 Fed. Rep. 87
" Sockets		John M. Curtis et al.	Ri	8581		Worden v. Fisher	21 O. G. 1957, 11 Fed. Rep. 505
" "		John O. Merrian et al.	Ri	5713	30 Dec. 1873	Merriam v. Van Nest	13 O. G. 597
" "		"			12 July 1870	Merriam v. Drake	9 Blatch. 336, 5 Fish. 259
" "		Anson Searls	Ri	9297	13 July 1880	Searls v. Bouton	21 O. G. 1784, 12 Fed. Rep. 140
" "		John M. Underwood		150195		"	12 Fed. Rep. 874
" "		Anson Searls	Ri	9297	"	Searls v. Van Nest	13 O. G. 772, 3 Ban & Ard. 121
" "		Erastus W. Scott	Ri	5400	6 May 1873	Searls v. Worden	21 O. G. 1955, 11 Fed. Rep. 501
" "		"			"	Searls v. Bouton	22 O. G. 946
" "		Anson Searls	Ri	9297	13 July 1880	Searls v. Merriam	22 O. G. 1040
" "		John M. Underwood		221482	11 Nov. 1879	Searls v. Van Nest	5 Ban & Ard. 456
" "						Searls v. Worden	13 Fed. Rep. 716
Wood Bending Machine		Thomas Blanchard	Ri		15 Nov. 1859	Blanchard v. Putnam	8 Wall. 420
" "		"			"	"	2 Bond 84, 3 Fish. 186
" "		John G. Morris			11 Mar. 1856	Morris v. Barrett	1 Bond 254, 1 Fish. 461
" "		"	Ri		27 May 1862	Morris v. Royer	2 Bond 66, 3 Fish. 176
Wood Bundling Machine		William L. Williams	Ri	4142	4 Oct. 1870	Ex parte Williams	1 O. G. 225
Wood Splitting Machine		Jacob A. Conover			15 May 1855	Conover v. Dohrman	6 Blatch. 60, 3 Fish. 382
" "		"			"	Conover v. Mers	3 Fish. 386
" "		"			"	"	11 Blatch. 197, 6 Fish. 506
" "		"			"	Conover v. Rapp	4 Fish. 57
" "		"			"	Conover v. Roach	4 Fish. 12
" "		"			"	Johnson v. Onion	3 Hughes 290
" "		"	Ex		15 May 1869	Johnson v. McCullough	4 Fish. 170
Wool, &c. Carding Machine		Stephen R. Parkhurst			1 May 1845	Parkhurst v. Kinsman	1 Blatch. 488
" Mode of Cleaning		Milton D. Whipple	Ex		28 Oct. 1854	Whipple v. Baldwin Manuf. Co.	4 Fish. 29
" Apparatus for Oiling		Benjamin A. Earl				Earl v. Dexter	1 Holmes 412, 6 O. G. 729, 1 Ban & Ard. 400
" " "		Geo. S. Howard & Geo. H.	Ri		27 Mar. 1866	Harwood v. Mill River Co.	3 Fish. 526
Wool Machinery		Eben D. Jordan [Quincy	Ri		28 Jun. 1864	Jordan v. Dobson	2 Abb. (U. S.) 398, 4 Fish. 232, 7 Phila. 535
" "		"			"	Jordan v. Wallace	5 Fish. 185, 8 Phila. 165
" "		John Goulding			15 Dec. 1826	Agawam Co. v. Jordan	7 Wall. 585
" "		Stephen B. Parkhurst				Parkhurst v. Kinsman	6 N. J. Eq. 600
" "		Amos Whittemore				Whittemore v. Cutter	1 Gallis 429, 1 Robb 28
" "		"				"	1 Gallis 478, 1 Robb 40
Wool Washing Machinery		Application				Ex parte Sargent	15 O. G. 512
" " "		J. O. Ackroyd			14 Oct. 1873	Proctor v. Ackroyd	6 O. G. 602

Wool Washing Machinery	Milton D. Whipple	Ex	28 Oct. 1854	Whipple v. Middlesex Co.	4 Fish. 41
Working Iron and Steel	Dickerson			Page v. Dickerson	28 Wis. 694
Wrenches	Application			Ex parte Coes	6 O. G. 1
"	"			Ex parte Prindle	1 O. G. 404
"	Collins Company	Ri 5294	25 Feb. 1873	Collins Co. v. Coes	20 O. G. 1034, 8 Fed. Rep. 517
"	"	"	"	"	3 Fed. Rep. 225
"	Lucius Jordan et al.		10 Oct. 1865	Ex parte Collins Co.	2 O. G. 617
"	John Lacey et al.	Ri 5026	8 Aug. 1872	Schumacher v. Cornell	96 U. S. 549
"	"	Ri	29 Aug. 1871	Cornell v. D. & B. Brewing Co.	7 Biss. 346, 11 O. G. 331, 2 Ban & Ard. 514
"	"	Ri 5026	6 Aug. 1872		
"	"	"	"	Cornell v. Littlejohn	9 O. G. 837, 922, 2 Ban & Ard. 324
"	Loring Coes	Ri 3483	1 Jun. 1869	Coes v. Collins Co.	22 O. G. 417, 9 Fed. Rep. 905
"	D. M. Moore	45344	Dec. 1864	Sinclair v. Backus	17 O. G. 1503, 4 Fed. Rep. 539
" and Clevis Combined	Interference			Lloyd & Engeman	2 O. G. 674
Zinc Board	Application			Ex parte Cottrell	1 O. G. 436

PATENT LAWS AND DECISIONS.

CONSTITUTION.

ART. I, SEC. 8.

The Congress shall have power * * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

The word "secure" does not mean the protection of an acknowledged legal right. Wheaton *v.* Peters, 8 Pet. 591.

No State can in any form interfere with the right of private persons under the copyright laws of the United States. Little *v.* Gould, 2 Blatch. 165, 362.

The Constitution does not authorize the protection of a dramatic composition which is grossly indecent and calculated to corrupt the morals of the people. Martinetti *v.* Maguire, 1 Deady 216; s. c. 1 Abb. C. C. 356.

In the exercise of this power Congress is limited to authors and inventors only. This clause, therefore, never can admit of so extensive a construction as to prohibit the respective States from exercising the power of securing to persons introducing useful inventions, without being the authors or inventors, the exclusive benefit of such inventions for a limited time. Livingston *v.* Van Ingen, 9 Johns. 507.

The power is general to grant to inventors, and it rests in the sound discretion of Congress to say when and for what length of time, and under what circumstances, the patent for an invention shall be granted. There is no restriction which limits the power of Congress to cases where the invention has not been known or used by the public. All that is required is that the patentee shall be the inventor. An act which gives a patent for an invention which was in public use and enjoyed by the community at the time of its passage, is not for that reason unconstitutional. Blanchard *v.* Sprague, 2 Story 164; s. c. 3 Sum. 535; s. c. 1 Robb 734, 742; Evans *v.* Jordan, 1 Brock 248; s. c. 9 Cranch 199; s. c. 1 Robb 20, 57; Jordan *v.* Dobson, 4 Fish. 232; s. c. 7 Phila. 533; s. c. 2 Abb. U. S. 398.

The power thus granted is domestic in its character, and necessarily confined within the limits of the United States. Brown *v.* Duchesne, 19 How. 183; s. c. 2 Curt. 371.

This constitutional power might have been fully exercised by Congress in making special grants of patents. Congress might have spent much time by such a course, and may not be the most competent body to investigate the facts and do equal justice to inventors, but this would be a question of expediency and not of constitutional power. Bloomer *v.* Stolley, 5 McLean 158.

The machinery through which the right to a patent is ordinarily applied for and obtained may be dispensed with, and the title may be conferred by a legislative grant, and this may be done in regard to the extension of an exclusive right the same as in originally granting it. No constitutional restriction appears to exist against the exercise of this power by Congress. Bloomer *v.* Stolley, 5 McLean 158.

Congress has the power to confer a new and extended term upon the patentee, even after the expiration of the first. Jordan *v.* Dobson, 4 Fish. 232; s. c. 7 Phila. 533; s. c. 2 Abb. U. S. 398; Blanchard *v.* Haynes, 6 West. L. J. 82; Blanchard's Factory *v.* Warner, 1 Blatch. 258; Evans *v.* Robinson, 1 Car. L. Rep. 209.

The power of Congress to secure the rights and privileges of assignees upon extending a patent is incidental to the general power conferred by the Constitution on Congress to promote the progress of the useful arts by securing to inventors for limited times the exclusive right to their discoveries. The assignees of the original patentee are frequently most instrumental in putting the invention into general use and bringing it successfully before the public by the expenditure of their time and money. More than half probably, of the useful patented inventions have been thus brought into general public use, the successful results operating directly or indirectly for the benefit and interest of the patentees. Although this would not authorize the renewal of a grant to assignees, as no such power exists in the Constitution, still in exercising the power in favor of the inventor it would be going too far to say that Congress has no right to regard incidentally the interests of meritorious assignees. Blanchard's Factory *v.* Warner, 1 Blatch. 258.

It is not the province of the judiciary to inquire into the reasons which induced the passage of the law, with the view of testing its validity. If constitutional, it must be enforced without regard to the policy or justice which dictated it. No inquiry as to the expenses and labor need be made when a patent is extended by a special act of Congress. Bloomer *v.* Stolley, 5 McLean 158.

It does not follow from this power that Congress may, from time to time, as they think proper, authorize an inventor to recall rights which he has granted to others, or reinvest in him rights of property which he has before conveyed for a fair and valuable consideration. Bloomer *v.* McQuewen, 14 How. 539.

Though changes in the patent laws may be retrospective in their opera-

tion, that is not a sound objection to their validity. The power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of patents is plenary, by the terms of the Constitution, and as there are no restraints on its exercise there can be no limitation of their right to modify them at their pleasure, so that they do not take away the rights of property in existing patents. M'Clurg *v.* Kingsland, 1 How. 202; s. c. 2 Robb 105.

The Constitution confers upon Congress the power of "securing" to inventors the exclusive right to "their discoveries." Congress is not empowered to grant to inventors a favor, but to secure to them a right; and the "term to secure a right" by no possible implication carries with it the opposite power of destroying the right in whole or in part by appropriating it to the purposes of government without complying with that other condition of the Constitution, the making of "just compensation." M'Keever *v.* U. S., 14 Ct. Cl. 396.

The property in inventions exists by virtue of the laws of Congress, and no State has a right to interfere with its enjoyment, or to annex conditions to the grant. If the patentee complies with the laws of Congress on the subject, he has the right to go into the open market anywhere within the United States and sell his property. An act of a State legislature that attempts to direct the manner in which patent rights shall be sold in the State is void. *Ex parte* Robinson, 4 Fish. 186; s. c. 2 Biss. 309; s. c. 3 A. L. T. (U. S.) 112; Hollida *v.* Hunt, 70 Ill. 109; Helm *v.* First National Bank, 43 Ind. 167; Crittenden *v.* White, 9 C. L. N. 110.

If a corporation is the owner of a patent, and its transactions in another State are connected with the sale, use or manufacture of the invention described in the patent, it is not subject to the provisions of the State laws relating to foreign corporations. Grover & Baker S. M. Co. *v.* Butler, 53 Ind. 454; Shook *v.* Singer Manuf. Co., 61 Ind. 520.

No State can require that the consideration of a note given for a patent shall be expressed on the face thereof, and make such a note subject in the hands of third parties to all defenses which could have been made against the payee. Hollida *v.* Hunt, 70 Ill. 109; Cranson *v.* Smith, 37 Mich. 309; State *v.* Lockwood, 43 Wis. 403; Bowen *v.* Kemerer, 2 Pearson 250.

An inventor is protected only in the incorporeal right to his invention or discovery against State legislation. This right must be enjoyed in subordination to the general authority of the State over all property within its limits. Webber *v.* Virginia, 103 U. S. 344; s. c. 33 Gratt. 898; Patterson *v.* Kentucky, 97 U. S. 501; s. c. 11 Bush. 311.

A State cannot impose a license tax upon the sale of a patent. State *v.* Butler, 3 Lea 222.

Although an inventor has obtained a patent, yet he cannot sell articles made according to the patent in a State without complying with the tax and license laws of the State, if those laws do not make any discriminations between those articles and articles on the manufacture of which there is no patent. Webber *v.* Virginia, 103 U. S. 344; s. c. 33 Gratt. 898.

A State may require a patentee to take out a license, although he only sells articles made according to his patent. People *v.* Russell, 49 Mich. 617.

A State law regulating the sale of an article manufactured in pursuance of a patented invention, because it is dangerous, is valid, for there is a manifest distinction between the right of property in the patent and the right to sell the property resulting from the invention or patent. Patterson *v.* Kentucky, 97 U. S. 501; s. c. 11 Bush 311.

The end of the statute is to encourage useful inventions, and to hold forth the exclusive use of his invention for a limited period as an inducement to the inventor. The sole operation of the statute is to enable him to prevent others from using the products of his labor except with his consent. But his own right of using it is not enlarged or affected. There remains in him, as in every other citizen, the power to manage his property or give direction to his labor at his pleasure, subject only to the paramount claims of society, which require that his enjoyment may be modified by the exigencies of the community to which he belongs, and regulated by laws which render it subservient to the general welfare, if held subject to State control. An attempt by the legislature in good faith to regulate the conduct of a portion of its citizens in a matter strictly pertaining to its internal economy is a legitimate exercise of power, although the law may sometimes indirectly affect the enjoyment of rights flowing from the Federal Government. A patent for a medicine does not confer upon the patentee the right to prescribe it for the sick without complying with the State laws for licensing physicians. Jordan *v.* Dayton, 4 Ohio 294; Thompson *v.* Staats, 15 Wend. 395.

A party who has a patent for a plan of constructing and drawing lotteries has no right to establish a lottery in a State whose laws prohibit lotteries, because they are pernicious and destructive to frugality and industry, and introductive of idleness and immorality, and against the common good and welfare. Vannini *v.* Paine, 1 Harring. 65.

Congress has no power to grant a copyright to any other person but an author or inventor or a person representing an author or inventor. Yuengling *v.* Schile, 12 Fed. Rep. 97.

Congress has no power under this clause to authorize the registration of trade marks. U. S. *v.* Steffens, 100 U. S. 82; Leidersdorf *v.* Flint, 8 Biss. 327.

The only writings that can be protected are those which require originality. While the word "writings" may be liberally construed to include original designs for engravings, prints, &c., it is only such as are original and are founded in the creative powers of the mind; the writings which are to be protected are the fruits of intellectual labor, embodied in the form of books, prints, engravings and the like. U. S. *v.* Steffens, 100 U. S. 82.

PROVISIONS

FROM THE UNITED STATES REVISED STATUTES

TITLE IV.

SEC. 178. In case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the chief of any bureau, or of any officer thereof, whose appointment is not vested in the head of the department, the assistant or deputy of such chief or of such officer, or if there be none, then the chief clerk of such bureau shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, as provided by section one hundred and seventy-nine, perform the duties of such chief or of such officer until a successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease.

Statute Revised—July 23, 1868, ch. 227, § 2, 15 Stat. 168.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 2, 5 Stat. 118.

The actual incumbent of a public office is presumed to be in the lawful possession of it, and no affirmative proof of his title is required to support his official acts; therefore the contingency upon which the assistant commissioner is authorized to assume the duties of commissioner is primarily to be taken to exist from his actual discharge of these duties. The burden of showing the non-existence of the prescribed contingency is upon the party who denies the validity of the ostensible officer's acts. Dorsey Co. *v.* Marsh, 6 Fish. 387; s. c. 9 Phila. 395; Smith *v.* Mercer, 5 Penn. L. J. 529; s. c. 4 West. L. J. 49.

SEC. 179. In any of the cases mentioned in the two preceding sections, except the death, resignation, absence or sickness of the Attorney General, the President may, in his discretion, authorize and direct the head of any other department or any other officer in either department whose appointment is vested in the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to perform the duties of the vacant office until a successor is appointed or the sickness or absence of the incumbent shall cease.

Statute Revised—June 22, 1870, ch. 150, § 2, 16 Stat. 162.
Prior Statute—July 23, 1868, ch. 227, § 3, 15 Stat. 168.

TITLE XI.

CHAPTER ONE.

SEC. 440. There shall also be in the department of the interior, * * * * * *

In the patent office:

One chief clerk, at a salary of two thousand five hundred dollars a year.

One examiner in charge of interferences, at a salary of two thousand five hundred dollars a year.

One examiner in charge of trade-marks, at a salary of two thousand five hundred dollars a year.

Twenty-four principal examiners, one of whom shall be librarian,* at a salary of two thousand five hundred dollars a year each.

Twenty-four first assistant examiners, at a salary of one thousand eight hundred dollars a year each.

Twenty-four second assistant examiners (two of whom may be women) at a salary of one thousand six hundred dollars a year each.

Twenty-four third assistant examiners, at a salary of one thousand four hundred dollars a year each.†

One librarian, at a salary of two thousand dollars a year.

One machinist, at a salary of one thousand six hundred dollars a year.

Three skilled draughtsmen, at a salary of one thousand two hundred dollars a year each.

* So amended by act of March 3, 1875, ch. 129, 18 Stat. 365.

† By the act of March 3, 1875, ch. 129, 18 Stat. 365, the grade of third assistant examiner in the patent office was abolished, but an appropriation is made for that class of officers in the act of March 3, 1883, 22 Stat. 557.

Thirty-five copyists of drawings, at a salary of one thousand dollars a year each.

One messenger and purchasing clerk, at a salary of one thousand dollars a year.

One skilled laborer, at a salary of one thousand two hundred dollars a year.

Eight attendants in the model-room, at a salary of one thousand dollars a year each.

Eight attendants in the model-room, at a salary of nine hundred dollars a year each.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, §§ 2, 3, 16 Stat. 198.
Prior Statutes—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 2, 5 Stat. 118.—March 3, 1837, ch. 45, § 10, 5 Stat. 194.—May 27, 1848, ch. 47, §§ 1, 3, 9 Stat. 231, 232.—March 3, 1853, ch. 97, § 3, 10 Stat. 209.—April 22, 1854, ch. 52, ¿ 1, 10 Stat. 276. —August 18, 1856, ch. 129, §§ 9, 10, 11 Stat. 91.—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, §§ 4, 7, 12 Stat. 247.—March 3, 1863, ch. 102, § 2, 12 Stat. 796.—March 29, 1867, ch. 17, § 1, 15 Stat. 10.

NOTE.—The changes in the employees in the patent office will be found in the appropriation act of March 3, 1883, 22 Stat. 557.

CHAPTER TWO.

SEC. 441. The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the supervising of public business relating to the following subjects:

Fifth. Patents for inventions.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 1, 16 Stat. 198.
Prior Statute—March 3, 1849, ch. 108, § 2, 9 Stat. 395.

An application for a *mandamus* to compel the issue of a patent must be against the Secretary of the Interior and not against the Commissioner of Patents. U. S. *v.* Marble, 22 O. G. 1365.

Appeal.

The decisions of the Commissioner of Patents while acting in a judicial capacity are not subject to review by the Secretary of the Interior. Edison *v.* Edison, 9 O. G. 403; Workman *v.* McNaught, 16 O. G. 216.

If the Commissioner declines to issue a patent because there is no novelty in the claim, no appeal lies to the Secretary of the Interior. Franklin B. Hunt, 13 O. G. 771.

The Secretary of the Interior cannot review a decision of the Commissioner excluding the deposition of a witness. Workman *v.* McNaught, 16 O. G. 216.

The power to supervise includes the power to direct and is applicable to executive duties. Edison *v.* Edison, 9 O. G. 403.

If the Commissioner neglects or refuses to perform any duty required by law to be performed by him, or performs a ministerial or administrative duty improperly, the Secretary of the Interior, by virtue of his supervisory power, may direct him in its performance. James Sargent, 12 O. G. 475.

CHAPTER SIX.

THE PATENT OFFICE.

SEC. 475. There shall be in the department of the interior an office known as the patent office, where all records, books, models, drawings, specifications and other papers and things pertaining to patents shall be safely kept and preserved.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 1, 16 Stat. 198.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 1, 5 Stat. 117.

SEC. 476. There shall be in the patent office a commissioner of patents, one assistant commissioner and three examiners-in-chief, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All other officers, clerks and employees authorized by law for the office shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, upon the nomination of the commissioner of patents.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 2, 16 Stat. 198.
Prior Statutes—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 1, 5 Stat. 117.—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 2, 12 Stat. 246.—March 3, 1869, ch. 121, § 1, 15 Stat. 294.

SEC. 477. The salaries of the officers mentioned in the preceding section shall be as follows:

The commissioner of patents, four thousand five hundred dollars a year.

The assistant commissioner of patents, three thousand dollars a year.

Three examiners-in-chief, three thousand dollars a year each.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 4, 16 Stat. 199.
Prior Statutes—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 1, 5 Stat. 117.—March 3, 1837, ch. 45, § 10, 5 Stat. 194.—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, §§ 2, 4, 12 Stat. 246.

SEC. 478. The seal heretofore provided for the patent office shall be the seal of the office, with which letters patent and papers issued from the office shall be authenticated.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 12, 16 Stat. 200.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 4, 5 Stat. 118.

SEC. 479. The commissioner of patents and the chief clerk, before entering upon their duties, shall severally give bond, with sureties, to the Treasurer of the United States, the former in the sum of ten thousand dollars, and the latter in the sum of five thousand dollars, conditioned for the faithful discharge of their respective duties, and that they shall render to the proper officers of the treasury a true account of all money received by virtue of their offices.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 6, 16 Stat. 199.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 3, 5 Stat. 118.

SEC. 480. All officers and employees of the patent office shall be incapable, during the period for which they hold their appointments, to acquire or take, directly or indirectly, except by inheritance or bequest, any right or interest in any patent issued by the office.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 16, 16 Stat. 200.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 2, 5 Stat. 118.

Patents to Officers and Employees.

If a person makes an invention before he becomes an employee he does not thereby forfeit or dedicate the invention to the public. He is simply prevented from taking a patent while he remains an employee; but as soon as his employment ceases he is in the same position, so far as any effect of the mere fact of his having been in such employment is concerned, as if he had never been in such employment. Page *v.* Holmes B. S. Tel. Co., 17 O. G. 737; s. c. 17 Blatch. 484; 5 Ban & Ard 165; 1 Fed. Rep. 304.

A commissioner after his commission ceases may take out a patent for an invention made by him while he was in office, and in a controversy with others the invention may be referred to the true date. Foote *v.* Frost, 14 O. G. 860; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard 607.

SEC. 481. The commissioner of patents, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall superintend or perform all duties respecting the granting and issuing of patents directed by law; and he shall have charge of all books, records, papers, models, machines and other things belonging to the patent office.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 7, 16 Stat. 199.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 1, 5 Stat. 117.

SEC. 482. The examiners-in-chief shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability, whose duty it shall be, on the written petition of the appellant, to revise and determine upon the validity of the adverse decisions of examiners upon applications for patents and for reissues of patents, and in interference cases; and when required by the commissioner they shall hear and report upon claims for extensions, and perform such other like duties as he may assign them.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 10, 16 Stat. 199.
Prior Statute—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 2, 12 Stat. 246.

Decisions.

The decision of the examiners-in-chief must be limited to the questions presented to them by the appeal of the party who considers himself aggrieved. Brown *v.* La Dow, 18 O. G. 1049.

SEC. 483. The commissioner of patents, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may from time

to time establish regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the patent office.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 19, 16 Stat. 200.

Rules.

If a rule established by the patent office is within the powers of the office it is just as authoritative as an act of Congress itself. U. S. v. Marble, 13 O. G. 1365.

If the rules do not permit the use of affidavits in a particular case the commissioner may pass a special order allowing them. Rodgers, 16 O. G. 1233.

SEC. 484. The commissioner of patents shall cause to be classified and arranged in suitable cases, in the rooms and galleries provided for that purpose, the models, specimens of composition, fabrics, manufactures, works of art and designs, which have been or shall be deposited in the patent office; and the rooms and galleries shall be kept open during suitable hours for public inspection.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 13, 16 Stat. 200.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 17, 5 Stat. 125.

SEC. 485. The commissioner of patents may restore to the respective applicants such of the models belonging to rejected applications as he shall not think necessary to be preserved, or he may sell or otherwise dispose of them after the application has been finally rejected for one year, paying the proceeds into the treasury, as other patent moneys are directed to be paid.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 14, 16 Stat. 200.
Prior Statute—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 5, 12 Stat. 247.

SEC. 486. There shall be purchased for the use of the patent office a library of such scientific works and periodicals, both foreign and American, as may aid the officers in the discharge of their duties, not exceeding the amount annually appropriated for that purpose.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 15, 16 Stat. 200.

SEC. 487. For gross misconduct the commissioner of patents may refuse to recognize any person as a patent agent, either generally or in any particular case; but the reasons for such refusal shall be duly recorded, and be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 17, 16 Stat. 200.

Patent Agents.

The death of the inventor revokes the power of attorney given to an agent. Eagleton Manuf. Co. *v.* W. B. & C. Manuf. Co., 17 O. G. 1504; s. c. 18 Blatch. 218; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard 475; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 774.

A patent agent does not sustain the same relation to the patent office as an attorney sustains to a court. An attorney is a permanent officer of the court, retained by parties in particular cases; but a patent agent is not an officer of the patent office. He is connected with the patent office only by means of the particular cases in which he is employed. Hoosier Drill Co. *v.* Ingels, 15 O. G. 1013.

The law prescribes no qualification either of capacity, character, age, sex or citizenship, or of any other kind for patent agents. Hoosier Drill Co. *v.* Ingels, 15 O. G. 1013.

When an inventor sends a notice to the patent office that he has discharged an agent, that is sufficient so far as the patent office is concerned. Hoosier Drill Co. *v.* Ingels, 15 O. G. 1013.

A discharge of an agent will not be effective against a third party until notice thereof is communicated to him. Hoosier Drill Co. *v.* Ingels, 15 O. G. 1013.

If a revocation of a power of attorney is received while a case is in the issue division it must be submitted to the commissioner for his action. Pitney, 17 O. G. 447.

If an inventor assigns his entire interest after executing a power of attorney, the attorney will not be allowed to proceed until he gets a new power. Ackerman, 17 O. G. 1036.

An attorney is entitled to retain possession of the letters patent until his fees are paid. Bowers, 16 O. G. 1004.

If an attorney agrees to pay all the expenses in obtaining a patent, and in consideration thereof the inventor agrees to give him an interest in the patent and executes a power of attorney as a part of the agreement, the power is irrevocable and the patent will be issued to the attorney. W. H. Harrison, 13 O. G. 547.

SEC. 488. The commissioner of patents may require all papers filed in the patent office, if not correctly, legibly, clearly written, to be printed at the cost of the party filing them.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 18, 16 Stat. 200.
Prior Statute—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 8, 12 Stat. 247.

SEC. 489. The commissioner of patents may print, or cause to be printed, copies of the claims of current issues,

and copies of such laws, decisions, regulations and circulars, as may be necessary for the information of the public.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 20, 16 Stat. 200.

SEC. 490. The commissioner of patents is authorized to have printed, from time to time, for gratuitous distribution, not to exceed one hundred and fifty copies of the complete specifications and drawings of each patent hereafter issued, together with suitable indexes, one copy to be placed for free public inspection in each capitol of every State and Territory, one for the like purpose in the clerk's office of the district court of each judicial district of the United States, except when such offices are located in State or territorial capitols, and one in the library of Congress, which copies shall be certified under the hand of the commissioner and seal of the patent office, and shall not be taken from the depositories for any other purpose than to be used as evidence.

Statute Revised—January 11, 1871, Res. No. 5, 16 Stat. 590.

SEC. 491. The commissioner of patents is authorized to have printed such additional numbers of copies of specifications and drawings, certified as provided in the preceding section, at a price not to exceed the contract price for such drawings, for sale, as may be warranted by the actual demand for the same; and he is also authorized to furnish a complete set of such specifications and drawings to any public library which will pay for binding the same into volumes to correspond with those in the patent office, and for the transportation of the same, and which shall also provide for proper custody for the same, with convenient access for the public thereto, under such regulations as the commissioner shall deem reasonable.

Statute Revised—January 11, 1871, Res. No. 5, 16 Stat. 590.

SEC. 492. The lithographing and engraving required by the two preceding sections shall be awarded to the lowest and best bidders for the interests of the government, due regard being paid to the execution of the work, after due advertising by the congressional printer, under the direction of the joint committee on printing; but the joint committee on printing may empower the congressional printer to make immediate contracts for engraving whenever, in their opinion, the exigencies of the public service will not justify waiting for advertisement and award; or if, in the judgment of the joint committee on printing, the work can be performed under the direction of the commissioner of patents more advantageously than in the manner above prescribed, it shall be so done, under such limitations and conditions as the joint committee on printing may from time to time prescribe.

Statutes Revised—January 11, 1871, Res. No. 5, 16 Stat. 590.—March 24, 1871, ch. 5, § 1, 17 Stat. 2.

SEC. 492 A. (Act of March 3, 1875, ch. 130, § 12, 18 Stat. 402.) That it shall be the duty of the commissioner of patents to furnish, free of cost, one copy of the bound volumes of specifications and drawings of patents published by the patent office, to each of the executive departments of government, upon the request of the head thereof.

SEC. 492 B. (Act of March 3, 1881, ch. 148, § 1, 21 Stat. 509.) That the sum of ten thousand dollars be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys belonging to the patent fund in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the commissioner of patents in the preparation of classified abridgments of all letters patent of the United States.

SEC. 492 C. (Act of March 3, 1881, ch. 148, § 2, 21 Stat. 509.) That the said abridgments shall be printed, and one copy of each shall be furnished to each senator,

representative and delegate in Congress; one copy to each of eight public libraries to be designated by each senator, representative and delegate; and two copies to the library of Congress; and also copies to such foreign governments, libraries and learned societies as the commissioner of patents may designate: *Provided*, that copies shall be sold at the cost of printing, and all sums received from such sale shall, on or before the first day of each month, be paid into the treasury.

SEC. 493. The price to be paid for uncertified printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents shall be determined by the commissioner of patents, within the limits of ten cents as the minimum and fifty cents as the maximum price.

Statute Revised—March 24, 1871, ch. 5, § 2, 17 Stat. 3.

SEC. 494. The commissioner of patents shall lay before Congress, in the month of January, annually, a report, giving a detailed statement of all moneys received for patents, for copies of records or drawings, or from any other source whatever; a detailed statement of all expenditures for contingent and miscellaneous expenses; a list of all patents which were granted during the preceding year, designating under proper heads the subjects of such patents; an alphabetical list of all the patentees, with their places of residence; a list of all patents which have been extended during the year; and such other information of the condition of the patent office as may be useful to Congress or the public.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 9, 16 Stat. 199.
Prior Statutes—July 3, 1832, ch. 162, § 1, 4 Stat. 559.—March 3, 1837, ch. 45, § 14, 5 Stat. 194.—July 20, 1868, ch. 177, § 7, 15 Stat. 119.

SEC. 495. The collections of the exploring expedition, now in the patent office, shall be under the care and management of the commissioner of patents.

Statute Revised—August 4, 1854, ch. 42, § 8, 10 Stat. 572.

SEC. 496. All disbursements for the patent office shall be made by the disbursing clerk of the Interior Department.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 69, 16 Stat. 209.

Prior Statutes—March 3, 1837, ch. 45, § 14, 5 Stat. 194.—March 3, 1869, ch. 121, § 1, 15 Stat. 294.

TITLE XIII.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

SEC. 629. The circuit courts shall have original jurisdiction, as follows : * * * * * * *

Ninth. Of all suits at law or in equity arising under the patent or copyright laws of the United States.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, §§ 55, 106, 16 Stat. 206, 215.

Prior Statutes—February 21, 1793, ch. 11, § 5, 1 Stat. 322.—February 15, 1819, ch, 19, § 1, 3 Stat. 181.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 14, 5 Stat. 123.

This section does not enlarge or alter the powers of the court over the subject-matter of the bill or the cause of action. It only extends its jurisdiction to parties not before falling within it. Before this provision was adopted it had been held that a citizen of one State could not obtain an injunction in the circuit court for a violation of a patent right against a citizen of the same State, as no act of Congress authorized such suit. This section removed that objection and gave the jurisdiction, although the parties were citizens of the same State. But in the exercise of the jurisdiction in all cases of granting injunctions to prevent the violation of patent rights, the court is to proceed according to the course and principles of courts of equity in such cases. Sullivan *v.* Redfield, 1 Paine 441 ; s. c. 1 Robb 477 ; Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454 ; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322 ; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 243 ; Day *v.* Newark Manuf. Co., 1 Blatch. 628.

The jurisdiction thus conferred upon the circuit courts in patent cases in equity exists independently of the local laws of the State, and is the same in its nature and extent as the equity jurisdiction in England. from which it was derived. Allen *v.* Blunt, 1 Blatch. 480.

There is a broad distinction between the jurisdictional right to take cognizance of a complaint and a denial of the relief which the complainant asks. Although the relief invoked may be refused, it does not follow that it is because the court cannot inquire into the merits of the cause and adjudge it accordingly. Want of equity does not imply a defect of jurisdiction. But it is only when the court is without power to pass upon the subject-matter of the complaint, or to grant the relief sought, that its jurisdiction may be challenged. McMillan *v.* Barclay, 5 Fish. 189 ; s. c. 4 Brews. 275.

A bill in equity cannot be maintained against an infringer for a naked account of profits and damages. Such relief is ordinarily incidental to some equity which gives the patentee a right to invoke the jurisdiction of

a court of equity. Root *v.* Railway Co., 105 U. S. 189; s. c. 21 O. G. 1112; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 349 n.; *contra* Perry *v.* Corning, 6 Blatch. 134; Dibble *v.* Augur, 7 Blatch. 86.

A bill for an account will lie where the accounting is such that it cannot readily be had before a jury. Vaughan *v.* East Tenn. Railroad Co., 1 Flippin 621; s. c. 11 O. G. 789; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 537.

In order to maintain a suit in equity for an account of profits there must be actual profits resulting to the infringer susceptible of computation or estimation of which the patentee can be deprived and with which the infringer can be charged as trustee. If from the character of the invention there can be nothing in the nature of profits of which the patentee can be deprived there is no basis for charging the infringer with receiving profits for his benefit and nothing for which he can be called upon to account. Vaughan *v.* Central Pac. R. R. Co., 4 Saw. 280; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 27.

If the recovery against a corporation must be confined to the value of a licence fee, then a bill cannot be maintained in equity after the expiration of the patent. Vaughan *v.* Central Pac. R. R. Co., 4 Saw. 280; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 27.

If a bill is filed against a corporation, it does not present a case for discovery, as an independent ground of equitable jurisdiction, for the officers are all competent witnesses, who may be called upon to testify in a court of law. Vaughan *v.* Central Pac. R. R. Co., 4 Saw. 280; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 27; *contra*, Vaughan *v.* Railroad Co., 1 Flippin 621; s. c. 11 O. G. 789; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 537.

A patentee cannot maintain a bill in equity for an account of profits and damage after the expiration of the patent. Root *v.* Railway Co., 105 U.S. 189; s. c. 21 O. G. 1112; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 349 n.; Sayles *v.* Richmond F. & P. R. R. Co., 16 O.G. 43; s. c. 3 Hughes 172; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 239; Vaughan *v.* Central Pac. R. R. Co., 4 Saw. 280; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 27; Campbell *v.* Ward, 12 Fed. Rep. 150; Haward *v.* Andrews, 12 Fed. Rep. 786; s. c. 23 O. G. 533; *contra*, Nevins *v.* Johnson, 3 Blatch. 80; Howes *v.* Nute, 4 Cliff. 173; s. c. 4 Fish. 263; Gordon *v.* Anthony, 16 O. G. 1135; s. c. 16 Blatch. 234; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 248; Atwood *v.* Portland Co., 10 Fed. Rep. 283; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 533; McComb *v.* Beard, 3 O. G. 33; s. c. 6 Fish. 254; s. c. 10 Blatch. 550; Vaughan *v.* East Tenn. Railroad Co., 1 Flippin 621; s. c. 11 O. G. 789; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 537; Sayles *v.* Dubuque & S. R. R. Co., 5 Dill. 561; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 219; Stevens *v.* Kans. Pac. R. R. Co., 5 Dill. 486.

If a patentee files a bill in equity only a few days before the expiration of the patent it will be dismissed. Burdell *v.* Comstock, 15 Fed. Rep. 393.

An assignee of a claim for profits and damages cannot maintain a bill in equity after the expiration of the patent. Haward *v.* Andrews, 12 Fed. Rep. 786; s. c. 23 O. G. 533.

If a patentee assigns his interest in a patent he cannot maintain a bill in equity to recover the profits that accrued from an infringement prior to the assignment. Spring *v.* Domestic S. M. Co., 22 O. G. 1445; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 446.

If the patent expires between the time of filing the bill and the hearing, an account can be ordered and other relief granted, although an injunction to restrain the further use cannot issue on account of the expiration of the patent. Imlay *v.* Railroad Co., 1 Fish. 340; s. c. 4 Blatch. 227; Sickles *v.* Gloucester Manuf. Co., 1 Fish. 222; s. c. 3 Wall. Jr. 186; Smith *v.* Baker, 5 O. G. 496; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 117; s. c. 19 I. R. R. 149; Wood Paper Co. *v.* Glens Falls Co., 4 Fish. 561; s. c. 8 Blatch. 513; Jordan *v.* Wallace, 5 Fish. 185; s. c. 8 Phila. 165; Gottfried *v.* Moerlein, 14 Fed. Rep. 170.

If the defendant dies while the action is pending the complainant may revive it against the personal representative, in order to obtain an account of the profits. Smith *v.* Baker, 5 O. G. 496; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 117; s. c. 19 I. R. R. 149; Atterbury *v.* Gill, 13 O. G. 276; s. c. 2 Flippin 239; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 174; *contra*, Draper *v.* Hudson, 6 Fish. 327; s. c. 1 Holmes 208; s. c. 3 O. G. 354.

Where the complainant seeks for an account and discovery, a court of equity has jurisdiction of a bill to recover damages for breach of a contract relating to a patent. Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Elm City Co., 13 Blatch. 151; s. c. 8 O. G. 773; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 152.

If a party is compelled to go into a court of equity to obtain a discovery in a case where the ascertainment of damages is complicated and intricate, and an action at law cannot be adequately tried without great difficulty, owing to the nature of the account or other circumstances, the court, after a discovery, will proceed to a decree on the merits. Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Elm City Co., 11 O. G. 501; s. c. 14 Blatch. 109; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 506.

A party is at liberty to select his forum, although he seeks a recovery of money only, and neither seeks nor requires a discovery or other ancillary or further relief. No language could be employed to declare the jurisdiction of the courts at law and in equity more completely concurrent or which would more clearly indicate that the party aggrieved may resort to either. Perry *v.* Corning, 7 Blatch. 195; Anthony *v.* Carroll, 9 O. G. 199; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 195; *contra*, Sanders *v.* Logan, 2 Fish. 167.

A court of equity has jurisdiction of a bill to enjoin the use of a patented invention, and for an account of profits by the infringer, although an action at law may be maintained to recover damages. McMillan *v.* Barclay, 5 Fish. 189; s. c. 4 Brews. 275.

An action which raises a question of infringement is an action arising "under the law," and one who has a right to sue for the infringement may sue in the circuit court. Such a suit may involve the construction of a contract as well as the patent, but that will not oust the court of its jurisdiction. If the patent is involved, it carries with it the whole case. Littlefield *v.* Perry, 21 Wall. 205; s. c. 7 O. G. 964; Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Elm City Co., 13 Blatch. 151; s. c. 8 O. G. 773; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 152.

Whenever a contract is made in relation to patent rights which is not provided for and regulated by an act of Congress, the court will not, under this section, have any jurisdiction over a dispute arising out of it. Good-

year *v.* Day, 1 Blatch. 565; Blanchard *v.* Sprague, 1 Cliff. 288; Wilson *v.* Sandford, 10 How. 99; Goodyear *v.* Union Rubber Co., 4 Blatch. 63; Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Elm City Co., 13 Blatch. 151; s. c. 8 O. G. 773; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 152; Albright *v.* Teas, 23 O. G. 829; s. c. 106 U. S. 613; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 406; Ingalls *v.* Tice, 14 Fed. Rep. 352; Hartell *v.* Tilghman, 99 U. S. 547; Adams *v.* Meyrose, 7 Fed. Rep. 208; s. c. 2 McCrary 360; Kelly *v.* Porter, 8 Saw. 482.

The jurisdiction of the circuit court under this section does not extend to a controversy which arises under a contract concerning a patent to be subsequently obtained, rather than under the patent law itself. Nesmith *v.* Calvert, 1 W. & M. 34; s. c. 2 Robb 311; Brooks *v.* Stolley, 3 McLean 523; s. c. 2 Robb 281; Smith *v.* Standard L. M. Co., 22 O. G. 587.

If an infringement is proved jurisdiction is conferred, and having power to protect the rights of a party under a patent, the court will take cognizance of other matters as incidental to the infringement. Hence the court has jurisdiction if the defendant has forfeited his right under a lic[illegible]. Bloomer *v.* Gilpin, 4 Fish. 50; Brooks *v.* Stolley, 3 McLean 52[illegible]. c. 2 Robb 281.

A bill to determine the meaning of a license to the complainant, or to ascertain whether the defendant has done an act upon which the right to a reduction of the license fee arises, and thereupon to decree that the complainant is only bound to pay the reduced rent, can not be sustained. An apprehension that the defendant under a condition in the license will deny the right of the complainant to use the licensed invention, or that the defendant threatens to give notice of his election to terminate the license, will not justify an application to a court of equity. Florence Co. *v.* Singer Co., 4 Fish. 329; s. c. 8 Blatch. 113.

Jurisdiction is not controlled solely by the pleadings, but the case itself must be one within the cognizance of the court where the suit is brought. Where it appears at the trial that there is no question involved in the case which it is competent for the court to decide under the pleadings, the case will be dismissed, notwithstanding the allegations of the bill may be sufficient to authorize the court to take cognizance of the suit. Blanchard *v.* Sprague, 1 Cliff. 288.

If a patentee sells the thing patented to a purchaser in violation of the license, the licensee can not maintain a bill in equity against the patentee and purchaser in the circuit court, without regard to the citizenship of the parties, for his rights arise under contract. Hill *v.* Whitcomb, 1 Holmes 317; s. c. 5 O. G. 430; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 34.

If the parties are citizens of the same State, the circuit court has no jurisdiction over a bill to obtain the cancellation of a license on account of the invalidity of the patent. Merserole *v.* Union Collar Co., 3 Fish. 483; s. c. 6 Blatch. 356.

If the parties are citizens of the same State, the circuit court can not entertain a bill to compel the specific performance of a contract to assign a patent. Burr *v.* Gregory, 2 Paine 426; Perry *v.* Littlefield, 17 O. G. 51; s. c. 17 Blatch. 272; s. c. 18 O. G. 571; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 624; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 464.

The mere fact that a bill prays for an account of the profits, in asking for a specific performance, will not give the court jurisdiction. Burr *v.* Gregory, 2 Paine 426.

A judgment creditor can not file a bill in the circuit court to reach a patent owned by the debtor if both parties are citizens of the same State. Ryan *v.* Lee, 10 Fed. Rep. 917.

A junior patentee can not maintain an action against a prior patentee for the purpose of obtaining an adjudication that his patent does not conflict with the prior patent. Celluloid Manuf. Co. *v.* Goodyear D. V. Co., 13 Blatch. 375; s. c. 10 O. G. 41; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 334.

The circuit court has no jurisdiction over any proceeding to vacate a patent and declare it null *ab initio*, upon the ground of false suggestion, or the ground that the government has undertaken to grant that which by law it can not grant. Att. General *v.* Rumford Works, 9 O. G. 1062; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 298.

The attorney general has no authority, as such and in his own name. to file an information or commence proceedings by bill in equity to annul a patent. Att. General *v.* Rumford Works, 9 O. G. 1062; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 298.

The circuit court may have jurisdiction over a controversy on account of the residence of the defendant, even if it has not on account of the subject. Nesmith *v.* Calvert, 1 W. & M. 34; s. c. 2 Robb 311.

If the parties are citizens of different States, and the amount claimed and in controversy exceeds five hundred dollars, the court has jurisdiction over a claim arising from a contract. Bloomer *v.* Gilpin, 4 Fish. 50.

If the circuit court in a patent case has jurisdiction over the subject-matter and parties, the correctness of the decree can not be called in question collaterally. Allen *v.* Blunt, 1 Blatch. 480.

Copyright.

A court of equity has jurisdiction of a bill for an infringement of a copyright, although there is a remedy at law, for that is less appropriate, efficient and ample. Pierpont *v.* Fowle, 2 W. & M. 23.

The title of the complainant and the infringement may be adjudicated in a court of equity, without having been first determined at law. Farmer *v.* Calvert Publishing Co., 1 Flippin 228; s. c. 5 A. L. T. 168.

A court of equity has no jurisdiction to enforce penalties and forfeitures incurred under the statute relating to copyrights. Stevens *v.* Gladding, 17 How. 447; Stevens *v.* Cady, 2 Curt. 200.

If the controversy in regard to a copyright arises out of a contract, and not under the statute, the circuit court has no jurisdiction over it. Pulte *v.* Derby, 5 McLean 328; Little *v.* Hall, 18 How. 165.

The circuit court has no jurisdiction of a bill in equity to protect the rights of an author at common law, where both parties are citizens of the same State. Boucicault *v.* Hart, 13 Blatch. 47.

If a party agrees to prepare a manuscript ready for printing but afterwards refuses to deliver it, and takes a copyright in his own name, a bill

to enjoin a publication of the manuscript or an assignment of the copyright can not be maintained in the circuit court if both parties are citizens of the same State. Haworth *v.* Nystrom, 8 W. N. 204.

A bill cannot be maintained in equity to recover damages as well as profits for the infringement of a copyright. Chapman *v.* Ferry, 8 Saw. 191; s. c. 12 Fed. Rep. 693.

The circuit court has jurisdiction of an action for an infringement of a trademark which has been registered under an act of Congress, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties. Duwel *v.* Bohmer, 2 Flippin 168; s. c. 14 O. G. 270.

CHAPTER ELEVEN.

SEC. 699. A writ of error may be allowed to review any final judgment at law, and an appeal shall be allowed from any final decree in equity hereinafter mentioned, without regard to the sum or value in dispute.

First. Any final judgment at law or final decree in equity of any circuit court or of any district court acting as a circuit court, or of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, or of any territory, in any case touching patent rights or copyrights.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, §§ 56, 107, 16 Stat. 207, 215.

Prior Statutes—Feb. 15, 1819, ch. 19, § 1, 3 Stat. 181.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 16, 5 Stat. 123.—Feb. 18, 1861, ch. 37, § 1, 12 Stat. 130.

General Principles.

An appeal or writ of error is allowed to all parties, without regard to the sum in controversy. Philip *v.* Nock, 13 Wall. 185.

Whenever a contract is made in relation to patents, which is not provided for and regulated by Congress, the parties, if any dispute arises, stand upon the same ground with other litigants as to the right of appeal, and the decree cannot be revised unless the matter in dispute exceeds five thousand dollars. Wilson *v.* Sandford, 10 How. 99.

Citation.

A citation signed by the clerk and not by the judge is irregular. Chaffee *v.* Hayward, 20 How. 208.

An appearance of the defendant in error without making a motion to dismiss during the first term is a waiver of any irregularity in the citation, and is an admission that he has received notice to appear to the writ of error. Chaffee *v.* Hayward, 20 How. 208.

The absence of counsel is no excuse for the omission to move to dismiss the writ of error. Chaffee *v.* Hayward, 20 How. 208.

If the defendant in error appears in the Supreme Court, and pleads to entitle him to appear by counsel and argue the cause, it is too late after the case has been remanded to the circuit court to raise the objection that no writ of error was sued out to remove the record into the Supreme Court, and that the judgment is, therefore, still in force and unreversed. It will be presumed that all formal objections, and particularly one to the want of a writ, were waived by consent of parties. Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wash. C. C. 443; s. c. 7 Wheat. 356; s. c. 1 Robb 193, 336.

If the defendant in error does not elect to have the writ of error dismissed on account of the failure of the plaintiff to appear, but files an argument, the court will decide the case. New York *v.* Ransom, 1 Fish. 252; s. c. 23 How. 487.

Bill of Exceptions.

The bill of exceptions affords the only means of ascertaining the precise state of facts on which an instruction was given. Whether the report of the evidence as set forth in the bill of exceptions may or may not be incomplete or imperfectly stated, can not be known in an appellate court. Bills of exception, when properly taken and duly allowed, become a part of the record, and as such can not be contradicted. Chaffee *v.* Boston Belting Co., 22 How. 217.

The Supreme Court can not notice the rules of the inferior courts, unless they are made a part of the bill of exceptions. Packet Co. *v.* Sickles, 19 Wall. 611.

Exceptions to Evidence.

If no exception is taken to the competency or sufficiency of evidence, either generally or for any particular purpose, there is no necessity for putting any portion of it in the bill of exceptions, when the opinion of the court presents a general principle of law. Pennock *v.* Dialogue, 2 Pet. 1; s. c. 4 Wash. C. C. 538; s. c. 1 Robb 466, 542.

If a witness is rejected as incompetent, and the facts which the witness offered to prove are not stated in the bill of exceptions, the exception can not be disregarded upon the idea that the testimony could not have been material or could not have changed the result of the verdict. Vance *v.* Campbell, 1 Fish. 483; s. c. 1 Black 427.

Parties are not at liberty to desert the purpose stated by them, and to show the pertinency or relevancy of the evidence for any other purpose not then suggested to the court. Phila. & Trenton R. R. Co. *v.* Stimpson, 14 Pet. 448; s. c. 2 Robb 46.

It is incumbent on those who insist upon the right to put particular questions to a witness, to establish that right beyond any reasonable doubt, for the very purpose stated by them. Phila. & Trenton R. R. Co. *v.* Stimpson, 14 Pet. 448; s. c. 2 Robb 46; Blanchard *v.* Putnam, 3 Fish. 186; s. c. 8 Wall. 420; s. c. 2 Bond 84.

It is incumbent on the party objecting to the ruling to show his right to introduce the rejected evidence. Silsby *v.* Foote, 14 How. 218; s. c. 1 Blatch. 445.

A party is not deprived of any right if a paper was not legal evidence upon the particular point for which alone it was offered, or if its reception, accompanied by proper instructions to the jury concerning its legal effect, must necessarily have assisted the opposite party. Silsby *v.* Foote, 14 How. 218; s. c. 1 Blatch. 445.

If a party is not deprived of any right by the rejection of evidence, it is not cause for reversing a judgment that an erroneous reason was assigned for rejecting it. Silsby *v.* Foote, 14 How. 218; s. c. 1 Blatch. 445.

Exceptions to Instructions.

The exceptions to the charge of the court should be to the points ruled by the court, and not to the charge as published at length. Stimpson *v.* West Chester R. R. Co., 4 How. 380; s. c. 2 Robb 335.

An omission of the court to instruct the jury upon particular points is not a ground for a bill of exceptions. Allen *v.* Blunt, 2 W. & M. 121; s. c. 2 Robb 530.

A direction to the jury to render a verdict in favor of the defendant is only proper where it is entirely clear that the plaintiff can not recover. Klein *v.* Russell, 19 Wall. 433.

It is no ground of reversal that the court below omitted to give directions to the jury upon any points of law which might arise in the cause, where it was not requested by either party at the trial. It is sufficient that the court has given no erroneous directions. If either party deems any point presented by the evidence to be omitted in the charge, it is competent for such party to require an opinion from the court upon that point. If he does not, it is a waiver of it. The court can not be presumed to do more in ordinary cases than to express its opinion upon the questions which the parties themselves have raised at the trial. Pennock *v.* Dialogue, 2 Pet. 1; s. c. 4 Wash. C. C. 538; s. c. 1 Robb 466, 542.

The substance only of the charge is to be examined, and if it appears upon the whole that the law was justly expounded to the jury, general expressions which may need and would receive qualification if they were the direct point in judgment, are to be understood in such restricted sense. Evans *v.* Eaton, 7 Wheat. 356; s. c. 3 Wash. C. C. 443; s. c. 1 Robb 193, 336.

It is clearly error for the court in its instruction to the jury to assume a material fact as proved, of which there is no evidence in the case, and when the finding of the jury accords with the theory of the instruction thus assumed without evidence, the error is of a character to deserve correction. Chaffee *v.* Boston Belting Co., 22 How. 217.

It is unnecessary and inconvenient to spread the charge *in extenso* upon the record. Evans *v.* Eaton, 7 Wheat. 356; s. c. 3 Wash. C. C. 443; s. c. 1 Robb 193, 336.

Practice.

The admission or rejection of evidence after a case has been closed is a matter of discretion and practice, in respect to which the Supreme Court possesses no authority to revise the decision of the circuit court. Phila. & Trenton R. R. Co. *v.* Stimpson, 14 Pet. 448, s. c. 2 Robb 46.

It rests in the discretion of the court, when a juror is withdrawn on account of sickness before any evidence is given, whether such withdrawal shall be treated simply as occasioning a vacancy on a still existing panel, or as breaking up the panel altogether, and no error can be assigned upon it. Silsby *v.* Foote, 14 How. 218; s. c. 1 Blatch. 445.

On a writ of error a point cannot be considered which was not made in the court below. Klein *v.* Russell, 19 Wall. 433.

If the damages are too large the fault lies with the jury, when they are properly instructed, and can not be corrected in the Supreme Court on a writ of error. Hogg *v.* Emerson, 11 How. 587; s. c. 2 Blatch. 1.

The Supreme Court may take cognizance of a case where judgment is entered upon an agreed statement of the parties, without any express or specific exceptions to the rulings of the circuit court. Stimpson *v.* Balt. & Sus. R. R. Co., 10 How. 329.

If the merits of the controversy have been determined in a previous case, the cause will be remanded without argument upon mere technical questions. However the points of special pleading may be ruled, they can have no material influence on the ultimate decision of the case, because if it is found that errors in pleading have been committed by either party injurious to his rights, an opportunity will be afforded him to correct them in some subsequent proceeding, so as to bring the real points in controversy fairly before the court. Smith *v.* Ely, 15 How. 137; s. c. 5 McLean 76.

After a case has been carried to the Supreme Court and decided, and a mandate issued to the court below, if a second writ of error is sued out, it brings up for revision nothing but the proceedings subsequent to the mandate. None of the questions which were before the court on the first writ of error can be reheard or re-examined upon the second. Sizer *v.* Many, 16 How. 98.

If one party pays the counsel fees on both sides, both in the court below and on appeal, he will be deemed to have such control over both the preparation and argument of the cause as to make the suit collusive, and on motion a decree of affirmance may be rescinded, the mandate recalled, and the bill dismissed. Gardner *v.* Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co., 6 Fish. 329; s. c. 3 O. G. 295; Cochrane *v.* Deener, 95 U. S. 355.

If the complainant buys in the patent under which the suit is defended, and thus owns both sides of the litigation, the suit will be dismissed on the motion of a third party, whose rights would be seriously affected if the question of law were decided in the manner that both parties to the suit desire it to be. They have the same interests, and those interests are in conflict with the interest of such third party, and for that reason the case should not be heard. Wood Paper Co. *v.* Heft, 3 Fish. 316; s. c. 8 Wall. 333.

Appeal.

An appeal can only be taken from a final decree. A decree is not to be considered final for the purposes of appeal, until after the coming in of the master's report. Potter *v.* Mack, 3 Fish. 428.

A decree for a perpetual injunction, with a reference to a master to ascertain the damages by reason of the infringement, is not a final decree. Barnard *v.* Gibson, 7 How. 650.

A motion to file an answer after default is generally addressed to the discretion of the court, and is not subject to revision in the Supreme Court. Dean *v.* Mason, 20 How. 198.

A motion by a party, to whom the complainant's title has been assigned since the commencement of the suit, for leave to file a supplemental bill is in the discretion of the court, and not a subject of revision. Dean *v.* Mason, 20 How. 198.

The granting of permission to retract an admission made in the answer is a matter in the discretion of the circuit court, and will not be reviewed in the Supreme Court. Jones *v.* Morehead, 1 Wall. 155.

Costs and expenses are not matters positively limited by law, but are allowed in the exercise of a sound discretion. No appeal lies from a mere decree respecting costs and expenses. Canter *v.* Am. Ins. Co., 3 Pet. 307.

An objection to the misjoinder of parties complainant, taken for the first time in the Supreme Court in a case where the parties consented to a decree, comes too late. Livingston *v.* Woodworth, 15 How. 546.

Exceptions taken to a master's report by a party who does not appeal can not be considered. Rubber Co. *v.* Goodyear, 9 Wall. 786; s. c. 2 Fish. 499; 2 Cliff. 351.

If the master's report is in any particular erroneous, it is incumbent on the party to point out the error by an exception filed pursuant to the rules on that subject. If no exception is filed, it is too late to object to the error in the Supreme Court for the first time. Kinsman *v.* Parkhurst, 18 How. 289; s. c. 1 Blatch. 488.

The appeal and bond given in pursuance thereof do not vacate or suspend the order of injunction. They affect only the amount adjudged as damages and costs. Mowry *v.* Whitney, 3 Fish. 157; s. c. 14 Wall. 620; s. c. 1 O. G. 492; s. c. 2 Bond 45.

The defendant must procure sureties to sign the bond, although he is amply responsible for the whole decree. American Pavement Co. *v.* Elizabeth, 6 O. G. 772; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 463.

The practice of requiring bond in double the amount of the decree need not be always followed, for the law does not require that the security shall be in any fixed proportion to the decree. American Pavement Co. *v.* Elizabeth, 6 O. G. 772; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 463.

The taking of an appeal and the filing of an appeal bond will not prevent the enforcement of that part of the decree which provides for the payment to the master of the fees due him for services rendered for the defendant. Myers *v.* Dunbar, 8 O. G. 321; s. c. 12 Blatch. 380; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 565.

CHAPTER TWELVE.

SEC. 711. The jurisdiction vested in the courts of the United States in the cases and proceedings hereinafter mentioned shall be exclusive of the courts of the several States. * * * * * *

Fifth. Of all cases arising under the patent right or copyright laws of the United States.

The exclusive right of the inventor to make and vend his newly-discovered implement is wholly statutory. Where a statute confers a right and prescribes adequate means for protecting it, the proprietor is confined to the statutory remedy. A State court can not, therefore, entertain a bill in equity to enjoin an infringement. Dudley *v.* Mayhew, 3 N. Y. 9; Parkhurst *v.* Kinsman, 6 N. J. Eq. 600; Kempton *v.* Bray, 99 Mass. 350; Tomlinson *v.* Battel, 4 Abb. Pr. 266.

If two patents have been issued to different parties, the State courts have no jurisdiction to settle their conflicting claims, or to enjoin the subsequent patentee at the instance of the prior patentee. Gibson *v.* Woodworth, 8 Paige 132.

A State court has no jurisdiction of an action brought by a patentee to restrain another from issuing circulars warning parties against purchasing a certain article, if the latter claims the right to do so under a patent. Hovey *v.* Rubber Tip Pencil Co., 33 N. Y. Sup. 522; s. c. 57 N. Y. 119.

The jurisdiction vested in the circuit courts is exclusive, and a State court has no jurisdiction over an action for an infringement of a patent. Parsons *v.* Barnard, 7 Johns. 144.

If a contract for a sale of a patent right is rescinded, and a note given for the return of the money paid thereon, the defendant in an action on the note can not plead the damages sustained by the plaintiff's infringement after the rescission as a set-off to the note. Smith *v.* McClelland, 11 Bush 523.

A State court has no jurisdiction over an action of assumpsit to recover upon a *quantum valebat* for the use of a patented invention. Batten *v.* Kear, 2 Phila. 301; De Witt *v.* Elmira Nobles Manuf. Co., 66 N. Y. 459; s. c. 12 N. Y. Supr. 301.

A State court has no jurisdiction of an action by an assignee to enjoin an infringer or recover damages. Stone *v.* Edwards, 35 Tex. 556.

A State court can not entertain a bill for discovery and an injunction against an execution issued upon a judgment for damages rendered in an action for the infringement of a patent. Kendall *v.* Winsor, 6 R. I. 453.

If a State court has jurisdiction over the rights of parties arising out of a contract relating to a patent, it may incidentally inquire into the validity of the patent. Burrall *v.* Jewett, 2 Paige 134; Sherman *v.* Champlain

Co., 31 Vt. 162; Lindsay *v.* Roraback, 4 Jones Eq. 124; Slemmer's Appeal, 58 Penn. 155; Parkhurst *v.* Kinsman, 6 N. J. Eq. 600; Rich *v.* Atwater, 16 Conn. 409; Middlebrook *v.* Broadbent, 47 N. Y. 443; Rice *v.* Garnhart, 34 Wis. 453; Saxton *v.* Dodge, 57 Barb. 84; Beebe *v.* McKenzie, 47 N. Y. 662; Nash *v.* Lull, 102 Mass. 60; McKenzie *v.* Bailie, 4 C. L. B. 209; Keith *v.* Hobbs, 69 Mo. 84; *contra*, Elmer *v.* Pennel, 40 Me. 430.

In an action in a State court to recover the price agreed to be paid for a patent right, the defendant, for the purpose of showing a want or failure of consideration, may prove that the patent is void for want of novelty or utility. Rice *v.* Garnhart, 34 Wis. 453; Street *v.* Silver, Brightly 96.

A State court has jurisdiction over an action to recover damages for fraud in the sale of a patent right. Hunt *v.* Hoover, 24 Iowa 231; Warren *v.* Cole, 15 Mich. 265; David *v.* Park, 103 Mass. 501.

If a party who has discovered a process without taking out a patent therefor, imparts the secret to another, under an agreement not to divulge it, he may maintain an action in a State court for an injunction and for damages for breach of the contract by the latter. Hammer *v.* Barnes, 26 How. Pr. 174.

If an inventor employs a mechanic to perfect his invention, under an agreement that the latter shall take out patents for the improvements, and assign them to the former, he may maintain an action in a State court to obtain an assignment, and recover the profits received in violation of the agreement. Binney *v.* Annan, 107 Mass. 94.

A State court has jurisdiction of an action by a manufacturer against a patentee, for falsely and intentionally advertising that his manufactures were an infringement of the patent. Snow *v.* Judson, 38 Barb. 210; Mason *v.* Stacey, 3 C. L. B. 1100.

If a patentee in an assignment warrants the novelty of the invention, a State court has jurisdiction of an action for the breach of a warranty. Wright *v.* Wilson, 11 Rich. 144.

A State court has jurisdiction over a suit to rescind a contract for the sale of a patent right, on account of a fraud on the part of the patentee in the sale thereof. Lindsay *v.* Roraback, 4 Jones Eq. 124; Page *v.* Dickerson, 26 Wis. 694.

A State court has jurisdiction over an action to annul a license to use the patented invention on the ground of fraud. Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. *v.* Whitney, 2 B. & Ard. 30.

A State court has jurisdiction of an action by a patentee to recover damages for breach of an agreement not to use the thing patented. Billings *v.* Ames, 32 Mo. 265.

A State court has jurisdiction of an action by an inventor to recover the consideration stipulated to be paid to him by another for the privilege of taking out a patent therefor in his own name. Lockwood *v.* Lockwood, 33 Iowa 509.

If a party agrees to improve machinery for a certain purpose, and the other party agrees to pay a certain price therefor, the defendant in an

action on the contract for the stipulated price, may show that the alleged improvement for which the patent was granted is worthless. McDougall *v.* Fogg, 2 Bosw. 387.

If the president of a corporation attempts to manufacture patented articles which the corporation had a license of the exclusive right to manufacture, a State court may punish him for contempt in interfering with the title of a receiver appointed to take charge of the assets of the corporation. *In re* Woven Tape Skirt Co., 19 N. Y. Supr. 111.

If a patentee merely sends a circular stating that an article is an infringement to his agents, he can not be enjoined from such use of the circular on the ground that it is a libel. Bell *v.* Singer Manuf. Co., 65 Geo. 452.

A State court has no jurisdiction over an action to enjoin the infringement of a copyright. Potter *v.* McPherson, 28 N. Y. Supr. 559.

The statute does not make the jurisdiction of the Federal courts over actions for the protection of the rights of authors at common law in their manuscripts exclusive, or deprive State courts of jurisdiction over such actions. At most it gives parties within its provisions. and not claiming the benefits of a copyright under the laws of the United States, a cumulative remedy and a choice of tribunals. The jurisdiction of the State courts in cases in which it had before been exercised, is not taken away or in any respect impaired. Palmer *v.* De Witt, 47 N. Y. 532; s. c. 40 How. Pr. 293; s. c. 5 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 130; s. c. 36 How. Pr. 222; s. c. 2 Sweeny 530; Woolsey *v.* Judd, 4 Duer 379; Jones *v.* Thorne, 1 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 408.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN.

SEC. 892. Written or printed copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the patent office, and of letters patent, authenticated by the seal and certified by the commissioner or acting commissioner thereof, shall be evidence in all cases wherein the originals could be evidence; and any person making application therefor, and paying the fee required by law, shall have certified copies thereof.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 57, 16 Stat. 207.

Prior Statutes—April 10, 1790, ch. 7, §§ 3, 6, 1 Stat. 111.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 4, 5 Stat. 118.—March 3, 1837, ch. 45, § 2, 5 Stat. 191.—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 15, 12 Stat. 249.

Construction.

An exemplification of the patent and specification is admissible in evidence although the drawing is not exemplified. Peck *v.* Farrington, 9 Wend. 44.

A certified copy of an assignment is *prima facie* evidence of the genuineness of the original, and is competent evidence, and absolute evidence of the correctness of the copies from the record. Lee *v.* Blandy, 2 Fish. 89; s. c. 1 Bond 361; Parker *v.* Haworth, 4 McLean 370; s. c. 2 Robb 725; Brooks *v.* Jenkins, 3 McLean 432.

A certified copy of a transfer of an interest in a patent which is not required by law to be recorded is not legal proof of such transfer. Sherman *v.* Champlain Co., 31 Vt. 162.

A transcript of certain documents on file in the patent office is competent evidence although it does not purport to be a copy of the whole proceeding. Tookey *v.* Harding, 1 Fed. Rep. 174; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 92.

A copy of a specification alone is not competent evidence to prove what was contained in the patent, for it affords no proof of the granting, or of the existence of a patent based upon the specification. Nor is the mere certificate of the commissioner, though authenticated by his official seal, that such patent was issued and remains in full force, competent evidence of the facts so certified. The proper evidence of the patent is a copy of the patent itself duly authenticated by the official seal and certificate of the commissioner. Davis *v.* Gray, 17 Ohio St. 330.

Patents are public records. All persons are bound to take notice of their contents, and consequently should have a right to obtain copies of them. These records being in the care and custody of the commissioner of patents, it is his duty to give authenticated copies to any person who shall demand the same, as soon as he conveniently can, on payment of the legal fees. Where there is a right on the one side and a corresponding duty on the other, a refusal to perform such duty on the reasonable request of the party entitled to demand it, will subject the officer to an action. But the party entitled to such services must request in a proper manner. He has no right to accompany his demand with personal insult or vulgar abuse of the officer. Those to whom the people have committed high trusts are entitled at least to common courtesy, and are not bound to submit to the insolence or ill temper of those who disregard the decencies of social intercourse. A demand accompanied with rudeness and insult is not a legal demand. Boyden *v.* Burke, 14 How. 575.

The commissioner is in error in refusing to comply with a second demand on account of former misconduct, or to enforce an apology by withholding the party's rights. Ill manners or bad temper do not work a forfeiture of men's civil rights. While the want of an apology for previous rudeness and insult may well justify the commissioner in refusing all social intercourse with the party, yet it cannot release him from the obligations imposed upon him by his official station, or entitle him to disregard the rights guaranteed to others by the laws of the land. Boyden *v.* Burke, 14 How. 575.

A clerk whose employment consists chiefly in making examinations in relation to assignments and other papers recorded and filed in the office, is a competent witness to prove that no assignment has ever been recorded. Stone *v.* Palmer, 28 Mo. 539.

A certificate that diligent search has been made, and that it does not appear that a patent has been issued is not competent evidence. Bullock *v.* Wallingford, 55 N. H. 619; Stoner *v.* Ellis, 6 Ind. 152.

If a party desires to prove the negative fact that there is no record, he must do so in the usual way, that is, by the deposition of the proper officer or by producing him in court, so that he may be sworn and cross-examined as to the thoroughness of the search made. Bullock *v.* Wallingford, 55 N. H. 619; Stoner *v.* Ellis, 6 Ind. 152.

Certified copies of the assignments of a patent are not evidence that there is no other title of record. Am. D. R. B. Co. *v.* Sheldon, 17 Blatch. 208; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 551.

An abstract of the title to the patent is not evidence that the person to whom the reissue was granted did not acquire a perfect title by another line of conveyance. Am. D. R. B. Co. *v.* Sheldon, 17 Blatch. 208; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 551.

The mere production of a certified copy of the application with a defective affidavit is not competent evidence that no sufficient affidavit was taken. Hoe *v.* Kahler, 11 Fed. Rep. 111.

SEC. 893. Copies of the specifications and drawings of foreign letters patent, certified as provided in the preceding section, shall be *prima facie* evidence of the fact of the granting of such letters patent, and of the date and contents thereof.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 57, 16 Stat. 207.

If a foreign patent is certified by the officer of the foreign patent office that corresponds to the commissioner of patents, it is admissible in evidence. Schoerken *v.* S. & C. & B. Manuf. Co., 19 O. G. 1493, 19 Blatch. 209; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 469.

A certificate of the commissioner of the correctness of a translation of a foreign patent contained in a volume in the library of the patent office is not competent evidence. Gaylord *v.* Case, 1 C. L. B. 382.

SEC. 894. The printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents, which the commissioner of patents is authorized to print for gratuitous distribution, and to deposit in the capitols of the States and Territories, and in the clerk's offices of the district courts, shall, when certified by him and authenticated by the seal of his office, be received in all courts as evidence of all matters therein contained.

Statute Revised—Jan. 11, 1871, Res. 5, 16 Stat. 500.

SEC. 972. In all recoveries under the copyright laws, either for damages, forfeitures, or penalties, full costs shall be allowed thereon.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 108, 16 Stat. 218.
Prior Statute—Feb. 3, 1831, ch. 16, § 12, 4 Stat. 438.

SEC. 973. When judgment or decree is rendered for the plaintiff or complainant, in any suit at law or in equity, for the infringement of a part of a patent, in which it appears that the patentee, in his specification, claimed to be the original and first inventor or discoverer of any material or substantial part of the thing patented. of which he was not the original and first inventor, no costs shall be recovered, unless the proper disclaimer, as provided by the patent laws, has been entered at the patent office before the suit was brought.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 60, 16 Stat. 207.
Prior Statute—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 15, 5 Stat. 123.

If the plaintiff on trial abandons one claim, he can not recover costs. Proctor *v.* Brill, 16 Fed. Rep. 971.

If the verdict was rendered upon all the claims, affirming their validity and the novelty of the invention claimed in each, the mere fact that the plaintiff disclaimed one or more of the claims after the trial and verdict, does not deprive him of his right to costs. Peck *v.* Frames, 5 Fish. 211.

Although a patentee files a disclaimer as to one division of a reissue, yet if the validity of the other division is sustained, he is entitled to recover costs. Elastic Fabrics Co. *v.* Smith, 100 U. S. 110.

If the disclaimer was unnecessary and inoperative, the complainant is entitled to costs. Sharp *v.* Tifft, 17 O. G. 1282; s. c. 18 Blatch. 132; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 390; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 697.

If the disclaimer is not filed until after the commencement of the suit, the complainant can not recover any costs at all in the case, not even those incurred after the filing of the disclaimer. Burdett *v.* Estey, 16 Blatch. 105; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 141; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 545; Matthews *v.* Spangenberg, 23 O. G. 92.

TITLE LX.

PATENTS, TRADE-MARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS.

CHAPTER ONE.

PATENTS.

SEC. 4883. All patents shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the patent office, and shall be signed by the Secretary of the Interior and countersigned by the commissioner of patents, and they shall be recorded, together with the specifications, in the patent office, in books to be kept for that purpose.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 21, 16 Stat. 200.

Prior Statutes—April 10, 1790, ch. 7, § 1, 1 Stat. 109.—Feb. 21, 1793, ch. 11, § 1, 1 Stat. 318.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 5, 5 Stat. 118.

Principles of Construction.

Patent laws should be liberally construed to meet the wise and beneficent object of the legislature. Patentees are a meritorious class, and the courts will give them all the aid and protection which the law allows. Commissioner *v.* Whiteley, 4 Wall. 522; Brooks *v.* Jenkins, 3 McLean 432; Grant *v.* Raymond, 6 Pet. 218; s. c. 1 Robb 604.

The right of property which a patentee has in his invention, and his right to its exclusive use, are derived altogether from the statute. An inventor has no right of property in his invention upon which he can maintain suit, unless he obtains a patent for it according to the statute, and his rights are to be regulated and measured by its provisions, and can not go beyond them. Brown *v.* Duchesne, 19 How. 183; s. c. 2 Curt. 371.

When Congress are legislating to protect inventors, their attention is necessarily attracted to the authority under which they are acting, and it ought not lightly to be presumed that they intended to go beyond it, and exercise another and distinct power conferred on them for a different purpose. Brown *v.* Duchesne, 19 How. 183; s. c. 2 Curt. 371.

A special act extending a patent must be construed in connection with the statute. They are statutes *in pari materia*, and all relate to the same subject, and must be construed together. Bloomer *v.* McQuewen, 14 How. 539; Jordan *v.* Dobson, 4 Fish. 232; s. c. 7 Phila. 533; s. c. 2 Abb. U. S. 398.

A special act of Congress in favor of a patentee, extending the time beyond that originally limited, must be considered as engrafted on the general law. Bloomer *v.* McQuewen, 14 How. 539.

An act of Congress which gives a patent for an invention will, if it is ambiguous, be construed to give damages for the construction or use of the invention only after the grant of the patent, so that it may not be deemed to create rights retrospectively, or make men liable for damages for acts lawful at the time when they were done. Blanchard *v.* Sprague, 2 Story 164; s. c. 3 Sumner 535; s. c. 1 Robb 734, 742.

The courts can never presume that Congress intended to decide that an individual is an author or inventor in a general act, the words of which

do not render such a construction unavoidable. Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 243.

The grant of an exclusive privilege to an invention for a limited time does not imply a binding and irrevocable contract with the people that at the expiration of the period the invention shall become their property. Congress may renew the patent right at the end of the period or decline to do so. Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 243.

Signature.

If a patent is issued without the signature of the Secretary of the Interior it is void. Marsh *v.* Nichols, 15 Fed. Rep. 914; s. c. 24 O. G. 901.

If a patent was not signed by the Secretary of the Interior at the time of the commencement of a suit, a subsequent signing will not make it valid as of the date when it was issued. Marsh *v.* Nichols, 15 Fed. Rep. 914; s. c. 24 O. G. 901.

If a patent was not signed when it was issued it can not be signed by the Secretary of the Interior after his tenure of office has expired. Marsh *v.* Nichols, 15 Fed. Rep. 914; s. c. 24 O. G. 901.

As the Secretary of the Interior must by law sign the patent, as well as the commissioner, should the patent be altered after he signs it, he must be made aware of any such subsequent alteration and sanction it before his signature can be regarded as verifying the amended patent. The entry of his sanction upon the letters patent themselves would be a convenient mode of perpetuating the evidence of it, but in principle nothing seems to be demanded beyond his assent or ratification. Woodworth *v.* Hall, 1 W. & M. 389; s. c. 2 Robb 517.

SEC. 4884. Every patent shall contain a short title or description of the invention or discovery, correctly indicating its nature and design, and a grant to the patentee, his heirs or assigns, for the term of seventeen years, of the exclusive right to make, use and vend the invention or discovery throughout the United States, and the territories thereof, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof. A copy of the specification and drawings shall be annexed to the patent and be a part thereof.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 22, 16 Stat. 201.

Prior Statutes—April 10, 1790, ch. 7, § 1, 1 Stat. 109.—Feb. 21, 1793, ch. 11, § 1, 1 Stat. 318.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 5, 5 Stat. 118.—March 2, 1861, ch. 88, § 16, 12 Stat. 249.

Rules of Construction.

Patents for inventions under the fair application of the rule *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*, are, if practicable, to be so interpreted as to uphold and not to destroy the right of the inventor. Turrill *v.* Railroad Com-

pany, 1 Wall. 491; Stover *v.* Halstead, 13 Blatch. 95; s. c. 8 O. G. 558; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 98; Ryan *v.* Goodwin, 3 Sumner 514; s. c. 1 Robb 725; Klein *v.* Russell, 19 Wall. 433; Allen *v.* Hunter, 6 McLean 303; Ingels *v.* Mast, 6 Fish. 415; Davoll *v.* Brown, 1 W. & M. 53; s. c. 2 Robb 303; Union Paper Bag Co. *v.* Nixon, 6 Fish. 402; s. c. 4 O. G. 31; Rubber Co. *v.* Goodyear, 9 Wall. 788; s. c. 2 Fish. 499; s. c. 2 Cliff. 351; Goodyear *v.* Berry, 3 Fish. 439; s. c. 2 Bond 189; Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 4 Fish. 224; s. c. 3 Cliff. 408; Brown *v.* Guild, 23 Wall. 181; s. c. 6 O. G. 392; s. c. 7 O. G. 739; Adams *v.* Joliet Manuf. Co., 12 O. G. 93; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 1; Blaisdell *v.* Tufts, 15 O. G. 881; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 521.

This principle is not to be carried so far as to exclude what is in it, or to interpolate anything which it does not contain. Rubber Co. *v.* Goodyear, 9 Wall. 788; s. c. 2 Fish. 499; s. c. 2 Cliff. 351.

The rights secured by a patent for an invention or discovery are as much property as anything else real or incorporeal. The titles by which they are held, like other titles, should not be overthrown upon doubts or objections capable of a reasonable and just solution in favor of their validity. Blandy *v.* Griffith, 3 Fish. 609.

Patents for inventions are treated as a just reward to ingenious men, and as highly beneficial to the public, not only by holding out suitable encouragement to genius, and talents, and enterprise, but as ultimately securing to the whole community great advantages from the free communication of secrets and processes and machinery, which may be most important to all the great interests of society, to agriculture, to commerce and to manufactures, as well as to the cause of science and art. Specifications are therefore clearly entitled to a liberal construction, since they are granted not as restrictions upon the rights of the community, but "to promote science and useful arts." Blanchard *v.* Sprague, 2 Story 164; s. c. 3 Sumner 535; s. c. 1 Robb 734, 742; Bussey *v.* Wager, 9 O. G. 300; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 229; Treadwell *v.* Parrott, 3 Fish. 124; s. c. 5 Blatch. 369; Dennis *v.* Cross, 6 Fish. 138; s. c. 3 Biss. 389; Potter *v.* Holland, 1 Fish. 382; s. c. 4 Blatch. 238; Carew *v.* Boston Elastic Fabric Co., 5 Fish. 90; s. c. 1 Holmes 45; s. c. 3 Cliff. 336; s. c. 1 O. G. 91; Singer *v.* Walmsley, 1 Fish. 558; Birdsell *v.* McDonald, 6 O. G. 682; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 165; Corning *v.* Burden, 15 How. 252; Goodyear *v.* Central R. R. Co., 1 Fish. 626; s. c. 2 Wall. Jr. 356; Winans *v.* Denmead, 15 How. 330; 4 Am. L. J. 498; Allen *v.* Hunter, 6 McLean 303; Parker *v.* Stiles, 5 McLean 44; Ames *v.* Howard, 1 Sumner 482; s. c. 1 Robb 689; Latta *v.* Shawk, 1 Fish. 465; s. c. 1 Bond 259; Bloomer *v.* Stolley, 5 McLean 158; Parker *v.* Haworth, 4 McLean 370; s. c. 2 Robb 725; Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* N. Y. Brass Co., 3 Fish. 43; Hogg *v.* Emerson, 6 How. 437; s. c. 2 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Robb 655; Davoll *v.* Brown, 1 W. & M. 53; s. c. 2 Robb 303; Seymour *v.* Osborne, 11 Wall. 516; s. c. 3 Fish. 555; Adair *v.* Thayer, 17 Blatch. 468; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 118; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 441.

It is the duty of the court in construing a patent to so construe it, if it

can without doing violence to the language used, as not to defeat the claim of the patentee, but to give to the patentee what he has actually invented, and all that he has actually invented—in other words, to make the claim commensurate with the invention which has been actually made by the patentee. New York *v.* Ransom, 1 Fish. 252; s. c. 23 How. 487; Swift *v.* Whisen, 3 Fish. 343; s. c. 2 Bond 115; Parker *v.* Stiles, 5 McLean 44; Coffin *v.* Ogden, 3 Fish. 640; s. c. 7 Blatch. 61; Union Sugar Refinery *v.* Mathiessen, 2 Fish. 600; s. c. 3 Cliff. 639; Whipple *v.* Middlesex Co., 4 Fish. 41; Roots *v.* Hyndman, 6 Fish. 439; s. c. 4 O. G. 29; Rogers *v.* Sargent, 7 Blatch. 507; Hovey *v.* Stevens, 3 W. & M. 17; s. c. 2 Robb 567; Andrews *v.* Carman, 13 Blatch. 307; s. c. 9 O. G. 1011; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 277; Estabrook *v.* Dunbar, 10 O. G. 909; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 427; Judson *v.* Moore, 1 Fish. 544; s. c. 1 Bond 285; Johnson *v.* Linen Co., 33 Conn. 436; Smith *v.* Fay, 6 Fish. 446; Clark *v.* Kennedy Manuf. Co., 14 Blatch. 79; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 470; s. c. 11 O. G. 68; Goodyear *v.* Providence Rubber Co., 2 Fish. 499; s. c. 9 Wall. 788; s. c. 2 Cliff. 35; Hamilton *v.* Ives, 6 Fish. 244; s. c. 3 O. G. 30; Francis *v.* Mellor, 5 Fish. 153; s. c. 8 Phila. 157; s. c. 5 A. L. T. (U. S.) 237; s. c. 1 O. G. 48; Union Paper Bag Co. *v.* Nixon, 6 Fish. 402; s. c. 4 O. G. 31; Henderson *v.* Cleveland Stove Co., 12 O. G. 4; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 604; Adams *v.* Joliet Manuf. Co., 3 Ban & Ard. 1; s. c. 12 O. G. 91; Fuch *v.* Bragg, 8 Fed. Rep. 588; s. c. 20 O. G. 1589.

The general rule that a patent will be liberally construed will not be applied in a case where it is evident that the claim has been expressed in loose, ambiguous or general terms for the fraudulent purpose of apparently covering subsequent inventions, especially where the objectionable claim has been first introduced in a reissue for the purpose of covering the subsequent invention of another. Taylor *v.* Garretson, 5 Fish. 116; s. c. 9 Blatch. 156.

If a reissue was taken out for the purpose of securing a broad claim the patentee will be held to it, although the result may be that the reissue is void for want of novelty. Wisner *v.* Grant, 7 Fed. Rep. 922; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 217.

The word "process" in a reissue will not be construed to mean machinery, for the same liberality of construction does not prevail in the case of a reissue as in the case of an original patent. Hatch *v.* Moffit, 15 Fed. Rep. 252.

A patent should be construed in such a way, if possible, as to conform to the actual invention. Hale *v.* Stimpson, 2 Fish. 565; Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117; Taylor *v.* Garretson, 5 Fish. 116; s. c. 9 Blatch. 156; Bussey *v.* Wager, 9 O. G. 300; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 229; Barnes *v.* Straus, 5 Fish. 531; s. c. 9 Blatch. 553; s. c. 2 O. G. 62; Gallahue *v.* Butterfield, 6 Fish. 203; s. c. 10 Blatch. 232; 2 O. G. 645; Mahn *v.* Harwood, 14 O. G. 859; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 515.

The patentee may so restrict his claim as to cover less than what he invented, yet such an interpretation should not be put upon his claim if it can fairly be construed otherwise. Winans *v.* Denmead, 15 How. 330; s. c. 4 Am. L. J. 498.

A claim will not be enlarged by construction beyond the fair interpretation of its terms. Burns *v.* Meyer, 100 U. S. 671; Delaware C. & I. Co. *v.* Packer, 24 O. G. 1273.

The intention of the inventor, so as to effect the object designed, is to govern the construction of the language he employs. Inventors are not always educated or scientific men. Some most useful inventions have sprung from an illiterate source. Genius is not always blessed with the power of language. Courts look to the manifest design in order to remove any ambiguity arising from the terms employed; but this ambiguity must not be such as would perplex an ordinary mechanic in the art to which it applies. Page *v.* Ferry, 1 Fish. 298.

There may be a liberality of construction very injurious to the public, especially if it permits a patentee to couch his specification in such ambiguous terms that its claims may be contracted or expanded to suit the exigency. Parker *v.* Sears, 1 Fish. 93.

The same exact rule of interpretation is not to be applied at all times, but such in each case as will best enable the court to arrive at the meaning intended. Welling *v.* Rubber Co., 7 O. G. 606; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 282.

It is not necessary to classify a claim and to draw deductions from such classification. That is generally an unsafe mode of reasoning. Howe *v.* Morton, 1 Fish. 586.

If two inventors were prosecuting experiments at the same time, and each obtained a patent, the subsequent patent should be so construed as to sustain it, if possible, if the principle upon which it operates is different from that of the prior patent. Moore *v.* Ludlow, 14 O. G. 1.

What may be Referred to.

It is the duty of the patentee to sum up his invention in clear and determinate terms, and his summing up is conclusive upon his right and title. Wyeth *v.* Stone, 1 Story 274; s. c. 2 Robb 23; Dennis *v.* Cross, 3 Biss. 389; s. c. 6 Fish. 138; Hovey *v.* Stevens, 3 W. & M. 17; s. c. 2 Robb 567; Wheeler *v.* McCormick, 6 Fish. 551; s. c. 11 Blatch. 334; 4 O. G. 692.

The patèntee is restricted to his claim. It is true that the whole patent, including the specifications and the drawings, is to be taken into consideration, but the court looks at them only for the purpose of placing a proper construction on the claim. Pitts *v.* Wemple, 2 Fish. 10; s. c. 1 Biss. 87; Johnson *v.* McCullough, 4 Fish. 170; Brooks *v.* Fisk, 15 How. 212; Rich *v.* Close, 4 Fish. 279; s. c. 8 Blatch. 41; Railroad Co. *v.* Mellon, 104 U. S. 112; s. c. 20 O. G. 1891.

The claim is the attempt on the part of the inventor to describe the very thing which he supposes he has invented, and for which he asks the patent. Many *v.* Jagger, 1 Blatch. 372.

The claim must be construed as favorably to the patentee as the language of the claim, the state of the art and the extent and character of his actual invention will allow. Burden *v.* Corning, 2 Fish. 477.

The claim contained in a patent is to be construed with reference to the state of the art at the time of the invention. Pitts *v.* Wemple, 2 Fish. 10; s. c. 1 Biss. 87; Tilghman *v.* Mitchell, 2 Fish. 518; Goodyear *v.* Wait, 3 Fish. 242; s. c. 5 Blatch. 468; Whipple *v.* Middlesex Co., 4 Fish. 41; Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 4 Fish. 224; s. c. 2 Cliff. 408; Rogers *v.* Sargent, 7 Blatch. 507; Loom Co. *v.* Higgins, 16 O. G. 675; s. c. 15 Blatch. 486; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 88, 105 U. S. 580; s. c. 21 O. G. 2031; American Whip Co. *v.* Hayden Whip Co., 5 Ban & Ard. 125; s. c. 1 Fed. Rep. 87; Garneau *v.* Dozier, 102 U. S. 230; s. c. 19 O. G. 61; Bate Refrigerator Co. *v.* Toffey, 6 Fed. Rep. 514; Jones *v.* Barker, 22 O. G. 771; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 597.

The extent of an invention must be ascertained by comparing what the inventor produces with what was known before the time of the invention and not the time of the application for a patent. Sprague *v.* Adriance, 14 O. G. 308; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 124.

In construing a patent the courts, in the first place, generally look to the claim, which by law is required to be a summing up of the particulars of the invention for which the applicant desires a patent. If that claim is vague and uncertain, then reference is made to the specification and drawings, together with such other exhibits as may aid in giving a construction to the patent. Haselden *v.* Ogden, 3 Fish. 378; Whipple *v.* Baldwin Manuf. Co., 4 Fish. 29; Whipple *v.* Middlesex Co., 4 Fish. 41; Johnson *v.* Root, 1 Fish. 351.

In order to determine what the patentee claims as his invention the court must look to the specification annexed to the patent, which is made by law a portion of the patent. In determining the construction of the claim it is proper that the court should refer to the whole specification and consider the whole of it in connection. New York *v.* Ransom, 23 How. 487; s. c. 1 Fish. 252; Carter *v.* Messinger, 11 Blatch. 34; Hovey *v.* Stevens, 1 W. & M. 290; s. c. 2 Robb 479; Hudson *v.* Draper, 4 Fish. 256; s. c. 4 Cliff. 176; 1 O. G. 204; Page *v.* Ferry, 1 Fish. 298; Roberts *v.* Dickey, 4 Fish. 532; s. c. 4 Brews. 260; s. c. 1 O. G. 4; Judson *v.* Cope, 1 Fish. 615; s. c. 1 Bond 327; Howe *v.* Morton, 1 Fish. 586; Rogers *v.* Sargent, 7 Blatch. 507; Vance *v.* Campbell, 1 Fish. 483; s. c. 1 Black 427; Davoll *v.* Brown, 1 W. & M. 53; s. c. 2 Robb 303; Carver *v.* Braintree Manuf. Co., 2 Story 432; s. c. 2 Robb 141; Seymour *v.* Osborne, 11 Wall. 516; s. c. 3 Fish. 555; Seymour *v.* McCormick, 19 How. 96; s. c. 3 Blatch. 209; Coffin *v.* Ogden, 3 Fish. 640; s. c. 7 Blatch. 61; Francis *v.* Mellor, 5 Fish. 153; s. c. 8 Phila. 157; 1 O. G. 48; 5 A. L. T. 237; Suffolk Co. *v.* Hayden, 4 Fish. 86; s. c. 3 Wall. 315; Holly *v.* Vergennes Machine Co., 18 Blatch. 327; s. c. 18 O. G. 1177; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 74; Nat'l Car B. S. Co. *v.* L. S. & M. S. R. R. Co., 9 Biss. 505; s. c. 18 O. G. 1173; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 219.

The patent, the specification and the drawings may be referred to in ascertaining the extent of the patentee's claim. While it is true that the court is to look at the summing up to discover what parts of the machine he claims to have invented, still, if anything is needed to enable it to

determine the proper meaning of the expressions used in the claim, it must refer to the previous portion of the specification for such explanations as may be necessary to understand the office and purpose of that which is claimed as new. Forbes *v.* Barstow Stove Co., 2 Cliff. 379; Morris *v.* Barrett, 1 Fish. 461; s. c. 1 Bond 254; Ingels *v.* Mast. 1 Flippin 424; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 24; Judson *v.* Moore, 1 Fish. 544; s. c. 1 Bond 285; Turrill *v.* Railroad Company, 1 Wall. 491; Washburn *v.* Gould, 3 Story 122; s. c. 2 Robb 206; Pitts *v.* Edmonds, 2 Fish. 52; s. c. 1 Biss. 168; Union Sugar Refinery *v.* Mathiessen, 3 Cliff. 639; s. c. 2 Fish. 600; Birdsall *v.* McDonald, 6 O. G. 682; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 165; Geir *v.* Goettinger, 7 O. G. 563; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 553; Earle *v.* Sawyer, 4 Mason 1; s. c. 1 Robb 491; Whitney *v.* Emmett, Bald. 303; s. c. 1 Robb 567; Kittle *v.* Merriam, 2 Curt. 475; Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 3 Cliff. 408; s. c. 4 Fish. 224; Doughty *v.* Day, 5 Fish. 224; s. c. 9 Blatch. 262.

A petition is always required to be presented by an inventor. The specification is required to be prepared and filed before the patent issues. The specification is incorporated expressly and at length into the letters patent themselves, and must be regarded as a component part by the statute. Hogg *v.* Emerson, 6 How. 437; s. c. 2 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Robb 655.

The specification and the claim emanate from the same pen—the one cannot contradict the other. Page *v.* Ferry, 1 Fish. 298.

If the claim and specification do not altogether agree, the claim governs the patent. Haselden *v.* Ogden, 3 Fish. 378.

The different parts of the patent must be compared with each other, and the instrument considered as a whole. Union Sugar Refinery *v.* Mathiessen, 2 Fish. 600.

The drawings are to be deemed a part of the specification, and may be referred to for the purpose of adding anything to the specification or claim not specifically contained therein. Washburn *v.* Gould, 3 Story 122; s. c. 2 Robb 206; Banker *v.* Bostwick, 18 O. G. 61; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 517.

The specification governs, and the drawings merely illustrate. Hogg *v.* Emerson, 11 How. 587; s. c. 2 Blatch. 1; Hamilton *v.* Ives, 6 Fish. 244; s. c. 3 O. G. 30.

If the claim refers to other parts of the specification and drawings, those parts are to be examined in connection with it, in order to ascertain what is claimed in the summary as the new improvement. Hovey *v.* Stevens, 3 W. & M. 17; s. c. 2 Robb 567; Heinrich *v.* Luther, 6 McLean 345.

Mere matters of adjustment of the individual elements of a combination are not limited or controlled by the drawings, unless: 1. They are expressly so limited by the specifications as well; or, 2. Such limitation and control are necessary to maintain the integrity of the specifications taken as a whole, or of some essential part or parts thereof; or, 3. Such limitation and control are essential to produce the result claimed. Hamilton *v.* Ives, 6 Fish. 244; s. c. 3 O. G. 30.

Although the drawings may be referred to in construing the patent, yet they can not supply an omission in a specification or claim. Tinker *v.* W. E. M. & R. Manuf. Co., 5 Ban & Ard. 92; s. c. 1 Fed. Rep. 138.

The courts will look at the model, which is as much a part of the patent as the specification, and which the statute requires to be preserved, in order to illustrate anything that may be doubtful to the mechanic who undertakes to make the machine from the patent after the patent has expired. Hoffheins *v.* Brandt, 3 Fish. 218; Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 3 Cliff. 408; s. c. 4 Fish. 224.

Where the construction of the patent and specification as to the subject of the grant is doubtful, the affidavit, if more precise, may be resorted to in order to explain the ambiguity. Pettibone *v.* Derringer, 4 Wash. C. C. 215; s. c. 1 Robb 152.

In construing a reissue the specifications in both the original and reissue will be examined. Forsyth *v.* Clapp, 6 Fish. 523; s. c. 1 Holmes 278; s. c. 4 O. G. 527; Atlantic Giant Powder Co. *v.* Mowbray, 12 O. G. 560; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 442; Swain P. Manuf. Co. *v.* Ladd, 102 U. S. 409; s. c. 19 O. G. 62; s. c. 11 O. G. 153; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 488.

The patent must be construed without reference to the previous correspondence and previously rejected applications, especially if the patent issued correctly describes the invention. Piper *v.* Brown, 4 Fish. 175; Johnson *v.* Root, 1 Fish. 351; Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 3 Cliff. 408; s. c. 4 Fish. 224.

The construction of a patent must certainly depend on the words of the instrument, but, where the words are ambiguous, there may be circumstances which ought to have great influence in expounding them. The intention of the parties, if that intention can be collected from sources which the principles of the law permit courts to explore, are entitled to great consideration. The parties are the Government, acting by its agents, and the patentee. Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 243.

Whether the specification is for a principle or not is to be decided in view of the art, the character of the machine, the entire specifications, drawings and claims. Few cases constitute precedents for others. Because some tribunals in a particular case decided that certain words, when used in connection with their accompanying incidents, did import a claim for a result or principle, another tribunal should not treat these decisions as setting up a formula in all circumstances involving a similar meaning. They assert no such rule. All go upon a full critical review of the accompanying facts in reference to which they have been used, excluding the idea that other courts are not to perform the same duty. Words identical should be rendered as diversely as the conditions in which they are employed demand, in order not to defeat the fairly presumed intention of those who use them. Union Paper Bag Co. *v.* Nixon, 6 Fish. 402; s. c. 9 O. G. 691; s. c. 4 O. G. 31; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 244.

Whether the thing claimed to have been invented is sufficiently described in the patent is in its nature a question of law, for it depends upon the construction of a written instrument. If technical terms are used pecu-

liar to mechanics in describing the invention, evidence may be heard in explanation of those terms, and in such case a jury may be necessary. Unless the thing claimed to be invented is so described as to be known from every other thing, the patent is void, and this must be determined by the court. Brooks *v.* Jenkins, 3 McLean 432; Davis *v.* Palmer, 2 Brock. 298; s. c. 1 Robb 518; Washburn *v.* Gould, 3 Story 122; s. c. 2 Robb 206; Davoll *v.* Brown, 1 W. & M. 53; s. c. 2 Robb 303.

The construction seldom rests on facts to be proved by parol, unless they are so referred to as to make a part of the description and to govern it; and when it does at all depend upon them, and they are proved or admitted, and are without dispute, it is the duty of the court on these facts to give the legal construction to the instrument. Davoll *v.* Brown, 1 W. & M. 53; s. c. 2 Robb 303.

The description of the operation and effect of each separate element of a combination must be read and construed with reference to the entire combination and its results, and the effect which the operation of each element has upon that of each of the others. Hamilton *v.* Ives, 6 Fish. 244; s. c. 3 O. G. 30.

The description or title of the invention ought not to be repugnant to the specification, but provided it honestly sets forth, in few words, the "nature and design" of the patent, it is sufficient. The specification must be looked to for the full disclosure of the discovery, and the extent of the inventor's claims. While the specification is usually, and always ought to be, drawn with the assistance of learned and able counsel, the short description or title in the patent is usually suggested by the commissioner of patents. The extent of the patentee's rights must be judged from the whole instrument taken together, and not from any one sentence. Sickles *v.* Gloucester Manuf'g Co., 1 Fish. 222; s. c. 3 Wall. Jr. 186; Goodyear *v.* Central R. R. Co., 1 Fish. 626; s. c. 2 Wall. Jr. 356; Hogg *v.* Emerson, 6 How. 437; s. c. 11 How. 587; 2 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Robb 655; Matthew *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602; Whittemore *v.* Cutter, 1 Gall. 429; s. c. 1 Robb 28.

The patentee is not controlled by his title, but the patent, specifications and drawings are all to be examined, and are all to have a fair and liberal construction in determining the nature and extent of the invention. Bell *v.* Daniels, 1 Fish. 372; s. c. 1 Bond 212; Parker *v.* Stiles, 5 McLean 44; Pitts *v.* Whitman, 2 Story 609; s. c. 2 Robb 189; Locomotive Co. *v.* Railway Co., 6 Fish. 187; s. c. 10 Blatch. 292; 3 O. G. 93.

The patent and specification are connected together and dependent on each other for support. The specification should maintain the title of the patent. The latter should not indicate one thing and the former describe another as the subject of the grant. Sullivan *v.* Redfield, 1 Paine 441; s. c. 1 Robb 477.

Construction.

A patent can not be construed to cover parts which have been omitted, although such omission will not vitiate it, unless they were made with a view to deceive the public. Burden *v.* Corning, 2 Fish. 477.

The courts have no power to correct a mistake in letters patent. Their duty is to construe the specification and claim as they stand, and determine the legal effect of the claim. Kittle *v.* Merriam, 2 Curt. 475.

If enough is left after the rejection of an erroneous description to clearly and certainly identify the mode of constructing the machine, the rule *error demonstrationis non nocet* applies. Kittle *v.* Merriam, 2 Curt. 475.

A defect should be clear and palpable to justify a court in saying that a patent is a nullity. It is subject to scrutiny before it passes into the hands of the patentee. The whole claim of the inventor is subjected to an officer who acts under oath, and who is usually a man well skilled in natural philosophy and mechanical science generally, and who would not be justified in granting a patent to any person unless, in his judgment, the specification was sufficiently clear. Judson *v.* Moore, 1 Fish. 544; s. c. 1 Bond 29[illegible]

No court of justice is at liberty to strike out any words which are sensible in the place where they occur, and are capable of a distinct application. Effect is to be given, if practicable, to all the words as containing a distinct expression of the intention of the party. Ames *v.* Howard, 1 Sum. 482; s. c. 1 Robb 689; Day *v.* Combination Rubber Co., 17 O. G. 1347; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 385; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 570.

An error of expression apparent on the face both of the patent and specification, by which no person could be misled, will not invalidate the patent. Kneass *v.* Schuylkill Bank, 4 Wash. C. C. 9; s. c. 1 Robb 303.

It is the province and duty of the court to settle the meaning of the patent, and if that can not be ascertained satisfactorily upon the face of the specification, the law declares it insufficient for ambiguity and uncertainty. The specification is laid before the jury as defined and settled by the exposition of the court, and the matters of fact presented by the respective parties to support or defeat the patent are then to be examined and applied, as if the construction fixed by the court had been incorporated in the specification. Hogg *v.* Emerson, 2 Blatch. 1; s. c. 11 How. 587; 6 How. 437; s. c. 2 Robb 655.

Although there is some ambiguity and uncertainty in a part of the specification, yet, if taking the whole together, the court can perceive the exact nature and extent of the claim made by the inventor, it is bound to adopt that interpretation and to give it full effect. Ryan *v.* Goodwin, 3 Sum. 514; s. c. 1 Robb 725; Swift *v.* Whisen, 3 Fish. 343; s. c. 2 Bond 115; Middletown Co. *v.* Judd, 3 Fish. 141.

Whether a claim is vague and uncertain is a question of law to be determined by the rules of construction applied in the light of the state of the art. Blake *v.* Stafford, 3 Fish. 294; s. c. 6 Blatch. 195.

A description, though in some respects obscure, imperfect, or not so intelligible as to fully answer all the objects of the law, is good if it enables the court to specify the improvement or invention patented from the face of the patent and accompanying papers. It is enough if there is a substantial description of the thing patented, though defective in form or

mode of explanation. Whitney *v.* Emmett, Bald. 303; s. c. 1 Robb 567; Judson *v.* Moore, 1 Fish. 544; s. c. 1 Bond 285; Wayne *v.* Holmes, 2 Fish. 20; Blake *v.* Stafford, 3 Fish. 294; s. c. 6 Blatch. 195.

The patentee is not to be bound down to any precise form of words, and it is sufficient if the court can clearly ascertain by fair interpretation what he intends to claim, and what his language truly imports, even though the expressions are inaccurately or imperfectly drawn. Wyeth *v.* Stone, 1 Story 273; s. c. 2 Robb 23.

The meaning of letters patent, like other grants or written instruments, must be ascertained by the language employed as applied to the subject-matter. Goodyear Dental Co. *v.* Gardner, 3 Cliff. 408; s. c. 4 Fish. 224.

Where the language employed is clear and unambiguous, it must speak its own construction in the specification of a patent, as well as in any other grant issued by public authority. Mitchell *v.* Tilghman, 4 Fish. 599; s. c. 19 Wall. 287; 5 O. G. 299; s. c. 9 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Fish. 518.

Language invoked to support a particular theory must be such as is fit, when it is compared with the whole instrument, to express the imputed intention, else the theory can not be supported. Mitchell *v.* Tilghman, 4 Fish. 599; s. c. 19 Wall. 287; 5 O. G. 299; s. c. 9 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Fish. 518.

Particular passages in the description must not be separated from what precedes or follows in the same connection, but one part of the instrument must be compared with another, and the whole considered together, in order to determine whether it is incomplete and ambiguous or sufficient to uphold the claim of the patent. Howes *v.* Nute, 4 Cliff. 173; s. c. 4 Fish. 263.

Whether a patent claims too much is a question of law to be determined by the rules of construction, applied in the light of the state of the art. Blake *v.* Stafford, 3 Fish. 294; s. c. 6 Blatch. 195.

If a combination is expressly claimed in one claim by apt and appropriate language, it must be inferred that if it had been intended to claim a combination merely in another claim, appropriate language to indicate such intention would have been used. Burden *v.* Corning, 2 Fish. 477.

In construing a claim the court can not look to a single phrase only to the exclusion of all the residue of the writing. Kittle *v.* Merriam, 2 Curt. 475.

The disclaimer at the close of a specification estops the patentee from setting up any privilege to the part disclaimed, and the summary is equally binding on him as a limitation to the thing patented. Whitney *v.* Emmett, Bald. 303; s. c. 1 Robb 567.

Where mere changes of form become patentable by reason of involving functional differences, the patent should be so construed as to allow subsequent inventors to devise other changes of form involving other functional changes, where the same result is not attained in substantially the same way. Swain T. Manuf. Co. *v.* Ladd, 11 O. G. 153; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 488; s. c. 102 U. S. 409; s. c. 19 O. G. 62.

Similar substance means a substance having the same property, and not a substance having the same chemical constituents. Roots *v.* Hyndman, 6 Fish. 439; s. c. 4 O. G. 29.

A literal construction is not to be adopted where it would be repugnant to the manifest sense and reason of the instrument. Brown *v.* Guild, 23 Wall. 181; s. c. 6 O. G. 392; 7 O. G. 739.

The patentee's rights depend on the claim in the patent according to its proper construction, and not upon what he may erroneously suppose it covers. If at one time he insists on too much, and at another time on too little, he does not thereby work any prejudice to the rights actually secured to him. Masury *v.* Anderson, 6 Fish. 457; s. c. 11 Blatch. 162; 4 O. G. 55.

Although the patentee files a disclaimer of a certain form of the invention in order to obtain a reissue, yet if the patent includes the form as an equivalent, the disclaimer is a mere nullity. Union Metallic Cartridge Co. *v.* U. S. Cartridge Co., 7 Fed. Rep. 344.

The words of a specification are to be taken together, and they are to be so construed as to give effect to the meaning and intention of the person using them. Words are not to be distorted from their meaning so as to effect what may be supposed to have been the intention of the person using them; but they are to have a reasonable construction as connected with the sentence in which they are used. Allen *v.* Hunter, 6 McLean 303; Russell Manuf. Co. *v.* Mallory, 5 Fish. 632; s. c. 10 Blatch. 140; 2 O. G. 495.

It is material to ascertain what was in point of fact the invention, for there is a reasonable presumption that the intention of the inventor was to obtain, and of the Government to concede to him, the exclusive right to what he actually invented. Kittle *v.* Merriam, 2 Curt. 475.

The construction should not be broader than the whole subject-matter and description and nature of the case indicate as designed. It should not be fancied, but rather what is natural and clear considering what already exists on the subject. Smith *v.* Downing, 1 Fish. 64; Trader *v.* Messmore, 7 O. G. 385; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 639.

There is no artificial or universal rule of interpretation beyond that which common sense furnishes, which is to construe the instrument as a whole, and to extract from the descriptive words and the claim what the invention is which is intended to be patented, and how far it is capable of exact ascertainment, and how far it is maintainable in point of law. Carver *v.* Braintree Manuf. Co., 2 Story 432; s. c. 2 Robb 141.

An amended specification which is not completed may be considered as an explanation by the patentee of his intended meaning, and can be referred to in considering whether the words, as used in the original specification, carry out clearly or not what is said to have been intended. Hovey *v.* Stevens, 3 W. & M. 17; s. c. 2 Robb 567.

Where the fair interpretation of the words employed to describe an invention includes matters not in the mind of the patentee at the time, he is as fully authorized to claim the unlooked for as the anticipated result. Welling *v.* Rubber Co., 7 O. G. 606; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 283.

The legal construction of every general claim is that the patentee means to limit the same to his described method or process; or, if it be a machine, to his described means of obtaining or accomplishing the described results. Usually the claim contains the words "as described," or "substantially as described," or words of like import, which are everywhere understood as referring back to the descriptive parts of the specification. Words of such import, if not expressed in the claim, must be implied. Mitchell *v.* Tilghman, 4 Fish. 599; s. c. 19 Wall. 287; 5 O. G. 299; s. c. 9 Blatch. 1; s. c. 2 Fish. 518; Dederick *v.* Cassell, 20 O. G. 1233; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 306.

The words "substantially as described and shown," relate only to material features of the combination specified, and these are to be ascertained by considering the object or purpose of the machine, and what are the elements of the combination which create its distinctive character, and are effective in producing the peculiar result for which the contrivance is made. Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* Miller, 15 Fish. 48; s. c. 9 Blatch. 77; Knox *v.* Murtha, 9 Blatch. 205; s. c. 5 Fish. 174.

The phrase "substantially the same," means the same in all important particulars. Adams *v.* Edwards, 1 Fish. 1.

On account of the great vagueness and indefiniteness of the language used in describing the various arts, machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter, it is almost impossible to describe the real nature of many discoveries or processes in language free from ambiguity or misconstruction. Different persons looking at it from different points of view, would describe it in different terms. Still, if the patentee has fully set forth his invention, he has done all that the law requires, and is entitled to its protection. The patent should be carefully examined to find the thing discovered; and if it be clearly set forth, the patentee should not suffer for the imperfection or vagueness of the language used in describing its true extent and nature. Goodyear *v.* Central R. R. Co., 1 Fish. 626; s. c. 2 Wall. Jr. 356.

There are few things more difficult, even for well-educated and practiced lawyers, than to describe a new invention clearly, and point out the principle which distinguishes the subject of it from all things known before. As inventors are rarely experts either in philology or law, it has long been established as a rule that their writings are to be scanned with a good degree of charity. But it is easy to abuse this liberality to the purposes of fraud. The public has rights to be guarded also, and these exact that the patentee's specification shall set forth his invention so fully and definitely that it can not be readily misunderstood. French *v.* Rodgers, 1 Fish. 133.

A patent for a gold pen can not be extended beyond the peculiar shape, form, or mode of construction which the patentee alleges he has invented. Rapp *v.* Bard, 1 Fish. 196.

What is the character of the grant made by the patent is a question of law, and must be determined by the court, and the jury must consider that the patent purports to grant that which the court shall determine it

to grant. Serrell *v.* Collins, 1 Fish. 289; Buck *v.* Hermance, 1 Blatch. 398; Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Douglass, 2 Fish. 330; Union Sugar Refinery *v.* Matthiessen, 3 Cliff. 639; s. c. 2 Fish. 600; Teese *v.* Phelps, 1 McAl. 48; Clark Patent Co. *v.* Copeland, 2 Fish. 221; Case *v.* Brown, 2 Fish. 268; s. c. 2 Wall. 320; 1 Biss. 382; Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* N. Y. Brass Co., 3 Fish. 43; Winans *v.* Denmead, 15 How. 330; s. c. 4 Am. L. J. 498; Conover *v.* Roach, 4 Fish. 12; Cahoon *v.* Ring, 1 Fish. 397; s. c. 1 Cliff. 592; Conover *v.* Rapp, 4 Fish. 57; Foss *v.* Herbert, 2 Fish. 31; s. c. 1 Biss. 121; Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602.

The interpretation of the specification is for the court. Experts are examined only to aid in interpreting the language of art, as other translators are. Batten *v.* Clayton, 2 Whart. Dig. 363.

Trade-Mark.

When a patent expires, the patentee can not claim a trade-mark in the name by which the patented invention was known. Singer Manuf. Co. *v.* Riley, 11 Fed. Rep. 706; Singer Manuf. Co. *v.* Stanage, 6 Fed. Rep. 279.

A manufacturer is entitled to be protected in the trade-mark on his articles although he makes them in accordance with a patent that has expired. Singer Manuf. Co. *v.* Brill, 9 A. L. Rec. 43.

If a machine constructed according to a patent acquires a particular name, a person who manufactures it after the expiration of the patent may call it by that name, but he must put some mark on it to indicate that it was not manufactured by the patentee. Singer Manuf. Co. *v.* Larsen, 8 Biss. 151; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 246.

When the patent expires, a person who has manufactured the thing patented under a trade name has the right to use the trade name as well as to manufacture the thing patented. Filley *v.* Child, 16 O. G. 261; s. c. 16 Blatch. 376; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 353.

Although the patentee used a certain form of a frame which was not covered by the patent, yet he is not entitled to the exclusive use of this after the expiration of the patent. Wilcox & G. S. M. Co. *v.* Frame, 24 O. G. 1272; s. c. 17 Fed. Rep. 623.

SEC. 4885. Every patent shall bear date as of a day not later than six months from the time at which it was passed and allowed and notice thereof was sent to the applicant or his agent; and if the final fee is not paid within that period the patent shall be withheld.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 23, 16 Stat. 201.

Prior Statutes—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 8, 5 Stat. 120.—March 3, 1863, ch. 102, § 3, 12 Stat. 796.

When Jurisdiction Ends.

The notice of allowance is the precise act which ends the jurisdiction of the examiner. Until notice that a patent has been passed and allowed has been sent to the applicant or his agent, it is not officially passed or allowed in the sense of the law or the rules. Starr, 15 O. G. 1053.

A mental determination of an examiner, whether communicated to an applicant or not, can not preclude a reconsideration and contrary decision unless his determination takes the official form prescribed by the law or rules. Starr, 15 O. G. 1053.

A reconsideration of the merits by an examiner on his own motion is permissible in all cases until the official notice of allowance is given. Starr, 15 O. G. 1053.

SEC. 4886. Any person who has invented or discovered any new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, not known or used by others in this country, and not patented or described in any printed publication in this or any foreign country, before his invention or discovery thereof, and not in public use or on sale for more than two years prior to his application, unless the same is proved to have been abandoned, may, upon payment of the fees required by law, and other due proceedings had, obtain a patent therefor.

Statute Revised—July 8, 1870, ch. 230, § 24, 16 Stat. 201.

Prior Statutes—Feb. 21, 1793, ch. 11, § 1, 1 Stat. 318.—April 17, 1800, ch. 25, § 1, 2 Stat. 37.—July 4, 1836, ch. 357, § 6, 7, 5 Stat. 119.

Invention.

Discovery is synonymous with invention. A discovery which merely consists in bringing to light that which existed before, but was not known, is not the subject of a patent. No discovery will entitle the discoverer to a patent which does not in effect amount to the contrivance or production of something which did not exist before. *Ex parte* John F. Kemper, Cranch Pat. Dec. 89.

Invention in the sense of the patent law is the finding out, contriving, devising, or creating something new and useful, which did not exist before, by an operation of the intellect. New York *v.* Ransom, 1 Fish. 252; s. c. 23 How. 487; Conover *v.* Roach, 4 Fish. 12; Potter *v.* Whitney, 3 Fish. 77; s. c. 1 Lowell 87.

A subject-matter to be patentable must require invention, but is not necessarily the result of long and painful study, or embodied alone in complex mechanism. A single flash of thought may reveal to the mind of the inventor the new idea, and a frail and simple contrivance may

embody it. Some inventions are the result of long and weary years of study and labor pursued in the face of abortive experiments and baffled attempts, and finally reached after the severest struggles, while others are the fruit of a single happy thought. Magic Ruffle Co. *v.* Douglass, 2 Fish. 330; Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602; Many *v.* Sizer, 1 Fish. 17; Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668; Carstaedt *v.* U. S. Corset Co., 13 Blatch. 371; s. c. 10 O. G. 3; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 331; Earle *v.* Sawyer, 4 Mason 1; s. c. 1 Robb 491; Blake *v.* Stafford, 3 Fish. 294; s. c. 6 Blatch. 195; Carr *v.* Rice, 1 Fish. 198; Middletown Co. *v.* Judd, 3 Fish. 141.

If with the knowledge that the public had at the time of the alleged discovery, it required no invention, but simply the ordinary skill and ingenuity of a mechanic to produce the invention—in other words, if the inventive faculty was not at work at all, and was not needed to produce the alleged invention, then the patent would be void because there would be no invention to be secured to the patentee. Carter *v.* Messinger, 11 Blatch. 34; New York *v.* Ransom, 1 Fish. 252; s. c. 23 How. 487; Kirby *v.* Beardsley, 3 Fish. 265; s. c. 5 Blatch. 438; Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117; Tucker *v.* Spaulding, 1 Deady 649; s. c. 13 Wall. 453; s. c. 1 O. G. 142; s. c. 5 Fish. 297; Larrabee *v.* Cortlan, 3 Fish. 5; s. c. Taney, 180; Knox *v.* Murtha, 5 Fish. 174; s. c. 9 Blatch. 205; Haselden *v.* Ogden, 3 Fish. 378; Day *v.* Telegraph Co., 5 Fish. 268; s. c. 9 Blatch. 345; 10 O. G. 551; Wood Paper Co. *v* Heft, 3 Fish. 316; s. c. 8 Wall. 333; Dane *v.* Chicago Manuf. Co., 3 Biss. 380; 2 O. G. 677; 7 O. G. 924; Dunbar *v.* Myers, 94 U. S. 187; s. c. 11 O. G. 35; Needham *v.* Washburn, 7 O. G. 648; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 537; Gardner *v.* Herz, 12 Fed. Rep. 491; s. c. 22 O. G. 683; Perry *v.* Co-operative Foundry Co., 12 Fed. Rep. 149; Wilson Packing Co. *v.* Chicago P. & P. Co., 21 O. G. 411; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 547; Ingersoll *v.* Turner, 12 O. G. 189; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 89; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 859; Gould *v.* Ballard, 13 O. G. 1081; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 324; Wilson Packing Co. *v.* Clapp, 8 Biss. 545; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 355; Couse *v.* Johnson, 16 O. G. 719; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 501; Root *v.* Welsh Manuf. Co., 17 O. G. 849; Tifft *v.* Sharp, 17 O. G. 1284; s. c. 18 Blatch. 138; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 416; s. c. 10 Fed. Rep. 673; Belt *v.* Crittenden, 2 Fed. Rep. 82; 1 McCrary 208; s. c. 18 O. G. 191; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 131; Perfection W. C. Co. *v.* Bosley, 2 Fed. Rep. 574; s. c. 9 Biss. 385; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 449; McMurray *v.* Miller, 16 Fed. Rep. 471; Pearce *v.* Mulford, 102 U. S. 112; s. c. 18 O. G. 1223; Slawson v. Railroad Co., 17 Blatch. 512; s. c. 24 O. G. 99; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 210; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 531; Atlantic Works *v.* Brady, 23 O. G. 1330; s. c. 10 O. G. 702; s. c. 4 Cliff. 408; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 436; Stephenson *v.* Brooklyn C. T. R. R. Co., 19 Blatch. 473; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 457; Ingersoll *v.* Turner, 12 O. G. 189; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 89; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 859; Griffiths *v.* Holmes, 20 O. G. 449; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 154; Boykin *v.* Baker, 4 Hughes 282; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 699; Guidet *v.* Brooklyn, 105 U. S. 550; s. c. 21 O. G. 1692; s. c. 13 O. G. 773; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 291; Searls *v.* Merriam, 22 O. G. 1040; Backus W. M. Co. *v.* Guirk, 17 Fed. Rep. 350.

It is exceedingly difficult to draw a line between what may be regarded by the eye as a small improvement or invention and one of magnitude. Oftentimes improvements and discoveries the most important in their consequences and in their beneficial effects on the business interests of the community are among the simplest ideas of the mind. On the other hand, improvements of less magnitude in their consequences and beneficial effects indicate a most laborious and complex action of the mind of the inventor. Seymour *v.* McCormick, 19 How. 96; s. c. 3 Blatch. 209.

The difficulty is in drawing the line between invention and mere construction. There are some things that everybody knows. The common uses of common materials are supposed to be known. If a man merely makes a machine out of iron that has been made out of wood, that is no invention, because everybody knows that a constructor can make a machine of iron instead of wood. There may even be a discovery which is not an invention, as, for instance, the application of a machine to a new use. The man who made the first invention made it for all the uses to which it is applicable. Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117; Kirby *v.* Beardsley, 3 Fish. 265; s. c. 5 Blatch. 438.

The difficulty of drawing the line of distinction between invention and mere obvious manual changes following the beaten track of mechanical experience, has inclined courts to give a liberal construction to the law so as to protect every contrivance that can be called new, which proves at all useful. Care has been taken to give the benefit of doubt as to originality or creative thought to the inventor, so as to nourish inventive enterprise by lending encouragement to every degree of merit. Kirby *v.* Beardsley, 3 Fish. 265; s. c. 5 Blatch. 438; Tuck *v.* Bramhill, 3 Fish. 400; s. c. 6 Blatch. 95; Whipple *v.* Middlesex Co., 4 Fish. 41; McMillin *v.* Barclay, 5 Fish. 189; s. c. 4 Brews. 275; Stanley Works *v.* Sargent, 4 Fish. 443; s. c. 8 Blatch. 344; Penn Salt. Co. *v.* Thomas, 5 Fish. 148; s. c. 8 Phila. 144; Woodman M. Co. *v.* Guild, 4 Cliff. 185; Stewart *v.* Mahoney, 4 Ban & Ard. 84; s. c. 5 Fed. Rep. 302; Mallory Manuf. Co. *v.* Marks, 20 O. G. 1521; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 887.

With regard to the degree of mental labor and inventive skill required in the work of invention, the law has no nice or rigid standard. There must be some inventive skill exercised, but the degree of that skill is not material. It not unfrequently happens in the progress of the mechanic arts that the time arrives when the whole atmosphere of inventive thought is quickened with the life of an approaching discovery; that many lines of investigation and experiment converging for a long time toward the point, almost but not quite reach it, when at last some mind by a happy thought supplies some new element or instrument, or mode of organization, and instantly gives birth to the organized idea. Clark Patent Co. *v.* Copeland, 2 Fish. 221.

The simplicity of an invention, so far from being an objection to it, may constitute its great excellence and value. Indeed, to produce a great result by very simple means before unknown or unthought of, is not unfrequently the peculiar characteristic of the very highest class of minds.

Ryan *v.* Goodwin, 3 Sum. 514; s. c. 1 Robb 725; *In re* Pennock, 1 McArthur 531; s. c. 5 O. G. 668; Lorillard Co. *v.* McDowell, 11 O. G. 640; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 531; Brainard *v.* Palsifer, 7 Fed. Rep. 349.

Almost all inventions that become the subject of patents are the embodiment and adaptation of appliances that are old, and if the article so produced is new and useful it is patentable, although an old article could have been easily altered or adapted so as to form the new one. Crandal *v.* Walters, 21 O. G. 945; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 659.

If a novel and useful result has been obtained, neither the simplicity of the structure, nor the greater or less amount of invention or intellect employed as an element, is of importance in determining the validity of the patent. The distinction is that where there is a mere application of an old thing to a new use it is not patentable, but where there is exhibited an inventive faculty in the process it is. Teese *v.* Phelps, 1 McAl. 48; Barnes *v.* Straus, 5 Fish. 531; s. c. 9 Blatch. 553; 2 O. G. 62.

Unless more skill and ingenuity are required in the discovery than are possessed by an ordinary mechanic acquainted with the business, there is an absence of that degree of skill and ingenuity which constitute essential elements of every invention. In other words, the improvement is the work of the skilful mechanic, not that of the inventor. Hotchkiss *v.* Greenwood, 11 How. 248; s. c. 4 McLean 456; s. c. 2 Robb 730; Teese *v.* Phelps, 1 McAl. 48; Fisher *v.* Craig, 3 Saw. 69; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 365; Treadwell *v.* Parrott, 3 Fish. 124; s. c. 5 Blatch. 369; Reed *v.* Reed, 12 Blatch. 366; s. c. 8 O. G. 193; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 575.

If an article is new and useful, the fact that no mechanic ever made it is a sufficient answer to the suggestion that it did not require invention. Dederick *v.* Cassell, 20 O. G. 1233; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 306.

The fact that previous experimenters wanted to obtain the result and failed tends to show that the inventor was not merely contending with mechanical difficulties, but that he had a problem which required the skill of the inventor to solve. Terry Clock Co. *v.* New Haven Clock Co., 17 O. G. 909; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 332.

The accidental making of an article, without any knowledge on the part of the producer of how to accomplish it, with utter inability on his part to produce another like it, is not an invention. A single fortuitous success is not invention within the protection of the patent law. Pelton *v.* Waters, 21 I. R. R. 125; s. c. 7 O. G. 425; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 599; Monce *v.* Adams, 12 Blatch. 1; s. c. 7 O. G. 177; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 126.

The degree of labor and thought may be sometimes evidence upon the question of invention. Many *v.* Sizer, 1 Fish. 17.

The validity of a patent does not depend on an opinion formed after the event, respecting the ease or difficulty of attaining it. Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668; Colgate *v.* West. Union Tel. Co., 14 O. G. 943; s. c. 15 Blatch. 365; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 37.

An invention in mechanics consists not in the discovery of new principles, but in new combinations of old principles. Tyler *v.* Devel, 1 A. L. J. 248; Stainthorp *v.* Elkinton, 1 Fish. 475.

When the patent is granted it becomes, to a certain extent, a contract upon the part of the Government, with the party named in the patent, that it will through its courts and in the ordinary course of the administration of justice, protect him in the exercise of the exclusive privilege which his patent gives to him. There would be no justice in granting to a party an exclusive privilege to use what he did not invent, because he would pay no consideration for the grant if he did not by his invention add to the stock of useful knowledge which may be applied for the benefit of the citizen. New York *v.* Ransom, 1 Fish. 252; s. c. 23 How. 487.

A patentable invention is a mental result. Everything within the domain of the conception belongs to him who conceived it. Smith *v.* Nichols, 6 Fish. 61; s. c. 21 Wall. 112; 1 Holmes 172; 2 O. G. 649.

A mere carrying forward, or new or more extended application of the original thought, a change only in degree, doing substantially the same thing in the same way, by substantially the same means, with better results, is not such an invention as will sustain a patent. Smith *v.* Nichols, 6 Fish. 61; s. c. 21 Wall. 112; 1 Holmes 172; 2 O. G. 649; Sawyer *v.* Miller, 12 Fed. Rep. 725; Theberath *v.* Rubber & C. H. T. Co., 23 O. G. 1121; s. c. 15 Fed. Rep. 246.

If a new idea is engrafted upon an old invention, and is distinct from the conception that preceded it, it is patentable. Heald *v.* Rice, 104 U. S. 737; s. c. 21 O. G. 1443.

The questions of invention, novelty or prior use are all questions of official judgment, and are all settled by the judgment of the commissioner. His judgment goes to the same extent on each question. He determines and decides for the purpose of issuing or refusing a patent. When the patent is sought to be enforced, the questions, and each of them, are open to judicial examination. Reckendorfer *v.* Faber, 92 U. S. 347; s. c. 12 Blatch. 68; 5 O. G. 697; 10 O. G. 71; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 229; Grant *v.* Raymond, 6 Pet. 218; s. c. 1 Robb 604.

Result as Evidence of Invention.

The result which has been produced may be considered in connection with the change, because the result, if greatly more beneficial than it was with the old contrivance, reflects back and tends to characterize in some degree the importance of the change. Hall *v.* Wiles, 2 Blatch. 194; Locomotive Truck Co. *v.* R. R. Co., 6 O. G. 927; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 470; Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117.

The superiority of an invention in utility and effect over what preceded it is proof tending to establish the fact of novelty. Birdsell *v.* McDonald, 6 O. G. 682; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 165; Stillwell & Bierce Manuf. Co. *v.* Cincinnati Gas Co., 7 O. G. 829; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 610; Washburn & M. Manuf. Co. *v.* Haish, 19 O. G. 173; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 900; Dunbar *v.* Albert Field T. Co., 4 Ban & Ard. 518; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 543; Shannon *v.* Stationery Co., 9 Fed. Rep. 205; s. c. 14 C. L. N. 57; Shedd *v.* Washburn, 9 Fed. Rep. 904; Stockton *v.* Maddock, 10 Fed. Rep. 132; Miller *v.* Pickering, 14 Fed. Rep. 540; s. c. 40 Leg. Int. 182.

If the device produces a new result, this is evidence of invention. Smith *v.* G. D. V. Co., 93 U. S. 486; s. c. 1 Holmes 354; 5 O. G. 585; 11 O. G. 246; 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 74; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 201; Loom Co. *v.* Higgins, 105 U. S. 580; s. c. 21 O. G. 2031; s. c. 15 Blatch. 446; s. c. 16 O. G. 675; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 88.

If the result is obtained in a better mode than was before known this is evidence of invention. Detroit Lubricator Manuf. Co. *v.* Penchard, 9 Fed. Rep. 293; Wood *v.* Packer, 17 Fed. Rep. 650.

If an article is rendered salable which was before unsalable, this is evidence of invention. Sargent *v.* Yale Lock Manuf. Co., 17 O. G. 106; s. c. 17 Blatch. 249; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 579.

Whenever a change or device is new and accomplishes beneficial results, the courts look with favor upon it. The law in such cases has no nice standard by which to gauge the degree of mental power or inventive genius brought into play in originating the new device. Middletown Co. *v.* Judd, 3 Fish. 141; Sewell *v.* Jones, 6 Fish. 343; s. c. 3 O. G. 630; s. c. 3 Cliff. 563; s. c. 91 U. S. 171; s. c. 9 O. G. 47; *In re* Pennock, 1 McArthur 531; s. c. 5 O. G. 668; Potter *v.* Holland, 1 Fish. 382; s. c. 4 Blatch. 238; Hoe *v.* Cottrill, 17 Blatch. 546; s. c. 18 O. G. 59; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 256; s. c. 1 Fed. Rep. 597; Collins Co. *v.* Coes, 3 Fed. Rep. 225; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 548.

If the new device has displaced other devices which had been used previously for analogous purposes, this fact may be considered, and when the other facts leave it doubtful whether the device involves a patentable invention, this is sufficient to turn the scale. Smith *v.* G. D. V. Co., 93 U. S. 486; s. c. 1 Holmes 354; 5 O. G. 585; 11 O. G. 246; 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 74; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 201; Weston *v.* Nash, 1 Holmes 488; s. c. 7 O. G. 1096; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 40; Ward *v.* Grand Detour Plow Co., 14 Fed. Rep. 696; Western E. Manuf. Co. *v.* Chicago E. Manuf. Co., 14 Fed. Rep. 691; Lindsay *v.* Stein, 21 O. G. 1613; s. c. 10 Fed. Rep. 907; Eclipse Windmill Co. *v.* May, 17 Fed. Rep. 344; Pickering *v.* Miller, 25 O. G. 89.

Although the utility of a device is entitled to great weight in considering the question of patentability, yet if the device did not involve the exercise of the inventive faculty, its very utility is an aggravation of the wrong done by the patentee in seizing and appropriating that which properly belongs to the public. Phillips *v.* Detroit, 17 O. G. 191; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 347.

Merely making an article better than it was ever made before by the use of known equivalents for some of the elements of the prior structure does not involve invention. Crouch *v.* Roemer, 103 U. S. 797; s. c. 19 O. G. 1067; 2 Ban & Ard. 637; Hatch *v.* Moffit, 15 Fed. Rep. 252.

If an invention is novel and useful in itself, it is patentable although it is not better than or superior to all other things. Shaw *v.* Colwell Lead Co., 11 Fed. Rep. 711.

Invention in Reference to Change.

Although the invention differs from prior inventions, yet if the variance does not involve the exercise of the inventive faculty it is not patentable. Phillips *v.* Detroit, 17 O. G. 191; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 347.

Although an article is old, yet if invention is required to adapt it to a new purpose, the inventor is entitled to a patent on his discovery in all its parts. Sharp *v.* Tifft, 17 O. G. 1282; s. c. 18 Blatch. 132; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 399; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 697; Yale Lock Manuf. Co. *v.* Norwich Nat'l Bank, 19 Blatch. 123; s. c. 6 Fed. Rep. 377.

Particular changes may be made in the construction and operation of an old machine so as to adapt it to a new and valuable use not known before, and to which the old machine had not been and could not be applied without those changes, and under those circumstances if the machine, as changed and modified, produces a new and useful result, it may be patented. Seymour *v.* Osborne, 3 Fish. 555; s. c. 11 Wall. 516.

A slight change sometimes of a known machine, or in some of its parts, will effect surprising results, and to protect a party who, by inventing such change, has produced a new and useful result, is one of the objects of the patent laws. Turrill *v.* Ill. Cent. R. R. Co., 3 Fish. 330; s. c. 3 Biss. 66.

If two inventions differ in principle, and there is a substantial difference in the product in which the invention is embodied and the purposes to which the product is to be applied, the latter invention is patentable. Jenkins *v.* Walker, 5 Fish. 347; s. c. 1 Holmes 120; 1 O. G. 359.

A contrivance which does not require the exercise of inventive power is not patentable. Brown *v.* Guild, 23 Wall. 181; s. c. 6 O. G. 392; 7 O. G. 739.

Substitution of Material.

The substitution of one material for another is not invention if the result is only greater cheapness and durability of product. A machine made in whole or in part of materials better adapted to the purpose than the materials of which the old one is constructed, and for that reason better and cheaper, can not be distinguished from the old one, or entitle the manufacturer to a patent. The difference is formal and destitute of ingenuity or invention. It may afford evidence of judgment and skill in the selection and adaptation of the materials in the manufacture of the instrument for the purposes intended, but nothing more. Hotchkiss *v.* Greenwood, 11 How. 248; s. c. 4 McLean 456; s. c. 2 Robb 730; Hicks *v.* Kelsey, 18 Wall. 670; s. c. 5 O. G. 94; Holbrook *v.* Small, 10 O. G. 508; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 396; Smith *v.* G. D. V. Co., 93 U. S. 486; s. c. 1 Holmes 354; 5 O. G. 585; 11 O. G. 246; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 201; 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 74; Terhune *v.* Phillips, 99 U. S. 592; Stow *v.* Chicago, 104 U. S. 547; s. c. 21 O. G. 790; s. c. 8 Biss. 47; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 83.

If the substitution of one material for another involves a new mode of construction, or develops new uses or properties of the article formed, it may amount to invention. The substitution may be something more

than formal. It may require contrivance, in which case the mode of making it would be patentable, or the result may be the production of an analogous, but substantially different article. Smith *v.* G. D. V. Co., 93 U. S. 486; s. c. 1 Holmes 354; 5 O. G. 585; 11 O. G. 246; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 201: s. c. 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 74; Putnam *v.* Weatherbee, 8 O. G. 320; 1 Holmes 497; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 78; Putnam *v.* Yerrington, 9 O. G. 689; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 237; Dalton *v.* Nelson, 13 Blatch. 357; s. c. 9 O. G. 1112; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 225; Goodyear D. V. Co. *v.* Root, 6 O. G. 154; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 384; Goodyear D. V. Co. *v.* Willis, 7 O. G. 41; s. c. 1 Flippin 385; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 568; U. S. Stamping Co. *v.* King, 17 O. G. 1399; s. c. 17 Blatch. 55; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 469: s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 860; Shuter *v.* Davis, 16 Fed. Rep. 564; s. c. 24 O. G. 365

The substitution of an india rubber covering for one of cloth may be an invention if it is important and valuable. Washing Machine Co. *v.* Lincoln, 4 Fish. 379.

If the patentee is not the inventor of the material, he can not obtain a patent for an article made therefrom which is similar to those made from other materials. Collar Co. *v.* Van Deusen, 5 Fish. 597; s. c. 10 Blatch. 109; 2 O. G. 361; 23 Wall. 530; 7 O. G. 919.

Change of Form.

A mere change of form is not patentable, because it involves no invention. It is simply the device of a mechanic. Sangster *v.* Miller, 2 Fish. 563; s. c. 5 Blatch. 243; Wicks *v.* Stevens, 2 Woods 310; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 318; Winans *v.* Denmead, 15 How. 330; s. c. 4 Am. L. J. 498; Evans *v.* Eaton, Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 3 Wheat. 454; 3 Wash. C. C. 443; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 193, 243, 336; Delano *v.* Scott, Gilp. 489; s. c. 1 Robb 700; Barrett *v.* Hall, 1 Mason 447; s. c. 1 Robb 207; Dixon *v.* Moyer, 4 Wash. C. C. 68; s. c. 1 Robb 324; Smith *v.* Pearce, 2 McLean 176; s. c. 2 Robb 13; Pettibone *v.* Derringer, 4 Wash. C. C. 215; s. c. 1 Robb 152; Flood *v.* Hicks, 4 Fish. 156; s. c. 2 Biss. 169; Brown *v.* Selby, 4 Fish. 363; s. c. 2 Biss. 457; Double Pointed Tack Co. *v.* I. R. Manuf. Co., 18 O. G. 683; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 465; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 26.

A formal change, such as a change in proportions, a mere change of form, or a different shape, is not a change within the meaning of the law. Hall *v.* Wiles, 2 Blatch. 194; *ex parte* Cutting, 11 O. G. 110; Buck *v.* Hermance, 1 Blatch. 398; Woodcock *v.* Parker, 1 Gallis. 438; s. c. 1 Robb 37; Day *v.* Telegraph Co., 5 Fish. 268; s. c. 9 Blatch. 345; 1 O. G. 551; Miller Falls Co. *v.* Backus, 17 O. G. 852; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 53.

A structural change of form and proportion, although it improves the operation without changing the mode of operation, and produces a better result, but of the same kind, is not patentable. Greely *v.* Commissioner, 6 Fish. 575; s. c. 1 Holmes 284; 4 O. G. 612.

If the change in form and location involves a functional difference beyond mere mechanical perfection and adjustment, and produces an improved product, it is patentable. Pearl *v.* Ocean Mills, 11 O. G. 2; s.

c. 2 Ban & Ard. 469 ; Pearl *v.* Appleton Company, 5 Ban & Ard. 553 ; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 153.

Sometimes form is of the very substance of an invention, and change of form is the invention itself. Eddy *v.* Dennis, 95 U. S. 560 ; s. c. 4 Fish. 423 ; New York B. & B. Co. *v.* Hoffman, 20 O. G. 1450 ; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 199.

If by changing the form and proportion a new effect is produced, there is not simply a change of form and proportion, but a change of principle also, and the invention is patentable. Davis *v.* Palmer, 2 Brock. 298 ; s. c. 1 Robb 518 ; Aiken *v.* Dolan, 3 Fish. 197 ; Thatcher Heating Co. *v.* Carbon Stove Co., 15 O. G. 1051 ; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 68 ; Strobridge *v.* Lindsay, 18 O. G. 62 : s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 411 ; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 692.

To change the form of an existing machine, and by means of such change to introduce and employ other mechanical principles or natural powers, or, as it is termed, a new mode of operation, and thus attain a new and useful result, is the subject of a patent. Winans *v.* Denmead, 15 How. 330 ; s. c. 4 Am. L. J. 498 ; Cahoon *v.* Ring, 1 Fish. 397 ; s. c. 1 Cliff. 593 ; Parham *v.* Sewing Machine Co., 4 Fish. 468 ; Isaacs *v.* Abrams, 14 O. G. 861 ; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 616 ; Eppinger *v.* Richey, 14 Blatch. 307 ; s. c. 12 O. G. 714 ; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 69 ; s. c. 23 I. R. R. 319.

The safest guide to accuracy in making the distinction between what constitutes form and what principle, is first to ascertain what is the result to be obtained by the discovery, and whatever is essential to that object, independent of the mere form and proportions of the things used for the purpose, may generally, if not universally, be considered as the principles of the invention. Treadwell *v.* Bladen, 4 Wash. C. C. 703 ; s. c. 1 Robb 531.

An invention of a peculiar form of a last is patentable. Mabie *v.* Haskell, 2 Cliff. 507.

There is no novelty in the mere change of the form of a die so as to change the form of that which is manipulated under the die. Smith *v.* American Bridge Co., 8 Biss. 312 ; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 565.

Change in Size.

The mere reduction of an article of bulk to one of a smaller size is not in general the subject of a patent as a new manufacture, unless the properties of the article are improved by the introduction of some new ingredient or by the subtraction of one or more of the ingredients of the original article, by which the new product is improved or made more useful. Glue Co. *v.* Upton, 96 U. S. 3 ; s. c. 6 O. G. 637 ; s. c. 4 Cliff. 237 ; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 497.

The enlargement of the organization of a machine does not afford any ground in the sense of the patent law for a patent. This is done every day by the ordinary mechanic in making a working machine from the patent model. Phillips *v.* Page, 24 How. 164.

The mere enlargement of an article does not constitute invention. Planing Machine Co. *v.* Keith, 101 U. S. 479; s. c. 17 O. G. 1031; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 100.

A mere reduction in size of an old device so as to make it small enough for a new use does not involve invention. Double Pointed Tack Co. *v.* T. R. Manuf. Co., 18 O. G. 683; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 465; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 26.

The making of a part of an old manufacture as a separate article of trade is not patentable. Seligman *v.* Day, 14 Blatch. 72; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 467.

Change in Mode of Making.

If the only difference between the old article and the new article is that the old article was cast or moulded and the new is drawn through a die, the invention is not patentable. McCloskey *v.* DuBois, 19 O. G. 1286; s. c. 20 O. G. 371; s. c. 19 Blatch. 205; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 710.

A change in the mode of cooking an article from broiling, roasting or steaming to boiling, all the other parts of the process remaining the same, does not involve invention. Packing Company Cases, 105 U. S. 566; s. c. 21 O. G. 1689.

The application of an old mode of baling hay to hay cut short is not patentable. Faulks *v.* Kamp, 17 O. G. 851; s. c. 17 Blatch. 452; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 73; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 898.

The mere transfer of a mode of constructing wooden slides to metallic slides is not invention. Carter *v.* Messinger, 11 Blatch. 34.

Change of Location.

The mere change of location of an old device is not patentable if the result is the same, and nothing new is required to adapt an apparatus in its new location. Marsh *v.* Dodge & Stevenson Manuf. Co., 6 Fish. 562; s. c. 5 O. G. 398; Stephenson *v.* Brooklyn C. T. R. C., 14 Fed. Rep. 457; s. c. 19 Blatch. 473.

Where change of location involves the employment of new devices to adapt an apparatus for use in the new position, and a beneficial result is produced, the location, in connection with such new devices, is patentable. Marsh *v.* Dodge & Stevenson Manuf. Co., 6 Fish. 562; s. c. 5 O. G. 398; G. & B. Manuf. Co. *v.* Tirrell, 12 Blatch. 144; s. c. 8 O. G. 2; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 315; Carstaedt *v.* U. S. Corset Co., 13 Blatch. 119; s. c. 9 O. G. 151; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 119; G. & B. Manuf. Co. *v.* Walworth, 9 O. G. 746; Singer Manuf. Co. *v.* Henry Stewart Manuf. Co., 20 O. G. 524; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 920; Moffitt *v.* Cavanagh, 17 Fed. Rep. 336; Eclipse Windmill Co. *v.* May, 17 Fed. Rep. 344.

The mere change of the location of the parts of a mechanism, so long as no different or additional function is performed, does not make the mechanism patentable. Dane *v.* Ill. Manuf. Co., 6 Fish. 124; s. c. 3 Biss. 374; 2 O. G. 330.

Change of Elements.

The mere substitution of an equivalent is not patentable. Cochrane *v.* Waterman, Cranch. Pat. Dec. 121.

The omission of an ingredient commonly supposed to be essential to a composition may be patentable. Tarr *v.* Folsom, 1 Holmes 312; s. c. 5 O. G. 92; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 24.

New Use.

A machine or apparatus, or other mechanical contrivance, in order to give the party a claim to a patent therefor, must in itself be substantially new. If it is old and well known, and applied only to a new purpose, that does not make it patentable. A coffee mill applied for the first time to grind oats or corn, or mustard, would not give a title to a patent for the machine. In short, the machine must be new, not merely the purpose to which it is applied. A purpose is not patentable; but the machinery only, if new, by which it is to be accomplished. In other words, the thing itself which is patented must be new, and not the mere application of it to a new purpose or object. Bean *v.* Smallwood, 2 Story 408; s. c. 2 Robb 133; Winans *v.* Bost. & Prov. R. R. Co., 2 Story 412; s. c. 2 Robb 136; Ames *v.* Howard, 1 Sum. 482; s. c. 1 Robb 689; Phillips *v.* Page, 24 How. 164; Sawyer *v.* Bixby, 5 Fish. 283; s. c. 9 Blatch. 361; 1 O. G. 165; Tucker *v.* Spaulding, 5 Fish. 297; s. c. 13 Wall. 453; 1 O. G. 144; s. c. 1 Deady 649; Smith *v.* Elliott, 5 Fish. 315; s. c. 9 Blatch. 400; 1 O. G. 331; Brown *v.* Hall, 3 Fish. 531, s. c. 6 Blatch. 401; Gallahue *v.* Butterfield, 6 Fish. 203; s. c. 10 Blatch. 232; 2 O. G. 645; Roberts *v.* Ryer, 91 U. S. 150; s. c. 6 Fish. 293; 11 Blatch. 11; 3 O. G. 550; 10 O. G. 204; *Ex parte* Hufeland. 1 O. G. 2.8; Northwestern Co. *v.* Philadelphia Co., 6 O. G 34; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 177; Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. *v.* Wright, 12 Blatch. 149; s. c. 6 O. G. 327; s. c. 94 U. S. 92; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 320; Couse *v.* Johnson, 16 O. G. 719; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 501; *Ex parte* Arkell, 15 Blatch. 437; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 80; Quirolo *v.* Ardito, 17 Blatch. 400; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 80; s. c. 1 Fed. Rep. 610; Western E. Manuf. Co. *v.* Ansonia B. & C. Co., 9 Fed. Rep. 706; s. c. 14 C. L. N. 121; Gottfried *v.* Crescent B. Co., 22 O. G. 497; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 762; Vinton *v.* Hamilton, 104 U. S. 485; s. c. 21 O. G. 557; Slawson *v.* Railroad Co., 17 Blatch. 512; s. c. 24 O. G. 99; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 210; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 531; Theberath *v.* Rubber & C. H. T. Co., 23 O. G. 1121; s. c. 15 Fed. Rep. 246; Heald *v.* Rice, 104 U. S. 737; s. c. 21 O. G. 1443; s. c. 13 Pac. L. R. 43; Palmenbing *v.* Bucholz, 23 O. G. 632; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 672; Am. Co. *v.* Anglo A. R. Co., 16 Fed. Rep. 915.

Invention or discovery is required as the proper foundation for a patent, and where both are wanting the applicant can not legally secure the privilege. Consequently where the claim rests merely upon the application of an old machine to a new use or to a new purpose, or upon the application of an old process to a new result, the patent can not be sustained

because, under those circumstances, the patentee has not invented or discovered any new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement, or any art, machine, manufacture or composition of matter not known or used by others, for which alone a patent can be ' ally granted. Bray *v.* Hartshorn, 1 Cliff. 538; Conover *v.* Roach, 4 Fish. 12.

If the principle is embodied in a machine used for a different purpose, the change from motion given by the hand to an automatic machine, makes no difference, and the party is not entitled to a patent. Singer *v.* Walmsley, 1 Fish. 558.

There is scarcely a patent granted that does not involve the application of an old thing to a new use, and that does not, in one sense, fail to involve anything more. But the merit consists in being the first to make the application, and the first to show how it can be made, and the first to show that there is utility in making it. Strong *v.* Noble, 3 Fish. 586; s. c. 6 Blatch. 477.

Old instruments placed in a new and different organization, producing in such new organization different results, or the same results by a new and different mode of operation, do not prevent such newly organized mechanism from being patentable. Clark Patent Co. *v.* Copeland, 2 Fish. 221; Gottfried *v.* P. Best. B. Co., 17 O. G. 675; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 4.

If the application of a method of corrugation to a new article requires experiment and invention to determine whether it can be made usefully, and develop a new mode of operation, as well as a new effect, it is patentable. Grosjean *v.* Peck, 11 Blatch. 54.

The use of a well-known substance in a particular but well-known form is not patentable, although the substance has never been used in that form before. Tarr *v.* Webb, 5 Fish. 593; s. c. 10 Blatch. 96; 2 O. G. 568.

A discovery of a new mode of operating an old machine to produce a new result does not give the discoverer the right to a monopoly of the old machine, although he may be entitled to a patent for the process. Boston E. F. Co. *v.* Rubber Thread Co., 1 Holmes 372; s. c. 5 O. G. 696; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 222.

The use of an old machine in a skilful mode well known in other arts in order to effect an old result is not patentable. Walker *v.* Rawson, 4 Ban & Ard. 128.

A person who takes something old and applies it in a new way or a new form, so as to produce a particular result, can not be protected beyond the particular way, or form, or device, and the application which he has made. Fuller *v.* Yentzer, 6 Biss. 203; s. c. 11 O. G. 551; s. c. 94 U. S. 288.

If an article has been made by hand in such a way that it may be used separately from the larger thing to which it is joined, though there has been no occasion so to use it, it is not patentable. Hatch *v.* Moffit, 15 Fed. Rep. 252.

The discovery of a new effect produced by old agents operating by old

means upon old subjects, however novel and important, is not patentable. It is nothing more in the eye of the law than the application of a well known agent by well known means, to a new or more perfect use. Morton *v.* N. Y. Eye Infirmary, 2 Fish. 320; s. c. 5 Blatch. 116.

A person who not merely supplies the public with a new article, but demonstrates unknown susceptibilities of the material out of which it is made, does something more than merely apply an old thing to a new purpose. He produces a new device by giving a new form to an old substance, and by suitable manipulation makes its peculiar properties available for a use to which it had not been before applied, thereby distinguishing it from all other fabrics of the class to which it belongs. Union Paper Collar Co. *v.* White, 7 O. G. 698; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 60.

A mere new use or application of a material or composition previously known is not a new invention. Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602.

A new composition of matter to which an old contrivance has been applied, and which results in a new and useful article, is the proper subject of a patent. The novelty consists in the new composition made practically useful for the purposes of life by the means and contrivances mentioned. It would be a new manufacture, and none the less so within the meaning of the patent law, because the means employed to adapt the new composition to a useful purpose was old or well known. Hotchkiss *v.* Greenwood, 11 How. 248; s. c. 4 McLean 456; s. c. 2 Robb 730.

The production of an old result by new means is patentable. Heinrich *v.* Luther, 6 McLean 345.

The application of an old process to a new subject without any exercise of the inventive faculty, and without the development of any idea which can be deemed new or original, is not patentable. Brown *v.* Piper, 91 U. S. 37; s. c. 1 Holmes 20; 10 O. G. 417; s. c. 4 Fish. 175; Andrews *v.* Loft, 36 Leg. Int. 405; Piper *v.* Moon, 6 Fish. 180; s. c. 10 Blatch. 264; 3 O. G. 4; Howe *v.* Abbott, 2 Story 190; s. c. 2 Robb 99; Meyer *v.* Pritchard, 12 Blatch. 101; s. c. 7 O. G. 1012; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 261.

The employment of an old machine for the very purpose for which it was made is not patentable as a new process. Moffitt *v.* Rogers, 8 Fed. Rep. 147.

Duplication.

There is nothing new in the multiplication of parts. Wilbur *v.* Beecher, 2 Blatch. 132; Moore *v.* Thomas, 3 Ban & Ard. 13; Stephenson *v.* Brooklyn C. T. R. Co., 19 Blatch. 473; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 457; Yale Lock Manuf. Co. *v.* Berkshire Natl. Bank, 17 Fed. Rep. 331.

The use of two deflecting plates instead of one does not involve invention. Dunbar *v.* Myers, 94 U. S. 187; s. c. 11 O. G. 35.

The placing of two or more letters on each block is not a patentable improvement in spelling blocks, although the inventor was the first one to place them systematically with a view to enlarge the usefulness of the blocks. Hill *v.* Houghton, 6 O. G. 3; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 291.

Quære. Is the making of the case which incloses the internal works of a lock with two faces just alike, and so well finished off in point of style

that either side may be presented outwards, a matter which can be patented? Jones *v.* Morehead, 1 Wall. 155.

The putting of a second cover upon a base ball is not patentable when a second cover has been previously used on softer balls. Mahn *v.* Harwood, 14 O. G. 859; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 515.

If a fare box has been constructed with one window so arranged that the driver can see the fare, the addition of another window so arranged that the passenger can see the fare does not involve invention. Slawson *v.* Railroad Co., 17 Blatch. 512; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 210; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 531; s. c. 24 O. G. 99.

Duplication, producing a new and useful result, may be patentable. It is often the material part of a discovery, because it may be that which renders useful what was previously useless. A number of rollers acting in pairs may be patented, though a single pair could not be. Parker *v.* Hulme, 1 Fish. 44.

The substitution of a double bar for a single bar in a spring bed is patentable if the change is not obvious. Ladd *v.* Tucker Manuf. Co., 4 Ban & Ard. 344.

Special Instances.

An improved paper bag, made by means of softening and rendering the upper portion of the bag flexible, is patentable. Arkell *v.* Paper Bag Co., 7 Blatch. 475.

An improvement in the mode of constructing a stone pavement is a patentable invention. Guidet *v.* Barber, 5 O. G. 149.

A new mode of making type for figures which involves the increase of the size of figures in proportion to the size of letters in connection with the size of the body of the type is patentable. Bruce *v.* Marder, 22 O. G. 1039; s. c. 10 Fed. Rep. 750.

A staple made in a certain shape by the action of dies is patentable. Rogers *v.* Sargent, 7 Blatch. 507.

Printing with copper plates on the reverse face of bank notes is an art. The patent is not for an effect but for the kind of printing by which the effect is produced. Kneass *v.* Schuylkill Bank, 4 Wash. C. C. 9; s. c. 1 Robb 303.

If the patentee is the inventor of the back, he may take out a patent for a brush and a patent for a hand mirror, where the application of the back to each purpose involves invention. Clark *v.* Scott, 15 Fish. 245; s. c. 9 Blatch. 301; s. c. 1 O. G. 4.

The composition of a new beverage, by introducing the oil of birch or the oil of wintergreen, is patentable if it is profitable to the vendor and agreeable to those who use it. Rogers *v.* Ennis, 15 Blatch. 47; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 366; s. c. 14 O. G. 601.

If the inventor invented the proper mode of enameling the proper quality of paper, the claim for a collar made from such enameled paper, as a new article of manufacture, is valid. Hoffman *v.* Stiefel, 3 Fish. 638;

s. c. 7 Blatch. 58; Hoffman *v.* Aronson, 4 Fish. 456; s. c. 8 Blatch. 324; 4 A. L. T. (N. S.) 110.

The manner of conducting air artificially set in motion to the fire in a furnace and the point where and direction in which it comes in contact with the burning fuel may be the subject of invention. Percival *v.* Harger, 40 Iowa 286.

The placing of a rivet at the corners of a pocket opening involves invention and is patentable. Strauss *v.* King, 17 O. G. 1450; s. c. 18 Blatch. 88; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 338; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 236.

If a person improves the art of curing fish by removing a part of the animal, not before known to be injurious, he is entitled to a patent. Crowell *v.* Harlow, 18 O. G. 466; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 478; s. c. 1 Fed. Rep. 140.

A register for bonds and coupons in the form of a book, with a page or pages spaced for each bond and its coupons of any series of coupon bonds, and with the spaces numbered and designated to show what bonds and coupons they are for while any of them are outstanding, and to receive them for safe keeping as vouchers or memoranda when any of them are taken up or paid, is patentable. Munson *v.* New York, 13 Blatch. 25[illegible]; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 486; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 338.

An arrangement of a concave flange coated on the under side with chalk on the leg of a table is novel and patentable. *Ex parte* Strong, 17 O. G. 446.

The transfer of flanges from an iron hub to a wooden hub would not be patentable unless it required some ingenuity or contrivance to adapt it to use in its new position. Sarven *v.* Hall, 5 Fish. 415; s. c. 9 Blatch. 524; 1 O. G. 437.

The discovery of an elastic erasive pencil head which consists merely of a piece of india rubber with a hole in it can not be the subject of a patent. Rubber Pencil Co. *v.* Howard, 5 Fish. 377; s. c. 9 Blatch. 490; 20 Wall. 498; 1 O. G. 407; 7 O. G. 172.

A party can not obtain a patent for a plan of packing ice by putting the blocks on the edge, although he was the first to discover the beneficial effects of that mode, for it is a mere discovery of a new effect of that which existed before. *Ex parte* Kemper, Cranch Pat. Dec. 89.

The application of hollow legs to support portable furnaces is not patentable. *Ex parte* C. Baxter, 1 McArthur, 520.

The mere attachment of prongs to a flat disk to be used for the same purpose as the disk had been used does not involve invention. Lorillard *v.* Ridgway, 16 O. G. 1231; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 564.

A patent for putting plasterers' hair into bales and compressing it is void. King *v.* Frostel, 8 Biss. 510; s. c. 16 O. G. 956; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 236.

Suggestions.

Suggestions from another, in order that they may be sufficient to defeat a patent subsequently issued, must embrace the plan of the improvement,

and must furnish such information to the person to whom the communications are made that they will enable an ordinary mechanic, without the exercise of any ingenuity and special skill on his part, to construct and put the improvement in successful operation. Agawam Co. *v.* Jordan, 7 Wall. 583; Slemmer's Appeal, 58 Penn. 155; Putnam *v.* Hickey, 5 Fish. 334; s. c. 3 Biss. 157; Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. c. 2; Alden *v.* Dewey, 1 Story 336; s. c. 2 Robb 17; Thomas *v.* Weeks, 2 Paine 92; Pitts *v.* Hall, 2 Blatch. 229; Dixon *v.* Moyer, 4 Wash. C. C. 68; s. c. 1 Robb 324; Nat'l F. D. Co. *v.* Hibbard, 21 O. G. 635; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 558.

Although the idea of the invention and hints concerning it came to the patentee from others, still, if he was the first who gave to that idea a useful and practical form, his rights are not to be defeated. Teese *v.* Phelps, 1 McAl. 48; Bell *v.* Daniels, 1 Fish. 372; s. c. 1 Bond 212; Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602; Roberts *v.* Dickey, 4 Fish. 532; s. c. 4 Brews. 2 1 O. G. 4; Tucker *v.* Spaulding, 13 Wall. 453; s. c. 1 O. G. 144; s. c. Deady 649; s. c. 5 Fish. 297; McMillin *v.* Barclay, 5 Fish. 189; s. c. 4 Brews. 275; Graham *v.* Gammon, 7 Biss. 346; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 7.

Neither the inquiries that may have been made, nor the information or advice that may have been received from men of science in the course of the patentee's researches, can impair his right to the character of an inventor. No invention can possibly be made consisting of a combination of different elements of power, without a thorough knowledge of the properties of each of them, and the mode in which they operate on each other. It can make no difference in this respect whether he derives his information from books or from conversation with men skilled in the sciences. If it were otherwise, no patent in which a combination of different elements is used could ever be obtained, for no man ever made such an invention without having first obtained this information, unless it was discovered by some fortunate accident. O'Reilly *v.* Morse, 15 How. 62; Hubbell *v.* U. S., 5 N. & H. 1.

If the suggestions simply aided the inventor in arriving at the desired result, but fell short of suggesting an arrangement that would constitute a complete machine, and if after all the suggestions there was something left for him to devise and work out by his own skill or ingenuity in order to complete the arrangement, then he is in contemplation of law to be regarded as the first and original discoverer. Pitts *v.* Hall, 2 Blatch. 229.

Although improvements in the form or proportions are adopted in consequence of the suggestions of others, before the invention is brought to perfection, they are not inventions or improvements for which a patent can be obtained, and can not invalidate the patent for the thing to which they are applied. Pennock *v.* Dialogue, 4 Wash. C. C. 538; s. c. 2 Pet. 1; s. c. 1 Robb 466, 542; Barker *v.* Woodruff, 1 O. G. 256.

It is not the man who may form an imperfect machine which may suggest to a higher and more practical order of mind valuable ideas, but the man who embodies those ideas in a practical and working form, whom the law protects. Pitts *v.* Edmonds, 2 Fish. 52; s. c. 1 Biss. 168.

If the whole or any of the essential parts and principles of the machine are invented by another, and introduced into the machine upon his suggestion, the whole patent is void. Watson *v.* Bladen, 4 Wash. C. C. 580; s. c. 1 Robb 510; Pitts *v.* Hall, 2 Blatch. 229; Agawam Co. *v.* Jordan, 7 Wall. 583.

Where the suggestions of an employee go to make up a complete and perfect machine, embracing the substance of all that is embodied in the patent subsequently issued to the party to whom the suggestions were made, the patent is invalid, because the real invention or discovery belonged to another. Agawam Co. *v.* Jordan, 7 Wall. 583; Berdan F. A. Manuf. Co. *v.* Remington, 3 O. G. 688; Collar Co. *v.* Van Deusen, 23 Wall. 530; s. c. 10 Blatch. 109; 7 O. G. 919; 5 Fish. 597; 2 O. G. 361.

Where an employer has conceived the plan of an invention, and is engaged in experiments to perfect it, no suggestions from an employee, not amounting to a new method or arrangement which in itself is a complete invention, is sufficient to deprive the employer of the exclusive property in the perfected improvement. Agawam Co. *v.* Jordan, 7 Wall. 583; Andrews *v.* Carman, 13 Blatch. 307; s. c. 9 O. G. 1011; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 277.

Where a person has discovered an improved principle in a machine, manufacture or composition of matter, and employs other persons to assist him in carrying out that principle, and they, in the course of experiments arising from that employment, make valuable discoveries ancillary to the plan and preconceived design of the employer, such suggested improvements are in general to be regarded as the property of the party who discovered the original improved principle, and may be embodied in a patent as a part of his invention. Agawam Co. *v.* Jordan, 7 Wall. 583; Dental Vulcanite Co. *v.* Wetherbee, 3 Fish. 87; s. c. 2 Cliff. 555; Brandy *v.* Griffith, 3 Fish. 609; Cogswell *v.* Burke, 1 O. G. 380.

If a workman merely suggests some alterations in the form or proportions of the machine as designed by the inventor, this will not be sufficient to deprive the inventor of the merit of the invention, or affect the validity of his patent. If a contrary doctrine were to be maintained, very few, if any, patents could be upheld, unless in those cases where the inventor is also the mechanic who constructs the machine. His genius may be equal to the task of conceiving all the principles as well as the general structure and form of the machine, but he may be unacquainted with the use of tools, and be quite unable to anticipate in what manner the contemplated form of any particular part of the machine should be made until the work is in progress, and the materiality of form can then be practically discerned. The workman is most likely to perceive the necessity of the alteration, and to suggest it, and such suggestions will not invalidate the patent. Watson *v.* Bladen, 4 Wash. C. C. 580; s. c. 1 Robb 510.

Invention is the work of the brain, and not of the hand. If the conception is practically complete, the artisan who gives it reflex and embodiment in a machine is no more the inventor than the tools with which he works. Both are instruments in the hands of him who sets them in

motion and prescribes the work to be done. Mere mechanical skill can never rise to the sphere of invention. The latter involves higher thought, and brings into activity a different faculty. Their domains are distinct. The line which separates them is sometimes difficult to trace; nevertheless in the eye of the law it always subsists. The mechanic may greatly aid the inventor, but can not usurp his place. Blandy *v.* Griffith, 3 Fish. 609; Warner *v.* Goodyear, Cranch. Pat. Dec. 125.

A party who merely states that a certain article is wanted for a certain purpose can not obtain a patent for the article if it is prepared by another. Collar Co. *v.* Van Deusen, 5 Fish. 597; s. c. 10 Blatch. 109; 2 O. G. 361; 23 Wall. 530; 7 O. G. 919.

The fact that others, by their zeal, public spirit and money, caused the discovery to be made, can not deprive the patentee of his rights as inventor, if in fact he is the inventor. Pennock *v.* Dialogue, 4 Wash. C. C. 538; s. c. 2 Pet. 1; s. c. 1 Robb 466, 542.

If an officer in the military service, not specially employed to make experiments with a view to suggest improvements, devises a new and valuable improvement in arms, tents, or any other kind of war material, he is entitled to letters patent for the improvement equally with any other citizen not engaged in the service. U. S. *v.* Burns, 12 Wall. 246.

Joint Invention.

In a joint invention each party must invent or discover something essential to the whole result. Slemmer's Appeal, 58 Penn. 155.

A joint patent may well be granted upon a joint invention. There is no difficulty in supposing, in point of fact, that a complicated invention may be the gradual result of the combined mental operations of two persons acting together *pari passu* in the invention. As neither of them could justly claim to be the sole inventor in such a case, it must follow that the invention is joint, and that they are jointly entitled to a patent. Barrett *v.* Hall, 1 Mason 447; Stearns *v.* Barrett, 1 Mason 153; s. c. 1 Robb 97.

An invention may be joint, although one inventor is the employer and the other the employe. Hoe *v.* Kahler, 12 Fed. Rep. 111.

To constitute two persons joint inventors it is not necessary that exactly the same idea shall occur to each at the same time and that they shall together work out this idea into a perfected machine. If an idea is suggested to one and he even goes so far as to construct a machine embodying this idea which is not a completed and working machine, and another person takes hold of it and by their joint labors one suggesting one thing and the other another, a perfect machine is made, a joint patent may be issued to them. Worden *v.* Fisher, 21 O. G. 1957; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 505.

If one suggests an idea in a general way, and the other falls in with it and by his aid develops it and gives it definite practical embodiment, the two may be considered joint inventors. Gottfried *v.* P. Best B. Co., 17 O. G. 675; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 4.

If one person invents a distinct part of a machine and another person invents another distinct and independent part of the same machine, each should obtain a patent for his own invention. Worden *v.* Fisher, 21 O. G. 1957; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 505.

If the joint invention is the final one of a series of complete separate inventions made by one inventor alone, before he was joined by his associate inventor, the patent must be limited to the final invention. Manufacturing Co. *v.* Corbin, 103 U. S. 786; s. c. 20 O. G. 297; s. c. 14 O. G. 3; s. c. 14 Blatch. 396; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 109.

If the invention patented by persons as joint inventors is the sole invention of one of the patentees only, and not the joint invention of all, the patent is void. New York *v* Ransom, 23 How. 487; s. c. 1 Fish. 252; Hotchkiss *v.* Greenwood, 4 McLean 456; s. c. 11 How. 248; s. c. 2 Robb 730; Barrett *v.* Hall, 1 Mason 447; s. c. 1 Robb 207; Slemmer's Appeal, 58 Penn. 155.

If a patent is granted to two persons as joint inventors, the proof must be clear that they were not joint inventors before the patent can be declared void on that ground. Worden *v.* Fisher, 21 O. G. 1957; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 505.

A joint patent for an invention is utterly inconsistent with several patents for the same invention by the same patentees, for it is impossible that any person can be at the same time the joint and sole inventor of the same invention. Barrett *v.* Hall, 1 Mason 447; s. c. 1 Robb 207.

A person who is a joint inventor can not have a patent as sole inventor. Arnold *v.* Bishop, Cranch. Pat. Dec. 103.

Novelty.

However new an invention may be, it can not be legally patented unless it is also useful; and however useful it may be, it can not be legally patented unless it is new. If it is either not new or not useful, the patent is void. Matthews *v.* Skates, 1 Fish. 602; Clark Patent Co. *v.* Copeland, 2 Fish. 221; Roberts *v.* Ward, 4 McLean 565; Tillotson *v.* Munson, 5 Biss. 426; Eddy *v.* Dennis. 95 U. S. 560; s. c. 4 Fish. 423; Jones *v.* McMurry, 2 Hughes 527; s. c. 13 O. G. 6; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 130; Barker *v.* Stowe, 14 O. G. 559; s. c. 15 Blatch. 49; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 337; Snow *v.* Taylor, 14 O. G. 861; Clough *v.* G. & B. Manuf. Co., 15 O. G. 1009; s. c. 22 O. G. 2241; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 523; Elastic Truss Co. *v.* Page, 16 O. G. 1045; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 328; Gardner *v.* Herz, 16 O. G. 1093; s. c. 16 Blatch. 303; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 420; Collender *v.* Griffith, 18 Blatch. 110; s. c. 18 O. G. 241; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 372; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 206; Olendorf *v.* Eckler, 2 Fed. Rep. 570; Wisner *v.* Grant, 18 O. G. 122; McNish *v.* Everson, 5 Ban & Ard. 484; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 899; Brummitt *v.* Howard, 5 Ban & Ard. 615; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 801; New *v.* Lawrence, 5 Ban & Ard. 627; 3 Fed. Rep. 714; American Whip Co. *v.* Hampden Whip Co., 5 Ban & Ard. 152; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 536; Buchan *v.* McKesson, 18 Blatch. 485; s. c. 19 O. G. 222; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 100;

Densmore *v.* Scofield, 102 U. S. 375; s. c. 19 O. G. 289; Monce *v.* Woodward, 19 O. G. 998; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 307; Patterson *v.* Stapler, 7 Fed. Rep. 210; s. c. 38 Leg. Int. 168; Schroerken *v.* S. & C. & B. Manuf. Co., 19 Blatch. 469; s. c. 19 O. G. 1493; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 469; White *v.* Gleason Manuf. Co., 19 O. G. 1494; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 917; Crandall *v.* Richardson, 19 O. G. 1628; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 808; Buzzell *v.* Fifield, 7 Fed. Rep. 465; Allis *v.* Stowell, 9 Fed. Rep. 304; Raymond *v.* Singer Manuf. Co., 11 Fed. Rep. 427; Packing Company Cases, 105 U. S. 566; s. c. 21 O. G. 1689; Woven Wire Mattress Co. *v.* Whittlesey, 8 Biss. 23; National Manuf. Co. *v.* Meyers, 15 Fed. Rep. 238; Crandall *v.* Dare, 11 Fed. Rep. 902; Railway Register Co. *v.* Highland St. R. Co., 4 Ban & Ard. 116; Doubleday *v.* Beatty, 22 O. G. 859; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 729; Singer R. C. Co. *v.* Tobey F. Co., 23 O. G. 93; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 8; Weir *v.* North Chicago R. M. Co., 9 Biss. 508; s. c. 23 O. G. 191; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 42; Welling *v.* Crane, 23 O. G. 189; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 571; Moffitt *v.* Cavanagh, 17 Fed. Rep. 336; Matteson *v.* Caine, 8 Saw. 498; s. c. 17 Fed. Rep. 528.

There must be novelty in the invention created by the mind of the person claiming to be the inventor, and in connection with that species of novelty there must be utility. This novelty worked out by the mind of the inventor, connected with utility, constitutes the essence of a patentable subject under the law. Seymour *v.* McCormick, 19 How. 96; s. c. 3 Blatch. 209.

If the invention is novel and useful it is patentable. Bruff *v.* Ives, 14 Blatch. 198; s. c. 11 O. G. 924; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 595; Graham *v.* Gammon, 7 Biss. 490; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 7; Gage *v.* Nelson, 23 O. G. 2119; s. c. 12 O. G. 753; s. c. 14 Blatch. 293; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 55; Hamilton *v.* Rollins, 4 Dillon 495; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 157; Adams *v.* Joliet Manuf. Co., 12 O. G. 91; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 1; Thomson *v.* Jacobs, 12 O. G. 890; Halsey *v.* Garlick, 12 O. G. 1026; Klein *v.* Park, 13 O. G. 5; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 145; Ketchum Harvesting Machine Co. *v.* Johnston Harvesting Co., 13 O. G. 178; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 139; Comstock *v.* Sandusky Seat Co., 13 O. G. 230; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 188; Abbe *v.* Clark, 13 O. G. 274; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 211; Hoe *v.* Cole, 13 O. G. 500; Schuessler *v.* Davis, 13 O. G. 1011; Gottfried *v.* Bartholomae, 8 Biss. 219; s. c. 13 O. G. 1128; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 308; H. B. & M. Manuf. Co. *v.* Sargeant, 14 O. G. 45; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 263; Miller's Falls Co. *v.* Ives, 14 Blatch. 169; s. c. 14 O. G. 203; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 574; Foot *v.* Frost, 14 O. G. 860; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 607; Isaacs *v.* Abrams, 14 O. G. 861; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 616; Bates *v.* Coe, 98 U. S. 31; s. c. 15 O. G. 337; American Manuf. Co. *v.* Lane, 14 Blatch. 438; s. c. 15 O. G. 421; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 268; Burdett *v.* Estey, 15 Blatch. 349; s. c. 15 O. G. 877; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 7; Atlantic G. Powder Co. *v.* Rand, 16 Blatch. 250; s. c. 16 O. G. 87; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 263; St. Louis Stamping Co. *v.* Quinby, 16 O. G. 135; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 192; Elizabeth *v.* Pavement Co., 97 U. S. 126; s. c. 6 O. G. 772; s. c. 3 O. G. 522; s. c. 6 Fish. 424; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 463; Odorless E. A. Co.

v. Clements, 16 O. G. 854; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 540; Starrett *v.* Athol Machine Co., 23 O. G. 1729; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 910; Judson *v.* Bradford, 16 O. G. 171; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 539; Smith *v.* Halkyard, 23 O. G. 1833; s. c. 16 Fed. Rep. 414; Cooke *v.* N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co., 16 O. G. 856; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 398; Williams *v.* B. & A. R. R. Co., 17 Blatch. 21; s. c. 16 O. G. 906; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 441; Coupe *v.* Weatherhead, 23 O. G. 1927; s. c. 16 Fed. Rep. 673; Megraw *v.* Carroll, 5 Ban & Ard. 324; Spill *v.* Celluloid Manuf. Co., 18 Blatch. 190; s. c. 17 O. G. 1448; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 405; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 707; Evory *v.* Candee, 5 Ban & Ard. 435; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 542; Peck S. & W. Co. *v.* Lindsay, 18 O. G. 63; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 390; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 688; Searles *v.* Van Nest, 5 Ban & Ard. 456; Strobridge *v.* Lindsay, 18 O. G. 62; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 411; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 692; Sinclair *v.* Backus, 17 O. G. 1503; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 81; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 539; Tyler *v.* Welch, 18 Blatch. 209; s. c. 17 O. G. 1508; 5 Ban & Ard. 511; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 636; Whitman *v.* James, 5 Ban & Ard. 575; Roberts *v.* Schreiber, 18 O. G. 125; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 491; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 855; Bankard *v.* Bostwick, 18 O. G. 61; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 463; s. c. 3 Fed. Rep. 517; Munson *v.* G. & B. Manuf. Co., 18 O. G. 194; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 595; Adams *v.* Moline Wagon Works Co., 16 Fed. Rep. 236; Adams *v.* Ill. Manuf. Co., 18 O. G. 412; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 543; Irish *v.* Knapp, 18 O. G. 735; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 47; Holly *v.* Vergennes Machine Co., 18 Blatch. 327; s. c. 18 O. G. 1177; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 74; Pearce *v.* Mulford, 102 U. S. 112; s. c. 18 O. G. 1223; s. c. 11 O. G. 741; s. c. 14 Blatch. 141; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 542; Bignall *v.* Harvey, 18 Blatch. 353; s. c. 18 O. G. 1275; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 636; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 334; U. S. Stamping Co. *v.* Jewett, 18 Blatch. 469; s. c. 18 O. G. 1529; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 869; Tyler *v.* Crane, 19 O. G. 128; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 775; Brown *v.* Deere, 19 O. G. 361; s. c. 6 Fed. Rep. 484; Blake *v.* McNab & H. Manuf. Co., 19 Blatch. 73; s. c. 19 O. G. 1219; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 821; Sharp *v.* Dover Stamping Co., 103 U. S. 250; 19 O. G. 1283; Pennington *v.* King, 19 O. G. 1568; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 462; Wisner *v.* Grant, 5 Ban & Ard. 215; s. c. 7 Fed. Rep. 485; Hobbs *v.* King, 19 O. G. 1709; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 91; Bridgeport Wood Finishing Co. *v.* Hooper, 18 Blatch. 459; s. c. 20 O. G. 156; s. c. 5 Fed. Rep. 63; Zinn *v.* Weiss, 7 Fed. Rep. 914; Watkins *v.* Cincinnati, 20 O. G. 1588; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 325; Emerson *v.* Howe, 8 Fed. Rep. 327; Wooster *v.* Blake, 8 Fed. Rep. 429; Davis *v.* Brown, 19 Blatch. 263; s. c. 20 O. G. 1021; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 647; Coburn *v.* Schroeder, 19 Blatch. 377; s. c. 20 O. G. 1524; s. c. 8 Fed. Rep. 519; Shirley *v.* Sanderson, 8 Fed. Rep. 905; Selden *v.* Stockwell S. L. G. B. Co., 19 Blatch. 544; s. c. 20 O. G. 1737; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 390; Lorillard *v.* Dohan, 20 O. G. 1587; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 509; Macdonald *v.* Blackmer, 9 O. G. 746; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 78; Cox *v.* Ramsdell, 4 Ban & Ard. 326; Bate Refrig. Co. *v.* Gillett, 9 Fed. Rep. 387; Bernard *v.* Heimann, 21 O. G. 140; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 400; Simmons *v.* Blackington, 3 Ban & Ard. 481; Hoe *v.* Tuthill, 3 Ban & Ard. 206; Stow *v.* Chicago, 104 U. S. 547; s. c. 21 O. G. 790; s. c. 8 Biss. 47; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 83; Coburn *v.*

Schroeder, 22 O. G. 1538; Gottfried *v.* Stahlmann, 22 O. G. 1788; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 673; Strobridge *v.* Landers, 21 O. G. 1027; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 880; Allis *v.* Buckstaff, 22 O. G. 1705; 13 Fed. Rep. 879; Damon *v.* Eastwick, 22 O. G. 1709; s. c. 14 Fed. Rep. 40; Amer. B. L. Co. *v.* Cotter, 21 O. G. 1030; Hayes *v.* Bockel, 11 Fed. Rep. 87; Wooster *v.* Blake, 22 O. G. 1132; Bernard *v.* Heimann, 22 O. G. 1134; Searls *v.* Worden, 21 O. G. 1955; s. c. 11 Fed. Rep. 501; Gottfried *v.* Crescent Brewing Co., 22 O. G. 1447; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 479; Wallace *v.* Noyes, 23 O. G. 435; s. c. 13 Fed. Rep. 172; Hoe *v.* Kahler, 12 Fed. Rep. 111; Schillinger *v.* Greenway Brewing Co., 24 O. G. 495; s. c. 17 Fed. Rep. 244; Crosby S. G. & V. Co. *v.* Ashcroft Manuf. Co., 17 Fed. Rep. 85; Fifield *v.* Whittemore, 17 Fed. Rep. 513; Pickering *v.* Miller, 25 O. G. 89.

Articles of manufacture may be new in the commercial sense when they are not new in the sense of the patent law. New articles of commerce are not patentable as new manufactures, unless it appears in the given case that the production of the new article involved the exercise of invention or discovery beyond what was necessary to construct the apparatus for its manufacture or production. Collar Co. *v.* Van Deusen, 23 Wall. 530; s. c. 10 Blatch. 119; 5 Fish. 597; 2 O. G. 361; 7 O. G. 919; Union Paper Collar Co. *v.* Leland, 1 Holmes 427; s. c. 7 O. G. 221; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 491; Glue Co. *v.* Upton, 97 U. S. 3; s. c. 4 Cliff. 237; s. c. 6 O. G. 837; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 497; Mackay *v.* Jackman, 22 O. G. 85; s. c. 12 Fed. Rep. 615; Cone *v.* Morgan Envelope Co., 4 Ban & Ard. 107; Anilin Fabrik *v.* Cummins, 4 Ban & Ard. 489.

To give an exclusive right, there must be what is called a new principle invented, not a new principle in an abstract sense, for none such is likely to be discovered, but a new combination or mode. If there is nothing different in the alleged discovery from a known mode, there can be no invention which gives a new right to the inventor. The ground on which a patent may be claimed is that something new and useful has been invented—a thing which did not exist before—a machine, for instance, differing from all other machines in its structure, movement or effect, by reason of the introduction of some new mechanical combination or principle. Hotchkiss *v.* Greenwood, 4 McLean 456; s. c. 11 How. 248; s. c. 2 Robb 730.

The principle or essential character of an invention involves two elements: 1st. The object obtained; 2d. The means by which it is obtained. If either of these is new, it may be the subject of a patent. Wilton *v.* R. R. Co., 2 Whart. Dig. 359; Batten *v.* Clayton, 2 Whart. Dig. 363.

The novelty required by the patent law does not refer to the materials out of which the article is made, or merely to the form or workmanship of the parts, or the use of one known equivalent for another. To be new in the sense of the patent law some new mode of operation must be introduced. Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668.

The novelty need not consist in the materials used, or the powers employed. But there must be a discovery of new principles, or the em-

ployment of old ones in a new proportion, or in a new process, or to a new purpose. Holden *v.* Curtis, 2 N. H. 61.

A new application of a principle by new mechanical contrivances and apparatus, by means of which a new and beneficial result is produced in the use of the article to which it has been thus applied, is patentable. Silsby *v.* Foote, 1 Blatch. 445; s. c. 14 How. 218; Mowry *v.* Whitney, 5 Fish. 515; s. c. 14 Wall. 434; 1 O. G. 499.

One invention may be better than the other, but that fact is not to be taken into account. The one that is alleged to be prior must, however, have been an apparatus of some practical utility; but whether it was superior or inferior in degree is not a question. Silsby *v.* Foote, 2 Blatch. 260; s. c. 20 How. 378; Smith *v.* Elliott, 5 Fish. 315; s. c. 9 Blatch. 400; 1 O. G. 331; Blandy *v.* Griffith, 3 Fish. 609; Fisher *v.* Craig, 3 Saw. 69; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 365.

If there is nothing new in the process, or the machinery for applying it, the result is not patentable. Collar Co. *v.* Van Deusen, 5 Fish. 597; s. c. 10 Blatch. 109; 2 O. G. 361; 23 Wall. 530; 5 O. G. 919.

Novelty in principle may consist in a new and valuable mode of applying an old power, effecting it not merely by a new instrument or form of the machine, but by something giving a new or greater advantage. Hovey *v.* Stevens, 1 W. & M. 290; s. c. 2 Robb 479.

The test of novelty as applied to a combination seems to be whether the application of the powers of nature by such means and appliances as the patentee claims to have invented, had been before known. Bell *v.* Daniels, 1 Fish. 372; s. c. 1 Bond 212.

Whether the one device is the same in substance or principle as another, depends on whether it is the same kind of instrument or not, and whether it acts in the same way in substance, and produces the same result in substance. Colt *v.* Mass. Arms Co., 1 Fish. 108; Platt *v.* Manufac. Co., 5 Fish. 265; s. c. 9 Blatch. 342; 1 O. G. 524; Rumford Works *v.* Lauer, 5 Fish. 615; s. c. 10 Blatch. 122; 3 O. G. 249; Singer *v.* Braunsdorf, 7 Blatch. 521; Wilcox *v.* Komp, 7 Blatch. 126; Springer *v.* Stanton, 2 O. G. 2.

The question of identity does not depend upon the appearance or form of the two structures claimed to be identical, but simply upon the question whether they are the same in their mode and principle of operation, and whether one is a mechanical equivalent for the other. Blanchard *v.* Putnam, 3 Fish. 186; s. c. 8 Wall. 420; 2 Bond 84; Whipple *v.* Baldwin Manuf. Co., 4 Fish. 29.

Change of form is not material when the form does not contribute towards the new result. When it does, the forms must be alike in all important particulars. Adams *v.* Edwards, 1 Fish. 1.

In order to determine whether the mechanism of two machines is the same, an examination should be made not only of the mechanism itself, that is, the devices and their arrangement, but also of their mode of operation and their effects and results. Eames *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 146; Suffolk Co. *v.* Hayden, 4 Fish. 86; s. c. 3 Wall. 315; Stainthorp *v.* Humiston, 4

Fish. 107; Cook *v.* Ernest, 5 Fish. 396; s. c. 1 Woods 195; 2 O. G. 89; Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* Miller, 5 Fish. 48; s. c. 9 Blatch. 77.

The question is not whether the alleged prior machine was of the same kind as that of the patentee, but whether it was substantially the same. Washburn *v.* Gould, 3 Story 122; s. c. 2 Robb 206; Smith *v.* Higgins, 1 Fish. 537; Fisk *v.* Church, 5 Fish. 540; s. c. 1 O. G. 634; Bray *v.* Hartshorn, 1 Cliff. 538; Roberts *v.* Schuyler, 12 Blatch. 444; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 5; Blake *v.* Robertson, 94 U. S. 728; s. c. 11 O. G. 877; s. c. 6 O. G. 297; s. c. 11 Blatch. 237; s. c. 6 Fish. 509; Butch *v.* Boyer, 8 Phila. 57; *Ex parte* Van Syckel, 1 O. G. 330; Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* Miller, 5 Fish. 48; s. c. 9 Blatch. 77; Dalton *v.* Jennings, 93 U. S. 271; s. c. 12 Blatch. 96; 5 O. G. 615; 11 O. G. 111; s. c. 93 U. S. 271; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 256; Chase *v.* Sabine, 1 Holmes 395; s. c. 6 O. G. 728; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 399; Dane *v.* Chicago Manuf. Co., 6 Fish. 130; s. c. 3 Biss. 374; 2 O. G. 677; 7 O. G. 924; Tufts *v.* Machine Co., 1 Holmes 459; s. c. 8 O. G. 239; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 633; Decker *v.* Silverbrandt, 8 O. G. 944; G. & B. Manuf. Co. *v.* Walworth, 9 O. G. 746; Lyman V. & R. Co. *v.* Chamberlain, 10 O. G. 588; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 433; Boomer *v.* Power Co., 13 Blatch. 107; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 107; Fuller *v.* Yentzer, 11 O. G. 597; s. c. 94 U. S. 299; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 520; Plastic Slate Roofing Co. *v.* Moore, 1 Holmes 167; U. S. Nickel Co. *v.* Keith, 1 Holmes 328; s. c. 5 O. G. 272; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 44; Cochrane *v.* Waterman, Cranch Pat. Dec. 121; Cundell *v.* Parkhurst, Cranch Pat. Dec. 128; Warner *v.* Goodyear, Cranch Pat. Dec. 125.

There must be a substantial difference in the principle and the application of it to constitute such an improvement in a machine as the law will protect. The principle here spoken of is not a new mechanical power. No new power in mechanics has been discovered for centuries, but the powers known have been so modified and combined as to produce the most extraordinary results. The principle consists in the mode of applying or combining mechanical powers to produce a certain result. Smith *v.* Pearce, 2 McLean 176; s. c. 2 Robb 13.

Strong resemblances in external appearances, similarity of products or operation, are not separately tests of the identity of the plan, construction or purpose of machines, nor is a superiority in products or in operation in one over the other, proof of an essential difference, because the slightest change of a machine which effects a real improvement in it may be patentable, while great apparent variations may be only disguises under which an older discovery is attempted to be employed and appropriated. Carr *v.* Rice, 1 Fish. 198; Howes *v.* Nute, 4 Fish. 263; s. c. 4 Cliff. 173.

An invention which is valuable for its simplicity and economy can not be antedated by more complex and expensive combinations. King *v.* Hammond, 4 Fish. 488.

The previous use of a structure bearing some resemblance in some respects to the invention of the patentee, and which might have been suggestive of ideas, or have led to experiments resulting in the discovery and completion of his invention, will not invalidate his claim under his patent. Parker *v.* Stiles, 5 McLean 44; Livingston *v.* Jones, 1 Fish. 521.

A party is not an original inventor if the knowledge which he derives from an abandoned experiment is sufficiently clear and definite to enable him to construct the improvement which is the subject of his alleged invention. Union P. B. M. Co. *v.* P. & W. Co., 15 O. G. 423; s. c. 15 Blatch. 160; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 403.

Although an inventor has knowledge of a prior abandoned experiment, yet if he is an original inventor of the improvement he is entitled to the benefit of unsubstantial variations and modifications in form of the principle of his invention notwithstanding such modifications may run into and include the forms of mechanism shown in the abandoned experiment. Union P. B. M. Co. *v.* P. & W. Co., 15 O. G. 423; s. c. 15 Blatch. 160; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 403.

Although an inventor is familiar with a model which has been laid aside, yet if he does not know that it is adequate to do the work, he starts as an independent inventor into an unoccupied field of invention, and his invention is as broad as the territory which he actually reduces to possession, although the utility of the model is subsequently proved. Union P. B. M. Co. *v.* P. & W. Co., 16 Blatch. 76; s. c. 4 Ban & Ard. 181.

Making a prior device which will serve the like useful purpose is not necessarily anticipating an invention. Where the mechanical means employed are different, and the mechanical result is different, one does not anticipate the other. Buerk *v.* Valentine, 5 Fish. 366; s. c. 9 Blatch. 479; 2 O. G. 295.

A device for applying a mechanical force or power to a new purpose can not be avoided by proving that the mechanical force or power is old. The application of a special spring to operate a churn dash may be new, although the spring is old. Dunbar *v.* Marden, 13 N. H. 311.

If the mechanical combination of the members of two machines is such that the action and mode of operation differ in the two machines, then one is something more than a mere mechanical equivalent for the other, although each element of the combination in one may, under some circumstances, be regarded as the equivalent of the corresponding element in the other, when the elements are separately considered. Blake *v.* Rawson, 6 Fish. 74; s. c. 1 Holmes 200; 3 O. G. 122.

Where two machines or things are made to operate substantially in the same way, so as to produce a similar result, they are the same in principle. Roberts *v.* Ward, 4 McLean 565.

If the invention is substantially different from anything before known in its mode of operation it is new. Lowell *v.* Lewis, 1 Mason 182; s. c. 1 Robb 132; *Ex parte* Barton, 1 O. G. 329; Parker *v.* Hatfield, 4 McLean 61.

If the mechanism in two machines is substantially different, then they are not the same, although they may produce the same result, for the same end may be attained by different processes or instrumentalities. Eames *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 146.

If the mode of operation of two machines is different it is evidence that the mechanism is different. Eames *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 146; *Ex parte* A. F. Jones, 1 O. G. 329.

An article which could be made only as a mere curiosity, and not as an article for the trade, will not defeat a subsequent invention. Lamb *v.* Hamblen, 11 Fed. Rep. 722.

Where the thing patented is an entirety, consisting of a single device, or combination of old elements incapable of division or separate use, the invention is novel, although a part of the entire invention is found in one prior patent, printed publication or machine, another part in another, and still another part in another. Imhaeuser *v.* Buerk, 17 O. G. 795; s. c. 101 U. S. 647; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 347; Parks *v.* Booth, 17 O. G. 1089; s. c. 102 U. S. 96; s. c. 1 Flippin 381; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 225; Waterman *v.* Thomson, 2 Fish. 461.

Although a person has brought together all the parts necessary to accomplish the result sought to be attained by the patentee, yet if he does not know how to use them this will not constitute such a known use as will defeat a patent. Campbell *v.* New York, 20 O. G. 1817; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 900.

If the inventor produced a new article he is entitled to a patent, although others approached very near to the invention without producing it exactly. M. & P. Manuf. Co. *v.* DuBruil, 13 O. G. 351; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 618.

If a device accomplishes a certain result it anticipates a subsequent invention, although the inventor does not mention the result or assign it as a reason for using the device. Stow *v.* Chicago, 104 U. S. 547; s. c. 21 O. G. 790; s. c. 8 Biss. 47; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 83.

To render an article new in the sense of the patent law it must be more or less efficacious or possess new properties by a combination with other ingredients. It is only where one of these results follows that the product of the compound can be treated as the result of invention or discovery and be regarded as a new and useful article. Glue Co. *v.* Upton, 97 U. S. 3; s. c. 4 Cliff. 237; s. c. 6 O. G. 837; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 497.

In a doubtful case the fact that the defendant has obtained possession of one of the alleged prior machines, and has not produced it, can not but exercise great influence on the determination. Washing Machine Co. *v.* Lincoln, 4 Fish. 379.

When a new invention is sought to be intercepted by a former one, the production of a former machine is of very great importance, showing that it does not rest merely in the recollection of witnesses that there was such a thing. Howe *v.* Underwood, 1 Fish. 160; Murphy *v.* Eastham, 5 Fish. 306; s. c. 1 Holmes 113; 2 O. G. 61; Orr *v.* Badger, 7 Law Rep. 465; Chase *v.* Wesson, 6 Fish. 517; s. c. 1 Holmes 274; 4 O. G. 476; Baldwin *v.* Schultz, 5 Fish. 75; s. c. 9 Blatch. 494; 2 O. G. 315; Moody *v.* Taber, 1 Holmes 325; s. c. 5 O. G. 273; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 41; Smith *v.* G. E. F. Co., 1 Holmes 340; s. c. 5 O. G. 429; La Baw *v.* Hawkins, 6 O. G. 724; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 428; Hawes *v.* Antisdel, 8 O. G. 685; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 10; McKisson *v.* Carnrick, 9 Fed. Rep. 44; Theberath *v.* Rubber & C. H. T. Co., 23 O. G. 1121; s. c. 15 Fed. Rep. 246.

The doctrine of equivalents should be critically scanned where there may be a difference in relation to two machines which in some respects operate by equivalent devices, and in other respects do not, to ascertain whether one has become a practical machine, while the other is not. Sayles *v.* Railroad Co., 2 Fish. 523; s. c. 1 Biss. 468.

The results produced constitute a safe kind of evidence, which may be relied upon with some degree of certainty, in order to ascertain whether the same means are used. Like means, provided the machine is in perfect order, will in a measure produce like results. If like results can not be produced by two separate devices, it is good evidence to consider in determining whether the means are the same, because, as a general rule, like results are produced by like means, and if like results are not produced by two separate devices it is fair to infer that the means may not be alike in kind or character. Waterbury Brass Co. *v.* New York Brass Co., 3 Fish. 43; Suffolk Co. *v.* Hayden, 4 Fish. 86; s. c. 3 Wall. 315.

It is decisive evidence, though not the only evidence, that a new mode of operation has been introduced if the practical effect of the invention is either a new effect or a materially better effect, or as good an effect more economically attained by means of the change made by the patentee. A new, or improved, or more economical effect attributable to the change made by the patentee in the mode of operation of existing machinery proves that the change has introduced a new mode of operation, which is the subject-matter of a patent. Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668.

If a materially different result is reached it is evidence of some new cause or means, although the mechanism may apparently be substantially the same. Hence a greater degree of utility being achieved by one machine is evidence, and sometimes conclusive evidence, of novelty in the means or instrumentalities which are used. Eames *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 146; Roberts *v.* Dickey, 4 Fish. 532; s. c. 4 Brews. 260; 1 O. G. 4.

If the patented invention produce a result decidedly and clearly different from any which has been produced by the action of any prior invention, and is decidedly superior to any other in its operation, it affords a ground for the presumption that the thing itself has not been known before. Judson *v.* Cope, 1 Fish. 615 s. c. 1 Bond 327.

New capabilities important to the practical use of a machine are some evidence that the subsequent invention is different from the prior one. Eames *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 146; Masury *v.* Anderson, 6 Fish. 457; s. c. 11 Blatch. 162; 4 O. G. 55; Child *v.* Bost. & F. Iron Works Co., 6 Fish. 606; s. c. 1 Holmes 303; 5 O. G. 61.

If the same effects are produced by two machines by the same mode of operation, the principles of each are the same. Whittemore *v.* Cutter, 1 Gallis. 478; s. c. 1 Robb 40; Odiorne *v.* Winkley, 2 Gallis. 51; s. c. 1 Robb 52.

If the same effects are produced, but by combinations of machinery operating substantially in a different manner, the principles are different. Whittemore *v.* Cutter, 1 Gallis. 478; s. c. 1 Robb 40.

When an invention is sought by many minds and developed in different

and independent forms, all original and yet all bearing a somewhat general resemblance to each other, he who precedes all the rest and strikes out something which includes and underlies all that they produce acquires a monopoly and subjects them to tribute. But if the advance towards the thing is gradual and proceeds step by step, so that no one can claim the complete whole, then each is entitled only to the specific form of device which he produces, and every other inventor is entitled to his own specific form so long as it differs from those of his competitors and does not include theirs. Railway Co. *v.* Sayles, 97 U. S. 354; s. c. 15 O. G. 243; s. c. 3 Biss. 52; s. c. 4 Fish. 584; Duff *v.* Sterling Pump Co., 23 O. G. 1622; Whitmun *v.* Seaman, 5 Ban & Ard. 95; s. c. 4 Fed. Rep. 436; New York B. & B. Co. *v.* Hoffman, 20 O. G. 1450; s. c. 9 Fed. Rep. 919; Williams *v.* Barker, 18 O. G. 243; s. c. 5 Ban & Ard. 453; s. c. 2 Fed. Rep. 649; Parsons *v.* Colgate, 24 O. G. 203; s. c. 15 Fed. Rep. 600.

Novelty in Combinations.

When the patent is for a combination it is immaterial whether the patentee is the inventor of any of the elements or ingredients. They may all be old, and yet if the patentee was the first to combine them for the particular purpose he is entitled to be protected in that improvement. Silsby *v.* Foote, 20 How. 378; s. c. 2 Blatch. 260; Carr *v.* Rice, 1 Fish. 198; Hovey *v.* Stevens, 1 W. & M. 290; s. c. 2 Robb 479; Carr *v.* Rice, 1 Fish. 325; s. c. 4 Blatch. 200; Buck *v.* Hermance, 1 Blatch. 398; Hovey *v.* Henry, 3 West. L. J. 153; Gray *v.* James, Pet. C. C. 394; s. c. 1 Robb 120; Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668; Buck *v.* Gill, 4 McLean 174; s. c. 2 Robb 150; M'Cully *v.* Cunningham, 19 Pitts. L. J. 142; *Ex parte* Sturgis, 1 O. G. 204; Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 1 Robb 243; Swift *v.* Whisen, 3 Fish. 343; s. c. 2 Bond 115; Crosby *v.* Lapouraille, Taney 374; Pitts *v.* Edmonds, 2 Fish. 52; s. c. 1 Biss. 168; Blake *v.* Stafford, 3 Fish. 294; s. c. 6 Blatch. 195; Butch *v.* Boyer, 8 Phila. 57; Heald *v.* Rice, 104 U. S. 737; s. c. 21 O. G. 1443; s. c. 13 Pac. L. R. 33; Barrett *v.* Hall, 1 Mason 447; s. c. 1 Robb 207; Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117; Latta *v.* Shawk, 1 Fish. 465; s. c. 1 Bond 259; Roberts *v.* Harnden, 2 Cliff. 500; Connover *v.* Roach, 4 Fish. 12; Ingels *v.* Mast, 6 Fish. 415; Knight *v.* Railroad Co., 3 Fish. 1; s. c. Taney 106; Lee *v.* Blandy, 2 Fish. 89; s. c. 1 Bond 361; Winans *v.* Schenec. & Troy R. R. Co., 2 Blatch. 279; Locomotive Co. *v.* Railway Co., 6 Fish. 187; s. c. 10 Blatch. 292; 3 O. G. 93; *Ex parte* A. B. Smith, 1 O. G. 403; Wisner *v.* Grant, 17 O. G. 447; Stillwell & B. Manuf. Co. *v.* Cin. G. & C. Co., 7 O. G. 829; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 610; Albright *v.* Celluloid H. T. Co., 12 O. G. 227; s. c. 2 Ban & Ard. 629; Worswick Manuf. Co. *v.* Steiger, 17 Fed. Rep. 250.

A patent for a new combination or arrangement to produce a new result is valid although one of the parts is old. O'Reilly *v.* Morse, 15 How. 62; Hall *v.* Wiles, 2 Blatch. 194; Frink *v.* Petry, 11 Blatch. 422; s. c. 5 O. G. 201; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 1; Buck *v.* Hermance, 1 Blatch. 398; Furbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fish. 668; Watson *v.* Cunningham, 4 Fish. 528.

A patent for a combination can not be proved to be invalid by showing that one of the elements is found in some one prior machine and another in another prior machine, until it is shown that all the elements are old, because the theory of such a patent is that the elements are old, and the invention consists merely in the new combination. Union Sugar Refinery *v.* Matthiesson, 2 Fish. 600; s. c. 3 Cliff. 639; Hall *v.* Stern, 24 O. G. 206.

A patent for a combination can not be supported by evidence of the novelty of one of its parts. Batten *v.* Clayton, 2 Whart. Dig. 363.

If old materials and old principles in mechanics or otherwise, are used in a state of combination so as to produce a new result, the inventor of the article so produced is entitled to apply for and may obtain a valid patent. Pennock *v.* Dialogue, 4 Wash. C. C. 538; s. c. 2 Pet. 1; s. c. 1 Robb 466, 542.

If the combination is new it is patentable matter, although a part of the apparatus might have been applied to similar purposes in other and different machines. Under such circumstances, it would not be a mere application of an old apparatus to a new purpose, but a new combination of machinery incorporating in part an old apparatus for a new purpose. Pitts *v.* Whitman, 2 Story 609; s. c. 2 Robb 189.

If the patentee borrowed the idea of the different parts which go to constitute his invention, and for the first time brought them together into one whole, and that whole is materially different from any whole that existed before, then he is the original and first inventor, and is entitled to a patent therefor. Many *v.* Sizer, 1 Fish. 17.

If not only all the primary elements but all the sub-combinations existed in different machines before, but were never brought together to constitute one machine and co-operating to produce one result, and the inventor brings them together by invention, producing a useful result, he is entitled to a patent for such combination and arrangement. Howe *v.* Morton, 1 Fish. 586.

The omission of a part in a combination with a corresponding omission in function so that the retained parts do just what they did before in the combination is not patentable. Stow *v.* Chicago, 104 U. S. 547; s. c. 21 O. G. 790; s. c. 8 Biss. 47; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 83.

If a device is a substitute for one element of an old combination, and not merely an improvement on it, then a machine containing this substitute and the other old elements, is a new and different machine from a machine containing the combination of old elements known before the invention, and not merely an improvement on such machine containing such combination of old elements. Potter *v.* Holland, 1 Fish. 382; s. c. 4 Blatch. 238.

Although the ingredients in a combination of materials may have been in the most common and extensive use, yet, if they have never been combined together in the manner stated in the patent, the invention of the combination is patentable. Ryan *v.* Goodwin, 3 Sum. 514; s. c. 1 Robb 725.

Priority.

No person who is not at once the first as well as the original inventor, by whom the invention has been perfected and put into actual use, is entitled to a patent. A subsequent inventor, although an original inventor, is not entitled to any patent. If the invention is perfected and put into actual use by the first and original inventor, it is of no consequence whether the invention is extensively known or used, or whether the knowledge or use thereof is limited to a few persons or even to the first inventor himself. It is sufficient that he is the first inventor to entitle him to a patent, and no subsequent inventor has a right to deprive him of the right to use his own prior invention. Spring *v.* Packard, 7 O. G. 341; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 531; Burrows *v.* Lehigh Zinc Co., 1 Ban & Ard. 521; Reed *v.* Cutter, 1 Story 590; s. c. 2 Robb 81; Watson *v.* Bladen, 4 Wash. C. C. 580; s. c. 1 Robb 510; Stimpson *v.* Woodman, 3 Fish. 98; s. c. 10 Wall. 117; Sayles *v.* Hapgood, 3 Fish. 632; s. c. 2 Biss. 189; Carr *v.* Rice, 1 Fish. 198; Roberts *v.* Ward, 4 McLean 565; Larabee *v.* Cortlan, 3 Fish. 5; s. c. Taney 180; Wing *v.* Schoomaker, 3 Fish. 607; Suffolk Co. *v.* Hayden, 4 Fish. 86; s. c. 3 Wall. 315; Boston E. F. Co. *v.* Rubber Thread Co., 1 Holmes 372; s. c. 5 O. G. 696; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 222; Bridge *v.* Brown, 1 Holmes 53; Bedford *v.* Hunt, 1 Mason 302; s. c. 1 Robb 148; Darst *v.* Brockway, 11 Ohio 462; Pickering *v.* McCullough, 104 U. S. 310; s. c. 21 O. G. 73; s. c. 13 O. G. 818; s. c. 3 Ban & Ard. 279; Garratt *v.* Seibert, 98 U. S. 75; s. c. 15 O. G. 383; Roemer *v.* Simon, 12 O. G. 796; s. c. 95 U. S. 214; s. c. 1 Ban & Ard. 138.

The patent law goes undoubtedly upon the ground that when a man, by his knowledge and skill, has made and perfected a machine, the public are then put in possession of the invention, and have the benefit in some form of that knowledge and skill, and that the man who comes afterward can not deprive the public of that benefit, though he may be an original inventor of the machine. He has not given the consideration for an exclusive privilege, because the public had it before, and although he may have the merit of invention, he can not have the right to take from the community that which they possess by the invention of another. Howe *v.* Underwood, 1 Fish. 160.

If the prior inventor made the article, for whatever purpose, he has a right to say that no one else is entitled to a patent for it, although he did not perceive all its advantages. Richardson *v.* Lockwood, 6 Fish. 454; s. c. 4 O. G. 398.

The patentee is presumed in judgment of law to have had a knowledge of prior inventions, although the fact may have been otherwise. Silsby *v.* Foote, 2 Blatch. 260; s. c. 20 How. 378.

If the invention has been in use, or has been described in a public work anterior to the supposed discovery, the patent is void. It may be that the patentee had no knowledge of this previous use or previous description, still his patent is void. The law supposes he may have known it. Evans *v.* Eaton, 3 Wheat. 454; s. c. Pet. C. C. 322; s. c. 1 Robb 68, 243;