

RECEIVED
MAR 13 1950
U. S. PATENT OFFICE
DIVISION 22

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

8071
U. S. PATENT OFFICE
PAPER NO. 4

MAR 14 1950

DIVISION 22

Aneta

Applicant: Gertrude Sugden et al

Serial Number: 61,702

Filed: November 23, 1948

For: FLEXIBLE KITE

Division: 22 - Room 5724

A M E N D M E N T

Commissioner of Patents
Washington 25, D. C.

Sir:

Responsive to Office Action of September 21, 1949.

Cancel claim 8.

Amend claim 1 as follows:

Line 4, delete "defined"; after "is" insert -- effected; after "by" insert -- a crevice at -- .

Line 5, after "sections", before the comma, insert -- and extends longitudinally the length of said body -- .

Amend claim 2 as follows:

Line 2, substitute -- effected -- for "defined"; insert -- crevice at the -- before "junction"; after "body" insert -- , said sections -- .

Line 3, delete "and", first occurrence. At the end of the claim change the period to a comma and add -- said juncture being disposed relative said wings in flight so as to effect a glide angle therefor. -- .

Amend claim 7 as follows:

Line 2, substitute -- effected -- for "defined"; insert -- juncture of -- before "symmetrical" -- .

Line 5, after the comma insert -- certain of said lines being attached to the outermost portions of said sections, -- .

A. M. ZALKIND

a

expected that Examiner will appreciate the difficulty of claiming an invention of this type and will recognize applicant's sincere effort to draft his claims in such a manner as to unequivocally avoid the prior art.

It is clear that no reference cited meets the terms and spirit of claim 1 as amended; Overbeke, in particular, on which this claim was rejected, is now thought fully avoided.

Claim 2 has also been amended as in claim 1, and in addition now defines the relative disposition of the juncture.

Claim 7 likewise has been amended as in claim 1, and in addition specifies the mode of attachment of certain bridle lines.

Reconsideration of claim 9 is requested in view of its dependency on amended claim 7, now thought allowable, and for the reason that the tail structure recited, viz: a pair of lines attached to the kite is not shown in the prior art.

Likewise, reconsideration of claim 10, as amended, is requested in view of its dependency on the novel subject matter of claim 7, particularly since Astle's pneumatic tubes are not yieldable in the sense applicant intends. It is clear from Astle's drawing that his tubes are not supposed to bend or take an arcuate shape by virtue of wind pressure during flight. In fact, they are fully rigid members from an aerodynamic point of view. On the other hand, applicant's edge reinforcements as shown in Figure 6 are truly yieldable and intended to be flexible in flight so as to permit the proper arcuateness of the wings. Non-bending tubes as shown by Astle would defeat applicant's purpose and for that reason is not thought that the reference is pertinent.

For the reasons hereinabove stated it is felt that claims 1, 2, 7, 9 and 10 are allowable, and a favorable finding is urged.

Respectfully submitted

Albert M. Zalkind

Albert M. Zalkind

March 10, 1950

a 3