

#18/D
mCpeli
4-5-82

1 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

3 In the Application of

4 JAMES R. DIEHR, II and THEODORE A. LUTTON

5 Serial No. 602,463

September 25, 1981

6 Filed August 6, 1975

7 For DIRECT DIGITAL CONTROL OF
8 RUBBER MOLDING PRESSES

9 Group Art Unit 236

10 Examiner: Joseph F. Ruggiero

SOLICITOR

SEP 28 1981

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11

12 Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

13 Washington, D.C. 20231

14

15 Dear Sir:

16

17

AMENDMENT

18

After the Supreme Court's Decision

19

20 During the hearings at the Board of Appeals, the
21 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the U.S. Supreme Court
22 there seemed to be no question as to what the claims meant.
23 However, from the comments of some attorneys since then, it
24 appears that, in the opinion of some, the claims do not literally
25 say what everyone involved up to now has interpreted them as
26 meaning. Therefore, the following amendments, fully supported
27 by the application, are offered in the hope that they will
28 clarify the meaning of the claims even to very critical readers
29 and will therefore conform the literal meaning to the very
30 meaning assumed by all the board members, judges, and justices

Please
enter
88

1 that have considered the case.

2 Please rewrite claims 1, 5, 7 and 11 as follows:

3 (Twice Amended)
4 1./ A method of operating a rubber-molding press for
5 precision molded compounds with the aid of a digital computer,
6 comprising:

7 providing said computer with a data base for said
8 press including at least,

9 natural logarithm conversion data (ln),
10 the activation energy constant (C) unique to each
11 batch of said compound being molded, and

12 a constant (x) dependent upon the geometry of the
13 particular mold of the press,

14 initiating an interval timer in said computer upon the
15 closure of the press for monitoring the elapsed time of said
16 closure,

17 constantly determining the temperature (Z) of the mold
18 at a location closely adjacent to the mold cavity in the press
19 during molding,

20 constantly providing the computer with the temperature
21 (Z),

22 repetitively [calculating] performing in the computer,
23 at frequent intervals during each cure, integrations to calculate
24 from the series of temperature determinations the Arrhenius
25 equation for reaction time during the cure, which is

26 $\ln v = CZ + x$

27 where v is the total required cure time,

28 repetitively comparing in the computer at [said]
29 frequent intervals during the cure each said calculation of the
30 total required cure time calculated with the Arrhenius equation

Dicivil

1 and said elapsed time, and
2 opening the press automatically when a said comparison
3 indicates [equivalence] completion of curing.

D2

4 (Twice Amended)
5 5./ A method of operating a plurality of rubber-molding
6 presses simultaneously curing precision molded compounds in
7 conjunction with a computer, comprising:
8 providing said computer with a data base for each said
9 press including at least,
10 natural logarithm conversion data (ln),
11 the activation energy constant (C) unique to each
12 batch of said compound being molded, and
13 a constant (x) dependent upon the geometry of the
14 particular mold of the said press,
15 constantly informing the computer of the temperature
16 (Z) of each mold,
17 informing the computer of the batch of the compound
18 being molded in each mold,
19 constantly informing the computer of the elapsed time
20 that the compound has been in each mold,
21 repetitively [calculating] performing for each said
22 press at frequent periodic intervals during each cure in the
23 computer, integrations to calculate from the series of
24 temperature determinations the Arrhenius equation to determine
25 the total required cure time, which is $\ln v = CZ + x$, where v
26 is the total required cure time,
27 repetitively comparing at [said] frequent periodic
28 intervals in the computer the calculated total required cure
29 time and the elapsed time for each said press, and
30

1 opening each said press automatically when its elapsed
2 time has reached its calculated total required cure time.

3 (Twice Amended)

4 7./ A method of manufacturing precision molded articles
5 from selected synthetic rubber compounds with the aid of a
6 digital computer, comprising:

7 providing said computer with a data base for a molding
8 press to be used in the molding, including at least,

9 natural logarithm conversion data (ln),

10 the activation energy constant (C) unique to each
11 batch of said compound being molded, and

12 a constant (X) dependent upon the geometry of the
13 particular mold of the press,

14 installing prepared unmolded synthetic rubber of one
15 said compound in a molding press cavity,

16 closing said press,

17 initiating an interval timer associated with said
18 computer upon the closure of the press for monitoring the elapsed
19 time of said closure,

20 constantly determining the temperature (Z) of the mold
21 at a location closely adjacent to the mold cavity in the press
22 during molding,

23 constantly providing the computer with the temperature
24 (Z),

25 repetitively [calculating] performing in the computer,
26 at frequent intervals during each cure, integrations to calculate
27 from the series of temperature determinations the Arrhenius
28 equation for reaction time during the cure, which is

29 $\ln v = CZ + x$

30 where v is the total required cure time,

D30211

1 repetitively comparing in the computer at [said]
2 frequent intervals during the cure each said calculation of
3 the total required cure time calculated with the Arrhenius
4 equation and said elapsed time,
5 opening the press automatically when a said comparison
6 indicates completion of curing [equivalence], and
7 removing the resulting precision molded article from
8 the press.

D4

9 (Amended)
10 11./ A method of manufacturing precision molded
11 articles from selected synthetic rubber compounds in an openable
12 rubber molding press having at least one heated precision mold,
13 comprising:
14 (a) heating said mold to a temperature range approxi-
15 mating a predetermined rubber curing temperature,
16 (b) installing prepared unmolded synthetic rubber of
17 a known compound in a molding cavity of a predetermined geometry
18 as defined by said mold,
19 (c) closing said press to mold said rubber to occupy
20 said cavity in conformance with the contour of said mold and to
21 cure said rubber by transfer of heat thereto from said mold,
22 (d) initiating an interval timer upon the closure of
23 said press for monitoring the elapsed time of said closure,
24 (e) heating said mold during said closure to maintain
25 the temperature thereof within said range approximating said
26 rubber curing temperature,
27 (f) constantly determining the temperature (Z) of
28 said mold at a location closely adjacent said cavity thereof
29 throughout closure of said press,
30

1 (g) repetitively [calculating] performing at frequent
2 periodic intervals throughout closure of said press integrations
3 to calculate from the series of temperature determinations the
4 Arrhenius equation for reaction time of said rubber to determine
5 total required cure time v as follows:

6
$$\ln v = cz + x$$

7 wherein c is an activation energy constant determined
8 for said rubber being molded and cured in said press, [z is the
9 temperature of said mold at the time of each calculation of
10 said Arrhenius equation,] and x is a constant which is a
11 function of said predetermined geometry of said mold,

12 (h) for each repetition of calculation of said
13 Arrhenius equation herein, comparing the resultant calculated
14 total required cure time with the monitored elapsed time
15 measured by said interval timer,

16 (i) opening said press when a said comparison of
17 calculated total required cure time and monitored elapsed time
18 indicates completion of curing [equivalence], and

19 (j) removing from said mold the resultant precision
20 molded and cured rubber article.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 5, and 7, as they stood prior to this amendment and as they went up to the Supreme Court, can be found in the preliminary amendment of August 5, 1975. Claim 11 can be found in the first amendment of April 19, 1976, following a first official action in this continuation application. The Examiner may want to refer to these papers.

As explained above, these amendments are being made to clarify the claims, actually conforming them to their meaning as understood throughout the prosecution of the application and in the appeals in the CCPA and the Supreme Court.

Claim 1 is amended to recite the step of repetitively performing integrations to calculate the Arrhenius equation from the series of temperature determinations. Previously, that portion of the claim recited simply "repetitively calculating in the computer ... the Arrhenius equation ... [by the formula] $\ln v = CZ + x$ where v is the total required cure time", and repetitively comparing each v calculation and the elapsed time.

This would be technically incorrect, if it were interpreted to mean that each calculated v value is based only upon the most-recent temperature determination, taking no account of all past variations in temperature. Such an interpretation is at odds with the remainder of the claim and with the entire application. The result would be erratic and inaccurate openings of the molds, probably occurring with a local increase in temperature as if the temperature had been at that increased value all along, rather than the result to which the invention is directed. The point of the amendment is to guard against such an interpretation and to assure correct

1 interpretation of the claims.

2 This amendment to claim 1 clarifies the manner in which
3 the calculations are performed, i.e. with integrations to take
4 into account all of the series of temperature determinations
5 up to the point of each integration. This is as disclosed in
6 the specification at page 7, lines 5 through 8. It is also
7 emphasized at page 7, lines 13 through 19. See also page 6,
8 lines 4 through 6.

9 Another amendment to claim 1 is the removal of the
10 word "said" in the first line of the next-to-last paragraph.
11 As claim 1 stood, it might have been interpreted as equating
12 the "frequent intervals" in that paragraph with the "frequent
13 intervals" above in the "repetitively calculating" paragraph.
14 However, it may be that the comparison of the most-recently
15 calculated total cure time with the elapsed time occurs much
16 more frequently than the occurrence of the actual calculations.
17 For example, see page 3, lines 21-25 in the specification, where
18 it is stated that the calculations may occur every ten seconds,
19 but the comparisons every second. The inclusion of the word
20 "said" by amendment to the claim August 5, 1975, was inadvertent,
21 and it should be deleted, even though it has created no
22 problems in the proceedings up through the Supreme Court.

23 Finally, claim 1 concluded with the molding press
24 being opened when a comparison indicates equivalence. However,
25 precise equivalence would rarely occur, and what was intended
26 was that the mold press open when sufficient time has elapsed.
27 This would usually be slightly more than sufficient time, since
28 the comparisons are made at finite intervals (e.g., one second)
29 and precise equivalence would almost always occur between
30 comparisons. Although the claim was certainly understood in

1 the way it was intended, it is preferred that amendment be made
2 to clear up any possible doubts. Thus, the claim is amended
3 to say that the molding press is opened when a comparison
4 indicates "completion of curing".

5 Claim 5 is amended in the same manner as claim 1,
6 with respect to the first two amendments made there, for the
7 same reasons. In the last line of claim 5, different wording
8 was used to define when the mold press is opened; so this does
9 not require amendment.


10 Claim 7 is amended as claim 1, in all three areas,
11 for the same reasons explained above with respect to claim 1.

12 Claim 11 is amended in paragraph (g) similarly to
13 claim 1. Two paragraphs below, a clause defining the term Z
14 is deleted, because Z is already defined above. In paragraph
15 (h) no change is necessary, because the phrase "said frequent
16 periodic intervals" is not included here. It is stated that
17 a comparison occurs for each repetition of the calculation
18 involving the Arrhenius equation, and this certainly would not
19 preclude the comparisons occurring more frequently than the
20 calculations.

21 In paragraph (i), the same amendment is made as was
22 made at the ends of claims 1 and 7.

23 These amendments are believed to correct and clarify
24 the claims, without changing the subject matter as found to
25 be allowable in the Supreme Court appeal. It is respectfully
26 requested that the amendments be entered and that the application
27 be passed to allowance.

28 Respectfully submitted,

29 
30 Robert E. Wickersham
Reg. No. 16,150
Attorney for Applicants
(415) 781-6361