

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 2, 2a, 5, 16a, 16b, and 16c. Figures 2A, 16A, 16B, and 16C have been amended to replace "2A," "16A," "16B," and "16C" with "2a," "16a," "16b," and "16c." The plane A-A in Figure 2 has been amended as plane 2a-2a. The plane z-z in Figure 16b has been amended as plane 16c-16c. Figure 5 has been amended to show the adjustment screw 32.

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-18, 28, 29, 31-33, and 36-42 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-31, 36, and 38-41 have been amended. Paragraphs [0010] and [0019] have been amended. Figures 2, 2a, 5, 16a, 16b, and 16c have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Action suggested eliminating clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information and highlighting those documents known to be of most significance. The previously submitted information disclosure statements noted the documents of most significance and are not duplicates and/or cumulative. The previous information disclosure statements included a “newly cited” notation for references that were not previously disclosed.

Objections to the Drawings

The Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.84(h)(3), 1.121(e), and 1.83(a).

The drawings and specification were objected to as being inconsistent with each other. The drawings have been amended to recite “2a” instead of “2A,” “16a” instead of “16A,” “16b” instead of “16B,” and “16c” instead of “16C.” The sectional planes for Figures 2 and 16b have also been amended to correspond to the planes of Figures 2a and 16c.

The drawings were objected to as failing to show every feature specified in the claims. Figure 5 has been amended to show the adjustment screw.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Action objected to the specification because of informalities. Paragraphs [0010] and [0019] have been amended to conform with the replacement Figures. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Action objected to the claims because of informalities regarding the term “control device.” The claims have been amended and withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 41 was objected to as failing to have support in the specification for a first portion and second portion. Claim 41 has been amended and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The drawings have been amended

to clearly show the screw elements, i.e. the screw and the female screw. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, 28, 29, 31-33, and 36-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to recite “control lever” instead of “control member” and “adjustment screw element” instead of “adjustment member.” Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 1-4, 6-18, 28, 29, 31-33, and 36-42 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11-18, 28, 29, 31-33, and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Irie et al. (U.S. 2003/0167871) (hereinafter “Irie”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first body adapted to be associated with a bicycle handlebar that defines a first grip portion of a control device and a second body that is distinct from the first body that defines a second grip portion of the control device.

Irie discloses a handlebar (15) connected to a bracket (30) and a lever (31) connected to the bracket (30). The Action cited the bracket (30) as the first body and an adjustment member (32) as the second body. The second body (32) does not define a second grip portion of the control device. The second body (32) is entirely mounted between the lever member (31) and the first body (30) and accordingly fails to define a second grip portion of the control device.

Claims 31 and 39 recite similar limitations as amended claim 1. Claims 2-4, 7, 8, 11-18, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36-38, and 40 depend from claims 1, 31, and 39 and are similarly patentable over Irie.

Claims 31 and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shimano (U.S. 4,459,871). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 31 and 39 recite, *inter alia*, a first body that defines a first grip portion of a control device and a second body that is distinct from or associated with the first body that defines a second grip portion of the control device.

The Examiner cited Shimano's cover (2) as the first body and the bracket (1) as the second body. The cover (2) includes a bore (14) for allowing adjustment of an adjustment member (13) for altering the location of control member (3). The adjustment member (13) is supported in the bracket (1). Shimano fails to disclose the second body (1) defines a second grip portion of the control device. The first body (2) is a cover that encompasses the second body (1); accordingly, Shimano fails to disclose the second body (1) defines a second grip portion of the control device.

Claims 40-42 depend from claim 39 and are similarly patentable over Shimano for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 31 and 39-42 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 31, and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Romano (U.S. 4,945,785). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Romano discloses a bicycle handlebar with a support (3) for attaching a brake lever (5) to the handlebar (1). The Action cited the second element (3b) as the first body and the first element (3a) as the second body. Neither the first body (3b) nor the second body (3a) defines a grip portion because a cyclist would never drive the bicycle of Romano by gripping portions other than the grip (2). If the cyclist were to grip portions other than the grip (2), the cyclist would not be able to access the brake mechanism. Accordingly, Romano defines a single grip portion (2) and fails to disclose two grip portions defined by the first and second bodies (3a, 3b) as recited by the independent claims.

Claims 40-42 depend from claim 39 and are similarly patentable over Romano for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 31, and 39-42 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irie. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is similarly patentable over Irie for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irie in view of Romano. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are similarly patentable over Irie in view of Romano for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that an interview will advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience to arrange the same.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application, including all of the pending claims, is allowable. Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Giuseppe Dal Pra'

By /Anthony S. Volpe/
Anthony S. Volpe
Registration No. 28,377
(215) 255-9101
AVolpe@vklaw.com

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

ASV/TPG/vag

Enclosures