

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in this application. Claims 12, 14-16, and 18, have been withdrawn. Claims 1 and 19-22 have been amended. Figures 1-14, 20, 21, and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because every line must be sufficiently dense, dark, uniformly thick, and well-defined. Replacement sheets including Figures 1-14, 20, 21, and 24 are submitted herewith and the withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11, 13, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Armstrong (US 3,972,247). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The rejected independent claims recite, *inter alia*, a first and second pawl for engaging teeth on an indexer mechanism. The first pawl moves with or is integrally formed with a driven arm of the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them, and is in thrusting engagement with the first teeth when the lever is moved in a first direction beyond a predetermined rotation threshold. The second pawl is driven out of retention engagement with the second teeth when the lever is moved in the first direction up to the predetermined rotation threshold.

Armstrong discloses a first pawl 98 that is **not integrally formed** with a driven arm of the lever 110 and that **does not move** with a driven arm of the lever 110. As shown in Armstrong's figures, the advance (first) pawl 98 is pivotaly mounted about an advance pawl pivot pin 96 that is connected to the control lever 110. The first pawl 98 and the lever 110 experience relative movement with regard to each other. (Armstrong, column 9, lines 37-56). The first pawl of the present invention moves with the driven arm of the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them. As a result, the first pawl and the driven arm function as a single piece with regard to rotary or translatory movement.

Claim 1 recites a toothed wheel that rotates with the cable-winding bush, so that there is no relative movement between them. The first pawl moves with a driven arm of the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them.

Claim 19 recites a toothed wheel that is integral in rotation with the cable-winding bush, so that the toothed wheel and the cable-winding bush function as a single unit. The first pawl is integrally formed as a portion of a driven arm of the lever.

Claim 20 is recites to a toothed wheel that rotates with the cable-winding bush, so that there is no relative movement between them. The first pawl is formed integrally with a driven arm of the lever.

Claim 21 recites a toothed wheel that functions with the cable-winding bush, so that there is no relative movement between them. The first pawl is integral with a driven arm of the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them.

Claim 22 is directed to a first pawl integrally formed with a driven arm of the lever.

As stated above, the first pawl 98 and lever 110 of Armstrong experience relative movement. A thrusting pawl (first pawl) that is integrally formed with or that moves with the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them, is simpler and safer in operation, and has a quicker and more controlled response than a pawl that is capable of swinging about a pin fixed to the lever and that is biased by a spring, such as Armstrong's pawl 98 and spring 100.

Independent claims 19-21 of the present application recite a swinging member having two arms, a driven arm and a driving arm, and pivoted onto the support body. A second pawl is formed on the driven arm of the swinging member. The second pawl disengages from the second teeth while the lever is moved in the first direction up to the predetermined rotation threshold. The driven arm of the lever, during its displacement up to the predetermined rotation threshold, controls the driving arm of the swinging member.

The Examiner states that Armstrong discloses a second pawl (specifically the portion of leg 84 that contacts teeth 68) formed on a driven arm (portion 84 that is driven by element 86) of a swinging member (element 76 as a whole). Applicants disagree. Armstrong's swinging member does not have two arms; the second pawl 76 is a single arm that is pivoted at 80 on the support body. The second pawl 76 is not formed on a driven arm of a swinging member pivoted to the support body as recited by claims 19-21. The stop pawl 76 is pivotally supported by pivot shaft 80

and has a leg portion 84 which is adapted to selectively engage respective ones of the teeth 66. The release means 34 is comprised of a release pawl 86 pivotally mounted on release pawl pivot 88. The release pawl 86 is operatively connected to a release pawl torsion spring 90 having one end abutting a surface of the release pawl 86 and an opposite end engaging an abutment surface located on the operator control means 38. The stop pawl 76 and its leg portion 84 do not engage or interact with the advance pawl or its leg portion 102. Accordingly, the independent claims are not anticipated by Armstrong.

Claims 2-10 and 13, which depend upon claim 1, are allowable over Armstrong for at least the same reasons provided above. Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 1-11, 13, and 19-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jordan et al. (US 2006/0207375 A1) (hereinafter "Jordan"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a first pawl that moves with a driven arm of the lever, so that there is no relative movement between them, and is in thrusting engagement with the first teeth when the lever is moved in a first direction beyond a predetermined rotation threshold. Jordan fails to disclose a first pawl as recited in claim 1. Rather, Jordan discloses a lever 20 that rotates about a shaft 32 and causes the drive pawl 84 (the first pawl) to move away from the declutching wall 88. This rotation pivots the drive pawl nose 96 to engage the ratchet wheel teeth 66. (See Jordan,

paragraph [0021]). Jordan's first pawl is rotatably mounted about a drive pawl pivot 90 that is fixed to the control lever 20. The drive pawl 84 and the lever 20 have a relative movement. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Jordan.

Claim 17 is dependent upon claim 1, which the Applicants believe is allowable over Jordan for at least the reasons noted above in connection with claim 1. Withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that an interview will advance prosecution of the application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to schedule an interview at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-22, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Dal Pra' et al.

By /Anthony S. Volpe/
Anthony S. Volpe
Registration No. 28,377
avolpe@vklaw.com
Tel: 215-255-9101

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

ASV/SAW/vag