



LIST OF PATENTS CLAIMS
ISSUED FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE,

For the week ending December 3, 1849.

To Sidney A. Bantz and William Andrew, of Frederick, Md., for improvement in Mills for Grinding.

What we claim as our invention is the vibratory motion given to the concave, substantially in the manner herein set forth.

To Wesley Chase, (Assignee of William T. Barnes, of Buffalo, N.Y.), for method of counterbalancing Window Sash.

What I claim is the arrangement herein described, of the hinged lever pinion and racks, with respect to a couple of window sashes, whereby the sashes can be connected and disconnected, adjusted and counterbalanced, as herein set forth.

But I make no claim to the mere counterbalancing of the sashes by this device.

To Ashley Crafts and Ebenezer Weeks, of Auburn, Ohio, for Double Revolving Scraper.

What we claim is the double cavity or cimeter-reversed scoop and scraper, whether of the precise shape herein described, or of any other substantially the same, revolving on pivots, so as to discharge and reload itself without being stopped and righted, (irrespective of the particular form of frame in which it is placed) in combination with devices substantially as described, for fastening and setting free the same.

To Wm. Eayrs, of Concord, N.H., for improvement in Stone-dressing Machines.

I wish it distinctly understood that I lay no claim to the invention of one or more chisels, and one or more hammers, as arranged, constructed, and applied to cutting or reducing stone, previous to the date of my invention or improvements, but I claim the *rotating hammer* as constructed and combined with each chisel stock, and made to impinge against it, and permit it to immediately afterwards move forward, preparatory to another blow essentially as specified.

To S. W. Foster, of Scio, Mich., for improvement in Grain Separators.

What I claim is the combination of the raking apparatus with the notched surfaces under which the irons on the ends of the rakes pass, by which means the rakes are caused to shake, which motion of the rakes shakes the straw and thereby separates the grain from it.

To Henry A. Landry, of Camden, N. J., (Assignee of John W. Hoffman, of Philadelphia, Pa.) for improved Frog for Railroads.

What I claim is a railroad frog, constructed with hinged leaves, acted up on either by weights or springs, essentially in the manner and for the purposes herein described.

To C. Kidder, (Administrator of George Crosby, of Baltimore, Md.) for improvement in File-cutting Machines.

Therefore what I claim, as Administrator of George Crosby, deceased, is, first, the peculiar combination of the spring hammer, in the manner and for the purpose above set forth.

Secondly, the application of a check for the purpose described.

To Nicholas Mason, of Roxbury, Mass., for improvement in Cooking Ranges.

I claim the arrangement of the flues on the sides, front, back and bottom of the boiler, and the upright plates, provided with valves at the top, and brick work of the range, in the manner and for the purposes set forth herein.

Secondly, I also claim the arrangement of the other flues on the sides and back of the fire chamber, and the flues under and at the back part and side of the oven and horizontal trunk, with valves and communicating with the apartments to be heated, for heating the air admitted from the cellar, or other place, by the valves, to the proper degree, to be conveyed to the apartments, as described.

Thirdly, I likewise claim the arrangement of the other plates, projecting from the plate and openings in said plate, for dividing the heat and causing one portion to be carried

around the front part of the wash boiler, and the other portion around the back part of the same, as described.

To George E. Murray, of Philadelphia, Pa., for improvement in making Artificial Teeth.

What I claim is an artificial tooth, having a plate combined therewith, substantially in the manner and for the purpose set forth.

To Jacob Pecare and Josiah M. Smith, of New York, N. Y., for improved concealed Trigger for Fire-Arms.

What we claim is the construction of a concealed trigger capable of being disclosed and made ready to operate by simple pressure imparted by the hand to its rear end, as described herein.

To Samuel W. Powell, of Tuscarora, Pa., for improvement in Mills for Grinding.

What I claim is a grinding mill, consisting of two rolls, on whose surfaces grooved and fluted helical ribs are formed, and which move with different velocities, the several parts of the machine being arranged and operated substantially as herein set forth.

To Alexander Stiven, of New York, N. Y., for improvement in Pumps for raising water.

What I claim is the annular ring with radial arm and slot in cylinder immediately between the exit and entrance, and giving motion to the annular ring or piston by an eccentric or cam, and the whole operating conjointly together as particularly set forth and illustrated in my specification and drawings herewith.

To Garret Van Riper, of Jersey City, N. J., for improvements in machinery for Spinning Hemp.

I do not claim the spinning frame, nor the spindle nor bobbin, nor the use of a flyer, or the mode of operating the same; but what I claim is the use of the circular headed flyer having a circular head at each end constructed and operating substantially as shown above.

I also claim in combination with a flanch or shoulder near the foot of the spindle, and permanently attached thereto, the use of a movable friction plate of metal, when the same is pressed to the flanch or shoulder, or upon an interposed washer, by an adjustable spring or lever pressing on both sides of the spindle, and thereby producing a drag or retardation—while by its longitudinal action it retains the spindle steadily in its step, at the same time increasing the friction and retardation, whereby I am enabled to impart any required degree of tightness to the yarn as spun, and give it a greater uniformity of texture, than can be done by any other known method, as herein set forth.

My improvements were intended for the purpose of spinning yarn from hemp and flax, but are equally useful for spinning yarn for cloth from hemp, flax or worsted—also for strong yarns from any material, and for rovings; for cotton twine from cotton yarn, and for doubling and twisting all sorts of yarn and twines.

To Prosp. Verdat au Trembley, of Paris, France for improvements in Condensers and Stuffing Boxes of Vapor Engines.

I claim the ether generator or vaporizer and condenser constructed substantially as described, whereby I obtain more perfect joints.

I also claim packing the stuffing boxes by means of leather or other analogous substance surrounding the body to be packed, when the said leather or other substance is surrounded by a chamber containing a fluid under pressure, substantially as described.

To Hiram H. Wiser, of Rochester, New York, for improvement in Cast-iron Car Wheels.

What I claim is the particular manner of forming my wheel, it being formed of an inside and outside plate—each plate being formed of sunk and raised panels alternately, the space between the raised panels extending from the hub to the tread—the part of the plates which form the sunk panels join between the hub and the tread, for the purposes substantially as herein described and represented.

To Alvah Worster, of Hannibal, N. Y., for improvement in detachable buckle-tongues.

What I claim is the detachable buckle-tongue, constructed and arranged in the manner and for the purpose herein represented.

DESIGNS.

To Daniel F. Goodhue and Charles Guild, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for Design for Stoves.

We claim the particular configuration of mouldings around the edge of the doors, and

the ornaments on their panels; also the external plates of the stove ornamented, as described and illustrated, and the ornamental pattern of leg, as shown.

To Samuel Hill and Wm. B. Cline, of Philadelphia, Pa., for Design for Stoves.

We claim the combination of the ornamental figures constituting one design, as herein set forth.

RE-ISSUES.

To John S. Hall, of Columbus, Ohio, for Mill for rolling irregular shapes by means of a cam pattern. Patented Jan. 30, 1849. Re-issued Dec. 4, 1849.

I wish it to be understood that I do not claim moving the top roller up and down by a pattern, that having already been done, but I claim the employment of cams, as herein described, for elevating or depressing one of the rollers of a rolling mill, in combination with gearing the same as above set forth, so that a pattern of any length on the cam may be made to effect the surface of any given length of bar in proportional ratio, by change of the relative size of the gearing by which I avoid, in rolling long bars, any long patterns, difficult to handle and expensive to construct.

Planing Machine Patent Cases.

JACOB P. WILSON vs. DANIAL BARNUM.—In Circuit Court U.S., Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Issued directed from Chancery.

(Continued from page 94.)

Let us take therefrom several claims in the words of specification, and see what is claimed in each, so that you may be enabled to discover whether the machines of the defendant now before you, or either of them, come within the principle or combination, or have the peculiar structure and constituent parts of either.

1st. The first claim in the specification is in these words: "What is claimed as the invention of William Woodworth, deceased, is, the employment of rotating planes substantially such as herein described, in combination with rollers or any analogous device to prevent the boards from being drawn up by the planes when cutting upwards—or from the reduced or planed to the unplanned surface as described."

As the machine patented by the defendant is alleged to be the same in substance with the combination here stated, this will form the first subject of your inquiry.

First, you will observe the patentee does not claim to be the inventor of the planing cylinder—nor of pressure rollers—nor of pressure—nor of the dip and lift cut—nor of planing from the finished to the unfinished surface—nor of planing on the length in opposition to across the head—but for a combination of these rollers or other device effecting the same purpose with rotating planes substantially such as described.

What sort of rotating planes have been described?

The patent describes them as cylinders, and the action of the planes as cutting on a curved line, making the cut like an adze, or what is called a dip and lift cut.

The difficulty to be overcome with this sort of rotating planes, was their tendency to lift the plank and cause a vibratory motion; to obviate this the pressure rollers were used. The question for your decision will therefore be:—Has the defendant's machine the rotary cylinder, or any other device substantially the same and operating in the same way, combined with pressure rollers or any known mechanical equivalent used for the purpose of preventing the boards from being drawn up? If so, he has infringed the plaintiff's patent.

Is the wheel used by the defendant substantially the same as that described in this patent? or is it an entirely different machine and the pressure guides used in connection with it used for an entirely different purpose, and to obviate a difficulty in its use entirely different from that proposed to be overcome by the pressure rollers in the plaintiff's machine? If so, it is no infringement on the plaintiff's patent.

Neither the plaintiff nor the defendant is the inventor of the Bramah or Disk wheel, or of cutters rotating cylindrically—they were both known before but not successfully applied.—The plaintiff's patent has been completely successful in overcoming the difficulties attending

the use of cutters rotating on cylinders—has the defendant merely applied the principle of his invention to a substantially similar tool or machine? Is there anything in plaintiff's specification, or the combination claimed therein, which would obviate the difficulties attending the use of the Disk?

The cones used in former cases are evidently mere colorable evasions. All the intermediate cones between the cylinder and the disk may be made by a corresponding inclination of their axes, to act substantially as cylinders, as was remarked by Brother Kane, in a late case. "The deviation from the strict form of the Woodworth machine towards that of Bramah's, or from the latter to the former, may go on increasing till the appropriate action of the original machine effectively disappears.—The cylinder by a series of progressive changes having lost itself in the disk, or the disk in the cylinder, it is impossible to define for practical purposes that angle or degree of deviation at which one of these geometric forms shall be said to pass into the other."

The same might be said with regard to the rotary cutter, or chisel, and the saw, while yet our senses demonstrate to us that the extremes are entirely different instruments, tools, or machines. If the defendant has discovered a mode of applying the disk to use in planing boards by some combination not set forth in the plaintiff's patent or suggested by it, he may be a meritorious inventor. But if he has only changed the form and proportion of his machine in order to show a mere colorable evasion to cover, while he pirates or steals the invention of the plaintiff's, he should be punished as a wrong doer; within which category this case comes, it is your province to decide.

It is not pretended that the patented machine of defendant infringes any other combination mentioned in plaintiff's specification excepting that which I have stated.

2d. Your next inquiry will be whether the machine used by the defendant for tonguing and grooving is an infringement of the plaintiff's patent, or any combination set forth in his specification.

The cutter wheels described and invented by plaintiff are evidently but modifications of his planing cylinders; the plane reduced to the chisel. The defendant uses circular saws in connection with pressure rollers.

It was said in a former case by my colleague that, "the idea of tonguing and grooving by modifications of the circular saw, is at least as old as 1793, when it was described by Gen Bentham, from whom Muir copied his machine many years after. The specifications of the two concur in describing a thick revolving saw or cutter to make the groove, and two wheel saws set at right angles with each other, on each side of the plank, making four in all, to cut the rebates of the tongue; the machine of Woodworth is an improvement on these, by substituting a single firm cutting wheel for the four circular tonguing saws, and combining this with the equally firm grooving cutter on the other edge of the plank, to reduce it to an exactly equal width throughout."

The plaintiff cannot now claim that the use of circular saws is an invasion of their patent as it is admitted that they were applied to this purpose long before their patent, and I do not understand that they make that allegation now, but that the defendant has so fashioned his grooving saw, as to be in fact the cutter wheel or revolving chisel used by them.

The second combination claimed by plaintiff as constituting the peculiarity, or principle of his invention is, "the combination of the rotating planes, with the cutter wheels for tonguing and grooving, for the purpose of planing, tonguing and grooving boards, &c. at one operation, as described."

It is not pretended that the defendant's machines infringe this claim.

His third claim is for "the combination of tonguing and grooving cutter wheels, for tonguing and grooving boards at one operation, as described."

And his fourth, "the combination of either the tonguing or the grooving cutter wheel for tonguing and (or) grooving boards, &c., with the pressure rollers, as described."

(To be Continued.)