EC-2

INTERNATIONAL SMELTING AND REFINING COMPANY

25 Broadway

New York

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

September 9, 1940

Mr. James W. Laist,
Pennie, Davis, Marvin & Edmonds,
165 Broadway,
New York City.

Re: Johnson et al. Application
Serial No. 178,352
Filed December 6th, 1937
For: METHOD OF PRODUCING
WHITE LEAD

Dear Sir:

I am sending you herewith copy of Mr. Case's letter of September 5th, 1940 relative to above noted patent application.

I would appreciate your outlining an affidavit for execution by Mr. Johnson.

Yours very truly,

S
Enc.

cc: Mr. F. O. Case

N11332

PNYC00008444

INTERNATIONAL SMELTING AND REFINING COMPANY

ANACONDA
from mine to consumer

F. O. CASE
MANAGER OF MIDWEST DISTRICT

20 N. WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Sept. 5, 1940

Mr. Frederick Laist,
Vice-President,
International Smelting & Refining Company,
25 Broadway,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Laist:

Two complete files are enclosed relative to Johnson et al. Application Serial No. 178,352. We did not have a chance to discuss this with you recently at East Chicago, but we have all been over it and, as indicated by Mr. Johnson, we would appreciate Mr. James W. Laist's outlining an affidavit for execution by Mr. Johnson.

We believe that Jim has all the information that he needs for this affidavit, but if there are any specific questions, it will be a pleasure to try and answer them.

Very truly yours,

F. O. Case

FOC:vlc
encls.

Copy Mr. James W. Laist 9/9/40

PNYC00008445

INTERNATIONAL SMELTING AND REFINING COMPANY

EAST CHICAGO, INDIANA

G. E. JOHNSON
PLANT MANAGER

ANACONDA

PLANTS: EAST CHICAGO, IND.
AKRON, OHIO

September 4th, 1940

Mr. F. O. Case, Manager of Midwest District,
International Smelting and Refining Company,
20 North Wacker Drive,
Chicago, Illinois.

Re: Johnson et al. Application
Serial No. 179,552
Filed December 6th, 1937
For: Method of Producing
White Lead

Dear Mr. Case:-

This letter will acknowledge receipt of yours of August 23rd, with particular reference to the above-mentioned patent application and an affidavit which Mr. James Laist suggested be prepared.

Since the receipt of this information, we have carefully considered the attitude of the Patent Office and also the suggestions made. We agree with the suggestion of Mr. James Laist that the prosecution of this case be continued by filing an affidavit, and presenting it to the Board of Appeals if necessary. It is our opinion that he is best qualified to prepare an affidavit along the lines that would be necessary to further prosecute the case. If this is satisfactory to Mr. Laist, we wish to suggest that he prepare such an affidavit that is satisfactory to him. We could then study and carefully consider the statements made in the affidavit, and if satisfactory execute it for use in presenting it to the Board of Appeals.

PNYC00008446

We trust these suggestions are acceptable; if not, we would appreciate any further comments.

Very truly yours,

G. E. Johnson.

GEJ/s
encl.