the two affidavits of the plaintiff, and the files and contents in the matter of the reissues, but is denied in the other particulars.

No reason is seen why the defendant should not recover the costs of the cause.

The same rulings are made as to the case against Thornton and others.

In the case against Blake and others, the application to introduce further evidence is granted in the respects above indicated, and denied in the other particulars, and the suit as to them will proceed in course.

---

## WOOSTER *v.* HOWE MACHINE CO.

*Circuit Court, S. D. New York.* July 22, 1884.

PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS.
*Wooster* v. *Handy, ante*, 51, followed. Bill dismissed.

In Equity.

BLATCHFORD, Justice. The decision herewith made, in *Wooster* v. *Handy, ante*, 51, requires that the bill in this case should be dismissed as to both of the reissued patents sued on, because of their invalidity as respects claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 of the Pipo reissue, and claims 8 and 9 of the Robjohn reissue; the dismissal to be with costs.

The same decision is made in the suits against the following defendants: The Singer Manufacturing Company, a New York corporation; the Wilcox & Gibbs Sewing-machine Company; the Domestic Sewing-machine Company, impleaded, etc.; Allen Schenck, impleaded, etc.; the Singer Manufacturing Company, a New Jersey corporation; and Charles B. Barker.

---

## HOOD and others *v.* BOSTON CAR-SPRING CO. and others.

*(Circuit Court, D. Massachusetts.* July 25, 1884.

PATENT—EARLIER PUBLICATION—DEFINITENESS.
A patent is not invalidated by statements in an earlier publication, unless these statements are full and definite enough to inform those skilled in the art how to put into practice the invention now patented.

In Equity.

*Dickerson & Dickerson*, for complainants.

*Eugene N. Eliot*, for defendants.

Before GRAY and NELSON, JJ.

GRAY, Justice. This is a bill in equity for the infringement of a patent granted to Isaac Adams, Jr., on May 6, 1879, for an improvement in coating metallic articles with vulcanizable rubber. The specification begins as follows:

"Great difficulty has been experienced in making rubber adhere securely to metals; but by my improvement a firm adhesion may be obtained. The invention consists in interposing between the metallic article and the rubber a film of any metal which, at the temperature of vulcanization, has a considerable tendency to unite with the sulphur always contained in the rubber compounds. Of metals possessing such tendency, the films of which may be interposed, the most suitable are copper and silver, and of these copper is the easiest as well as the cheapest to apply. Lead and zinc may likewise be used; but there is a greater difficulty in obtaining a suitable deposit of these metals for the interposing film. The metallic article is first covered with the film selected, and the rubber compound is then applied in the usual way and vulcanized."

The specification throughout insists upon the necessity of making the interposed film very thin. It states that the film must not be of the same metal as the article on which it is deposited; that it may be produced either by dipping or by electro-plating; that in covering iron, steel, or tin articles with copper, the method of dipping is preferable, and the article must be immersed in a weak solution of sulphate of copper just long enough to produce a bright copper-colored deposit; and that when the method of electro-plating is adopted, great care should be taken that too thick a film be not deposited, and a film such as is known as "coloring" or "striking" is sufficient.

The principal claim is for "the process of covering metallic articles with rubber, by first coating the said metallic articles with a thin film of copper or other metal which readily unites with sulphur, and then applying the rubber and submitting it to vulcanization, substantially as described."

According to the evidence, the peculiar value of this invention consists in the very thin film of copper, or other suitable metal, which, in the process of vulcanizing, is acted on by the sulphur contained in the rubber, so as to unite or combine with the sulphur and be absorbed into the rubber, and to hold together the rubber and the metal which has been coated with the film, and make the rubber stick so fast to that metal that it cannot be forced off without tearing the rubber itself. If the film of copper is too thick, the whole of it is not absorbed into the rubber, and so much of it, modified by the action of the sulphur, as is not absorbed, has so little coherence that the rubber may be readily detached. The difference is analogous to that which appears in the case of a glue, in itself friable and of little tenacity, a very thin film of which will hold two articles together, but a thicker layer of which may be easily broken apart. The value of the invention is well exemplified in the construction of wringer rolls, for which it has been much used by both parties.

The defendants admit that if the Adams patent is valid they have