

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation of a "projection means", on line 6, has been set forth without a corresponding function to be performed and therefore there is no basis for determining what the structure is or what would be an equivalent.

6. Claim 8 recites the phrase "configured to accommodate an elastomeric gasket" in line 2. It is unclear what exactly "configured to accommodate" means. Is any particular configuration being required? Also, it is unclear if the "elastomeric gasket" is supposed to be the same gasket as set forth in claim 1, line 4, which has the same parenthetical designator, or another gasket. Note that the gasket of claim 1 is not positively claimed as being elastomeric. It is further unclear if the gasket of claims 8 and 9 is the elastomeric gasket of claim 8 or the gasket of claim 1. For this Office action only, the gasket of claims 8, 9, and 10 will be treated as the gasket of claim 1 for claim rejection purposes.

7. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the cone surface" on line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Is this the same surface as the "cone-shaped surface" of claim 11? For this Office action only, the surface of claims 11 and 13 will be treated as the same for rejection purposes.

8. Claim 16 recites the limitation "wherein the bores" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For this Office action only, claim 16 will be treated as being dependent upon claim 15 for claim rejection purposes, which provides antecedence.

9. Claim 19 sets forth the limitation of "an elastic band" in line 2. Is this supposed to be the same as the "external elastic band" of claim 17, line 3 or in addition thereto? For this Office action only, the band of claim 19 will be treated as the band of claim 17 for rejection purposes.