BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PATENT AND TRADEMARK CAUSES

SUITE 300
419 SEVENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004-2299

TELEPHONE (202)-628-5197

TELECOPIER FACSIMILE
(202) 737-3528
(202) 393-1012

E-MAIL
BrwdyNmrk@nmaa.org

SHERIDAN NEIMARK
ROGER L. BROWDY

ANNE M. KORNBAU
NORMAN J. LATKER
NICK BROMER*
(*PA BAR ONLY)

OF COUNSEL
IVER P. COOPER

SENIOR COUNSEL
ALVIN BROWDY

PATENT AGENT
ALLEN C. YUN, PH.D.

December 26, 1996

VIA TELEFACSIMILE

Ms. Mayah Shevet
ROTLEX
TEMED Industrial Park
D.N. Arava
ISRAEL

Re: International PCT Application PCT/US96/00791
ROTLEX (1994) LTD.
AN OPTICAL DEVICE AND A METHOD OF UTILIZING ...
Our Ref: KEREN=2 PCT

Dear Ms. Shevet:

We have now received a written opinion from the PCT examiner in charge of this case. It can be seen that the examiner considers claims 1-20 claims 13 and 14 as being obvious over U.S. patent 5,046,843. A copy of this reference was forwarded to you with our letter of June 13, 1996.

Any response to a written opinion must be filed within two months of the date of the opinion. In this case, the response is due by February 6, 1997. No extensions of time are possible.

It is not necessary to amend the claims in response to a written opinion or even to file any response to a written opinion. If no response is filed, a preliminary examination report will issue which will probably be the same as the written opinion. However, the preliminary examination report is not binding on the examination in the national or regional phases. Accordingly, you may prefer to withhold amendments to the claims until examination by each national or regional office which is eventually entered. Alternatively, you may wish to amend the claims and file arguments in an attempt to convince the PCT examiner to issue a preliminary examination report confirming the novelty and unobviousness of all of the claims. Again, this is not binding on any of the national or regional offices eventually entered, except that it is usually accepted by the examiner in the U.S. national phase, which examiner will probably be the same as the international examiner.

As you are more familiar with this case than we are, we have not reviewed this written opinion on the merits. Please

advise if you wish for us to do so and we will let you have our comments and opinions.

Unless you advise to the contrary, we will take no action to respond to the Written Opinion prior to the deadline of February 6, 1997. A copy of the written opinion is enclosed herewith along with our debit memorandum for services.

Sincerely,

Roger L. Browdy

RLB:al
Enclosure
roger\pct\keren2.wop