Justification for "adapted for" feature

REMARKS

The Official Action of October 6, 2003, and the prior art relied upon therein have been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1-3, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under the second paragraph of § 112. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant does not understand why the language "adapted for mounting in a mounting hole" is indefinite. If something is "adapted" to do something, then it has to have requisite structure to enable it to undertake that task. The "adapted for" language is well accepted in U.S. patent practice and appears in so many U.S. patent claims as to be practically ubiquitous. In a search of the USPTO Patent Full-Text And Image Database, conducted by undersigned on January 5, 2004, containing data current through December 30, 2003, it was revealed that since 1976 there have been issued 411,902 U.S. patents in which claims contain the wording of either "adapted for" or "adapted to". Attached is a printout of the page revealing this information.

It would seem that if there are over four hundred thousand U.S. patents having claims using such language, the terminology cannot possibly be in non-compliance with the second paragraph of § 112.

Nevertheless, in deference to the examiner's views and to minimize needless argument, an amendment has been made in claim 1 addressing this criticism. Such amendment is of a formal nature only, i.e. made to place the claims in better forms consistent with the examiner's understanding of what is necessary or desirable under U.S. practice. Such an amendment is not a "narrowing" amendment because the scope of the claims has not been reduced in this regard. No limitations have been added in this regard and none are intended.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under § 102 as anticipated by each of Bias 5,082,409 (Bias '409), Bias USP 5,857,818 (Bias '818) and Huang USP 5,810,532 (Huang). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In setting forth these rejections, the PTO acknowledges that the Bias references and the reference to Huang all disclose the combination of a nut (or female screw rod) and a quick-release cap wherein the cap includes a top portion (that blocks the threaded bore of the nut) and a