

Brief Notes Concerning Patents.

If the reports of the daily press are to be credited, Alexander Graham Bell is the inventor of an airship which is shortly to be tested. As usual, no one but the inventor knows anything of the structural features of the contrivance.

Edwin D. Brainard, an inventor, mechanical engineer and architect, well known all over the country, died at his home in Pittsfield, Mass., on July 9. He was seventy-three years old, and his death was directly due to a shock sustained a week before. He was the inventor of the Brainard cold storage system, which has been installed all over the world for the purposes of refrigeration, which was the means of carrying his name far and wide.

Up to the first of May there had been fifty-seven patents granted covering wireless telegraphy or the parts of the instruments used in the transmission of messages by the wireless systems. The first was granted to A. E. Dolbear on October 5, 1886. Thomas Edison received the third patent in this line, and he has another patent issued in 1891. The first one issued to Marconi was in July, 1897, and since that time he has taken out eleven others, the last of which was dated June 11, 1901. Tesla has taken out seven patents in this field of invention.

Prof. Reginald Fessenden, the inventor of a system of wireless telegraphy with which the United States government is experimenting, has announced his intention of resigning his position in the Weather Bureau early in September, and soon after that the company which has been organized to exploit his invention will be ready to engage in commercial business. Stations equipped with his instruments will be located along the Pacific coast at an early date, and will be used in the dissemination of the weather reports through that part of the country.

C. Henry Wernle, an inventor and maker of delicate mathematical instruments, died recently at his home, No. 2650 Bockius Street, Philadelphia. He was born in Germany, and came to this country when a very young man, and for fifty years had been employed by the United States government at the Frankford arsenal. Many of the instruments now in use at that institution were of his invention and manufacture, and his secret of tempering fine and delicate instruments is said to have died with him, for he repeatedly refused to impart it to others.

A stone of granite to the memory of John Fitch, who was identified with the early history of the locomotive and the steamboat, has been erected in Warminster township, Bucks county, Pa. The stone was presented to the Bucks County Historical Society by Edward Longstreth, of Philadelphia, and that organization placed it on the spot where Fitch is said to have conceived the idea of propelling carriages by power. He worked on this thought for a while, and abandoned it to devote his time to a boat driven by power. The latter experiments were commenced in 1781. The memorial is nine feet high, and two feet square at the base.

A handsome monument will be erected to the memory of Matthew Baldwin, the founder of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, in Philadelphia, which recently completed its 20,000th locomotive. It will take the form of a bronze effigy on an imposing base, and will be placed in a small park which belongs to the city, but which faces the offices of the company.

Charles E. Yetman, a Western telegraph operator, is the inventor of a machine for sending telegraph messages by a typewriter. The idea, to be sure, is not new; nevertheless Mr. Yetman is said to have made some important improvements. His invention consists of a typewriter and telegraph instrument combined. The latter is so arranged that, by striking a key, the Morse letters are plainly and accurately produced. Wires connect the machine with the telegraph line.

Capt. Charles C. Dickinson, of the General Land Office at Washington, D. C., is the inventor of a lifeboat and a new means of launching such craft, which was given a successful trial from the deck of the steamer "Kent" recently. The boat is made of steel, and with the exception of the middle is covered with a rounded top. At each end is a water-tight compartment large enough to accommodate several persons. Entrance to these compartments is secured through doors which are closed to keep out the water and which are supplied with heavy glass to permit those inside to see out. These shelters are ventilated by funnels which are arranged to close automatically in case of the capsizing of the boat. The craft is so weighted that it will always right itself in the heaviest sea. The new system of launching does away with any gear or tackle or davits. The keel of the boat rests on a cradle so connected with rollers that on being slightly elevated the boat with its occupants shoots out of the cradle into the water. The tests given at Washington were successful in every particular.

Legal Notes.

THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY.—A trade-mark case of unusual interest was recently decided in the Court of Appeals of New York State. The case in question, *Roberson vs. Rochester Folding Box Company* and the *Franklin Mills Company*, appellant, involved the right of the defendant to use the plaintiff's portrait as a poster in advertising the *Franklin Mills Flour*. In this State no precedent for such an action is to be found in the decisions of the Court of Appeals. For that reason the decision now handed down is one of considerable legal importance. Chief Justice Parker, who wrote the prevailing opinion, held that the right of privacy, founded upon the claim that a man has the right to pass through this world without having his picture published, his business enterprises discussed, his successful experiments written up for the benefit of others, or his eccentricities commented upon, would, when recognized to the fullest degree, result not only in a vast amount of litigation, but litigation bordering upon absurdity. For the right of privacy once legally asserted, it would necessarily be held to include the same thing if spoken instead of printed; for one, as well as the other, invades the right of privacy. On grounds, therefore, of public policy, and on examination of the authorities which have indirectly dealt with similar cases, the Court was led to the conclusion that the so-called right of privacy has not as yet found an abiding place in our jurisprudence, and that the doctrine cannot now be incorporated among our legal principles without doing violence to settled principles of law. It therefore seems that there is no possible means of preventing one's picture from being used as an advertisement. But the plaintiff always has his action in tort if he can show that he has suffered actual injury. Furthermore, the New York Penal Code provides ample punishment for the malicious publication of pictures.

In his dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Gray holds more liberally that an individual has a right to privacy which he can enforce, and the invasion of which equity will prevent. The right of privacy, in Judge Gray's opinion, or the right of the individual to be let alone, is a personal right, which is not without judicial recognition and is the complement of the right to immunity of one's person. The common law regarded individual personal property as inviolate. When, as here, there is an alleged invasion of some personal right or privilege, the fact that early commentators on the common law have not discussed the subject is of no material importance in awarding equitable relief. Judge Gray takes the broad view that because the preventive power of a court of equity has not hitherto been exercised in analogous cases no valid objection can be made to the assumption of jurisdiction in the particular circumstances of the present case. The performance of an act by a defendant which is wrongful, because constituting an invasion in some novel form of a right to something which is conceded to be the plaintiff's, and as to which the law provides no adequate remedy, should be enjoined.

The case came up before the Court on demurrer from the Appellate Division, the opinion of which was reversed, the Court standing four for reversal and three for affirmance.

GEOGRAPHICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE WORDS AS TRADE-MARKS.—The old matter of the use of geographical and descriptive terms as trade-marks has once again been aired in court, and once again been decided in the long-established way. The latest case was that of *Draper vs. Skerrett*, decided in the Circuit Court, Eastern District Pennsylvania (116 Fed. Rep. 206). The plaintiff purchased from France a thin emollient paper dressing for corns, known as "*Papier Fayard*," which he put up in a different and more useful and attractive form, and sold under the name of "*French Tissue*." By that name it became known in this country. Through an arrangement with plaintiffs, defendants acquired the sole right to handle this preparation in certain localities, plaintiffs furnishing specially-colored envelopes upon which their names appeared as proprietors. Subsequently defendants began putting up and selling a similar preparation for themselves under the same name of "*French Tissue*," employing a dress, both as to the squares of paper themselves, the envelopes in which they were sold, and the advertising circulars inside, closely simulating that of plaintiffs. The court held that whether the relation of defendants to plaintiffs was that of sales agents or merely customers, it was clear that they were attempting to take advantage of that relation. It was held, therefore, that the plaintiff was entitled to an injunction restraining defendant from using not only the simulated dress, but also the name. Apart from the question of unfair competition, the words "*French Tissue*" as applied to a paper dressing,

originating in France, cannot be appropriated as a trade-mark; the first being broadly geographical, and the second descriptive of the texture of the paper.

A GERMAN PATENT DECISION.—The German patent law ordains that three years after the grant of a patent it can be declared void if the owner of the patent neglects to work the invention by practically making and distributing the patented article, or at least to take the necessary steps for doing so. On the strength of this provision of the law, application was made to the Patent Office to declare void a patent for an American type-setting machine, as also six additional patents granted to the same owner for separate articles having a technical connection with the machines. The Patent Office denied the application, and the case being appealed to the Imperial Supreme Court (tribunal of last resort in Germany) the latter sustained the decision of the Patent Office as far as the patent for the type-setting machine (the main question) was concerned, on the ground that the owner of the patent had made reasonable—though unsuccessful—efforts to find customers for his machines. As to the other six patents, the application to void them was granted, the defendant having admitted that the manufacture of the articles covered by them in Germany would not prove profitable and therefore he did not intend to work these patents practically.

DESIGN PATENTS.—The United States Circuit Court for the District of Connecticut recently held the *Scranton* design patent for a design for a bell intended to be used on automobiles not to be infringed and void for lack of patentable novelty, at the same time laying down these general rules. The fundamental question in determining the validity of a design patent is whether the inventive faculty has been exercised to produce something which is original and pleasing to the eye. In design patents, the test of identity on questions of anticipation and infringement is the eye of the ordinary observer, and in determining such question the court may avail itself of such common knowledge as is possessed by the general public.

PURE INVENTION.—Two claims of the *Parramore* patent for a new stocking supporter to be used in connection with corsets, and having as its main and novel feature a single connection with a stud or clasp of the corset, thus dispensing with all other means of attachment thereto, have been held infringed, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. "Notwithstanding the apparent simplicity of the improvement," says the court, "the record discloses the labor and experiments required to produce a patentable supporter fastened to the front of the corset by a single point of support on the corset, and the inventive character of the device is made apparent despite first impressions as to triviality."

SCOPE OF INVENTION.—Where an inventor has made and patented a thing which is novel, but which performs in part the functions of each of two old structures, his selection of the name of one of them for his invention, as being approximately descriptive, should not be held a limitation which deprives him of the right to protection, save as to the features of his invention which are appropriately described by such name; nor, on the other hand, can he escape anticipation by a prior structure because it was given a different name, where the functions of the two are substantially the same.

TRADE-MARK OF FRAUDULENT BUSINESS.—"Equity will not protect a trade-mark for a patent medicine, the statement on the label of which asserts a falsehood, and being designed to deceive the public," announces Justice Briscoe, of the Maryland Court of Appeals, in a case involving the right to use a label for a medicine. The statement referred to was "The great smallpox and diphtheria cure and preventive. Cures the worst cases without marking, unless already scabbed."

Much space is devoted in the daily press to the suit of John Brislin against the Carnegie Steel Company for patent infringement. Brislin was once a roller, and, in conjunction with Antoine Vinnac, invented a patent table for carrying hot ingots of steel to and from the rolls mechanically. Vinnac died two years ago, leaving his interest to Brislin. The royalties which Brislin will collect, if he eventually succeeds in his action, will amount to many millions. The case will be appealed.

LIABILITY FOR USE BY PURCHASER CONSTITUTING INFRINGEMENT.—While one selling a patented device for a use which would be an infringement might be liable as a participator, he would not be liable for an improper use made by the purchaser afterward, and not contemplated in making the sale. (*Cary Mfg. Co. vs. Standard Metal Strap Co.*, 113 Fed. Rep. 429.)