

P. O. BOX 92.

KEARNEY, NEBRASKA, March 30th 1893.

Richard Hubbard Esq.

City,

Dear Sir,

I have looked through the specifications of patents awarded to Joseph Conley, and compared them with Klose's No. 469,151. The claims in Patents No. 491,037 and No. 477,993, it seems to me, contain glaring infringements on your patent. In No. 491,037. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6. conflict greatly with your claim No. 7. regarding transverse flues & apertures, and the longitudinal flue with dampers. In No. 477,993. the principal points of confliction. relate to perforated transverse flues & dampers, in which claims 1, 2, 3, & 4 conflict with your No. 1; temporary partitions, claims 1 and 2, and the stoke holes & cover supported by green brick, as set forth in his claim 3.

Conley's Patents, No. 477,994, 491,038, and 487,174 I consider as "doubtful." The two first relate to circular kilns, and the third differs from yours in its details. I do not

P. O. BOX 92.

KEARNEY, NEBRASKA,-----189

much in the wording of his claims, that could be set forth as a direct confliction with yours, but it is virtually + morally self evident that he has confiscated the principles of your device.

This of course is not a matter for me to give you a decided opinion on, but it seems to me, that the case involves some fine legal points, that will come within the province of your attorney, and are beyond my field in the matter.

Yours very truly

Ernest G. Brabrook