7 Sold in Court Och 8, 1965

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

THE FINNEY COMPANY,
a partnership,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NOS.

JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION,
a corporation,
and

and

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS FOUNDATION,
a non-profit corporation,
Defendants.

Defendants.

ANSWERS BY PLAINTIFF THE FINNEY COMPANY TO
DEFENDANT JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION'S SECOND
SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PLAINTIFF THE FINNEY COMPANY
UNDER RULE 33

57. State the date when plaintiff commenced the manufacture and sale of each model of antenna which it considers to be in direct competition with the so-called log periodic antennas manufactured and sold by defendant JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION.

Answer (By Lewis H. Finneburgh, Jr.)

	Date of
<u>Model</u>	First Manufacture
VL-5	July 9, 1964
VL-7	July 21, 1964
VL-10	July 7, 1964
VL=13	July 16, 1964
VL-18	July 27, 1964
UVF-10	March 16, 1965
UVF-16	November 2, 1964
UVF-18 UVF-24	November 3, 1964
UVF-24	November 3, 1964
MARK X	May 10, 1965
MARK XII	August, 1964
MARK XVIII	August 17, 1964
MARK XXIV	August 17, 1964
FMSL-5	April 21, 1965
FMSL-8	April 19, 1965
FMSL-10	April 16, 1965
FMSL-12	April 19, 1965
- A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

INTERROGATORY 58

58. State, as to each model antenna manufactured and sold by plaintiff and which is considered by it to be in direct competition with log period antennas manufactured and sold by defendant JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, whether or not the manufacture and sale by plaintiff thereof was continuous barring seasonal fluctuations.

Answer (By Lewis H. Finneburgh, Jr.)

Yes, with various design revisions from time to time for some models since first manufacture and sale.

INTERROGATORY 59

59. If as to any one of said directly competitive models of antennas, plaintiff's manufacture and sale thereof was not continuous, state the length of time of each hiatus of manufacture and of sale, the date when such manufacture and sale was resumed if resumed, and the facts and circumstances surrounding each such hiatus.

Answer (By Lewis H. Finneburgh, Jr.)

No answer required in view of the answer to Interrogatory 58.

STATE OF OHIO COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)

Lewis H. Finneburgh, Jr., who signed the foregoing answers to interrogatories, being duly sworn by me, deposed and said that the answers given by him are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

> Notary Public Prond A HAFER, Notary Public My Commission Expires June 21, 1970

A copy of the foregoing "ANSWERS BY PLAINTIFF THE FINNEY COMPANY TO DEFENDANT JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PLAINTIFF THE FINNEY COMPANY UNDER RULE 33" was mailed this 7th day of October, 1965, postage prepaid, to each of the following:

I. Irving Silverman, Esq. Silverman & Cass 105 West Adams Street Chicago, Illinois 60603

Basil P. Mann, Esq. Merriam, Marshall, Shapiro & Klose 30 West Monroe Street Chicago, Illinois 60603

John Thomas