

Opinion of the Court.

Under these views, it must be held that the first claim of the patent is invalid.

As to the second claim, there is no infringement, the defendant's apparatus having no removable conductor corresponding to the removable conductor, E, of the second claim. The defendant's pipe is screwed fast to the furnace, and cannot be removed while the machine is in use. It is cast separate from the furnace, for convenience of renewal in case of the breakage of either it or the furnace. The movable conductor, E, is described in the specification of the patent as a pipe provided with a bowhandle, by means of which it can be removed or adjusted in place, without liability of burning the hands. The defendant's pipe which enters the keg or cask is not removable or detachable in this sense.

For these reasons the decree of the Circuit Court is:

Reversed, and the case is remanded to that court with a direction to dismiss the bill of complaint, with costs.

GAFF, EXECUTRIX v. GOTTFRIED, No. 36. HACK v. GOTTFRIED, No. 37. Appeals from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Indiana. MR. JUSTICE BLATCHFORD delivered the opinion of the court. These are appeals by the defendants in two suits brought by Matthew Gottfried, in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, upon the same patent involved in the case of *The Crescent Brewing Co. v. Gottfried*, just decided. The proofs are the same as in that case, and the same conclusions are reached. *The decree in each case is reversed, and each case is remanded to the Circuit Court with a direction to dismiss the bill of complaint, with costs.*

Mr. Robert H. Parkinson for appellants.

Mr. Thomas A. Banning and *Mr. Ephraim Banning* for appellee.