

Written Arguments In Response To Examiner's Opinion

In claim 6, line 2, the applicant has changed "fullerines" to "fullerenes", thereby correcting a typographical error.

Figs. 3, 5 and 6 of US patent 5,355,235 clearly show that organic material layer 16 is in contact with electrodes 14 and 15 and is spaced from electrode 12, and organic material layer 13 is in contact with all three electrodes (12, 14, 15). Thus, layer 16 of the '235 reference corresponds in a topographical sense to our first organic material layer (16, or 115). Consequently, if there is in Figs. 3, 5 and 6 of the '235 reference any counterpart to our second organic layer 21, then it would have to be layer 13. However, layer 13 of the reference clearly is in contact with gate electrode 12, and thus is not spaced from the third contact means, as required by our amended claim 1. Thus, the claimed article is novel over the '235 reference.

Nothing in the '235 reference suggests the possibility of an organic thin film transistor that can be either a p-channel transistor or a n-channel transistor, depending on bias conditions. Thus, one skilled in the art had no reason to drastically modify the structure of the '235 reference, to obtain a structure according to our invention, and to select the first and second organic materials such that they were of opposite conductivity type, e.g., p-type -5T and n-type C₆₀, respectively.

Therefore, the claimed invention is novel and unobvious over the '235 reference.