

64 State of Illinois, } ss.
County of Cook. }

I, WALTER E. BEEBE, being first duly sworn, on oath state that I am the attorney of The Sanitary District of Chicago; that I have read the foregoing Answer and Counterclaim and that the statements therein contained are, within my personal knowledge and true, save as stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

WALTER E. BEEBE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of July, 1929.

EDITH KRIEGER,

(Seal) Notary Public.
My commission expires April 2nd, 1933.

Filed Aug. 31,
1929.

65 And on, to wit, the 31st day of August, 1929, came the Plaintiffs by their attorneys and filed in the Clerk's office of said Court a certain Motion to Dismiss in words and figures following, to wit:

66 MOTION TO DISMISS AND REPLY OF EDGAR C. GUTHARD, ACTIVATED SLUDGE, LIMITED, AND ACTIVATED SLUDGE, INC., FILED AUGUST 31, 1929.

Now come the plaintiffs, Edgar C. Guthard, Activated Sludge, Limited, and Activated Sludge, Inc., and referring to the counterclaim of the defendant's answer herein, say:

(1) Plaintiffs allege that the answer of the defendant does not contain any counterclaim cognizable herein and plaintiffs therefore move to strike out paragraphs 1 to 6, inclusive, of the said counterclaim. Without waiving the right to move for an order striking out said paragraphs and dismissing the said counterclaim, plaintiffs allege as follows:

(2) Plaintiffs admit the incorporation of the defendant, The Sanitary District of Chicago, but referring to the other allegations of paragraph 1 of the counterclaim, plaintiffs state that they are without knowledge and therefore leave the defendant to its proof.

(3) Referring to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the defendant's counterclaim, plaintiffs aver that they are without knowledge

or information as to the matters therein alleged and plaintiffs therefore leave the defendant to its proof.

(4) Referring to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the defendant's counterclaim, plaintiffs deny the allegations thereof.

(5) Plaintiffs deny that defendant is entitled to the relief sought and prayed for in the defendant's counterclaim and pray that the same may be dismissed with costs to the plaintiffs and with such other and further relief as it may be entitled to.

EDGAR C. GUTHARD,
ACTIVATED SLUDGE, LIMITED,
ACTIVATED SLUDGE, INC.,
By WILLIAMS, BRADBURY, Mc-
CALEB & HICKLE,
Solicitors and Counsel for Plaintiff s.

LYNN A. WILLIAMS,
C. C. BRADBURY,
Of Counsel.

68 And on, to wit, the 17th day of May, 1932 came the Defendant by its attorneys and filed in the Clerk's office of said Court a certain Amendment to Answer in words and figures following, to wit:

69 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.
* * * (Caption—4280) * * *

AMENDMENT TO DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO ORIGINAL BILL IN THE NATURE OF A SUPPLEMENTAL BILL OF COMPLAINT FILED JULY 26, 1929.

Comes now defendant in the above entitled case, pursuant to order of court, and amends its answer herein in the following particulars, to-wit:

By making the following formal corrections in the publications set up under Paragraph VII thereof as follows:

Page 12, in the catalog entitled "Purification of Manufacturers Waste Water," insert an apostrophe after Manufacturers.

Page 12, in the pamphlet entitled "Purification of Effluent Water from Dye Works etc.," change "Water" to Waters and change "Dye Works" to Dyeworks.