

[54] SET OF CUE RACKS OR SIMILAR ARTICLE

[76] Inventor: Lance K. Halverson, 7301 27th Ave. NW., Seattle, Wash. 98117

[**] Term: 14 Years

[21] Appl. No.: 395,580

[22] Filed: Jul. 6, 1982

Related U.S. Application Data

[60] Division of Ser. No. 119,604, Feb. 7, 1980, which is a continuation-in-part of Ser. No. 065,905, Aug. 13, 1979, abandoned.

[52] U.S. Cl. D6/552

[58] Field of Search D6/114, 125, 157; 211/13, 14, 60 R, 60 A, 60 T, 87, 88; 248/220.3, 220.4, 221.1, 221.2

[56] References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

D. 120,343	5/1940	Hopkins	D6/125
D. 198,691	7/1964	Schaefer	D6/125
D. 209,682	12/1967	Williams	D6/125
D. 242,097	11/1976	O'Neal	D6/125
D. 252,429	7/1979	Morin	D6/125
2,371,433	3/1945	Davis	211/60 T
2,815,863	12/1957	Larson	211/60 A
2,974,804	3/1961	Maro	211/60 T
3,491,893	1/1970	Morris	211/60 R
3,650,407	3/1972	Benham	211/87
3,698,563	10/1972	Gordon et al.	211/13
3,871,526	3/1975	Marsack	211/89
4,049,126	9/1977	Halverson	D6/125

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Rolf Sporting Goods, Inc., Prior 40 2/7/79, LD10 bar rack.


Primary Examiner—B. J. Bullock
Attorney, Agent, or Firm—Gregory W. Moravan; Don R. Mollick

[57] CLAIM

The ornamental design for a set of cue racks or similar article, as shown and described.

DESCRIPTION

FIG. 1 is a perspective view of a set of cue racks or similar article showing my new design;
 FIG. 2 is a side elevational view of the upper rack of FIG. 1 shown separately for ease of illustration, the supporting bracket under the lower rack being identical;
 FIG. 3 is a rear elevational view of FIG. 2;
 FIG. 4 is a bottom plan view of FIG. 2;
 FIG. 5 is a bottom perspective view of a second embodiment of the design of FIG. 1, the only difference being the supporting bracket, again the upper rack is shown separately for ease of illustration;
 FIG. 6 is a perspective view of a third embodiment of the design of FIG. 1, the only differences residing in the straight sides and the front edge;
 FIG. 7 is a side elevational view of the upper rack of the fourth embodiment of the design of FIG. 1, the only differences being the straight sides, the front edge and the supporting bracket.
 The pool cue illustrated in broken lines in FIGS. 1 and 6 does not comprise a part of my new design.







FIG. 1

FIG. 2






FIG. 3

FIG. 4





FIG. 5

FIG. 6





FIG. 7