

Internal distribution code:

- (A) [-] Publication in OJ
- (B) [-] To Chairmen and Members
- (C) [-] To Chairmen
- (D) [X] No distribution

**Datasheet for the decision
of 22 October 2024**

Case Number: T 1379/22 - 3.3.09

Application Number: 16158374.5

Publication Number: 3067201

IPC: B32B27/12, A41D31/00, F16L59/02

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
HIGH TEMPERATURE FLEXIBLE BLANKET FOR INDUSTRIAL INSULATION
APPLICATIONS

Patent Proprietor:
Johns Manville

Opponent:
Microtherm NV

Headword:
Insulating blanket/MANVILLE

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 54(2), 56, 100(b)
RPBA 2020 Art. 12(2), 12(4), 12(6)

Keyword:

Main Request: sufficiency of disclosure, novelty, inventive step - (yes)

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Boards of Appeal of the
European Patent Office
Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8
85540 Haar
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0

Case Number: T 1379/22 - 3.3.09

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.09
of 22 October 2024

Appellant: Microtherm NV
(Opponent) Industriepark Noord 1
9100 Sint Niklaas (BE)

Representative: Etex Services NV - Etex IPSC
Kuiermansstraat 1
1880 Kapelle-op-den-Bos (BE)

Respondent: Johns Manville
(Patent Proprietor) 717 Seventeenth Street
Denver, CO 80202 (US)

Representative: Dörr, Klaus
Dörr IP
Nordring 29
65719 Hofheim (DE)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 4 May 2022
rejecting the opposition filed against European
patent No. 3067201 pursuant to Article 101(2)
EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman A. Haderlein
Members: A. Veronese
C. Schmidt

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal was filed by the opponent (appellant) against the opposition division's decision to reject the opposition filed against the European patent.

II. Claims 1 and 10 as granted read:

"1. An insulation blanket for insulating a structure comprising:

(i) a first facer layer;

(ii) a second facer layer;

(iii) a plurality of intermeshed non-woven fibers disposed between the first and second facer layers; and

(iv) an insulating powder disposed between the first and second facer layers and within the intermeshed non-woven fibers, the [sic];

wherein the insulation blanket includes at least one exposed edge having a cauterized face that is roughly orthogonal to the first and second facer layers, the cauterized face forming a barrier on the exposed edge that encases the insulating powder within the interior of the insulation blanket thereby minimizing degradation of the insulating value due to loss or shedding of the insulating powder through the exposed edge, the cauterized edge having a depth of cauterized material of between 0.05 and 3 mm."

"10. A method of forming an insulation blanket comprising:

- (i) positioning a plurality of intermeshed non-woven fibers between a first facer layer and a second facer layer;*
- (ii) positioning an insulating powder between the first and second facer layers and within the intermeshed non-woven fibers; and*
- (iii) cauterizing an exposed edge of the insulation blanket to form a barrier on the exposed edge that encases the insulating powder within the interior of the insulation blanket."*

III. With its notice of opposition the opponent had requested that the patent be revoked in its entirety on the grounds under Article 100(a) (lack of novelty and lack of inventive step) and 100(b) EPC.

IV. The documents submitted during the opposition proceedings included:

D7: US 4,365,135

D10: Brochure ThermoDyne, Excelflex[®] Microporous Insulation (published on 1 July 2001)

D11: Brochure ThermoDyne, Featherflex[™] Microporous Insulation (published on 20 December 2005)

D21: Brochure Microtherm Panel (published September 1990)

D34: Extract from Lexico.com: definition of "blanket"

D35: Merriam-Webster Dictionary: definition of "blanket"

D39: Declaration of Tom Martens, dated 4 November 2021

D40: Drawing of a product for Corning, dated 7 March 2005

- D43: Eurofins EAG Laboratories, Analysis report, 28 October 2021
- D44: J. Mathew et al., Journal of Materials Processing Technology, 1999, vol. 89-90, pages 198-203
- D45: S. Bluemel et al., "Laser Machining of CFRP using a high power fiber laser - investigations on the heat affected zone", ECCM 15 Conference, Venice (Italy), 24-28 June 2012
- D47: J. Berckmanns et al., Laser cutting. LASERLINE[®] Technical brochure, 18 June 2008

V. In its decision, the opposition division found *inter alia* that:

- D39 to D45 and D47 were not to be admitted.
- The claimed invention was sufficiently disclosed. The patent provided sufficient information to prepare a cauterised edge having the claimed thickness and properties by laser cutting.
- The claimed subject-matter was novel over D7 to D11 and over D21 and D22. These documents did not relate to a blanket, i.e. a flexible material, and/or did not disclose a cauterised edge material having a depth of 0.05 to 3 mm having the claimed properties.
- The claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step starting from D12 or, alternatively, from D10 or D11 as the closest prior art. The claimed blanket and the method of forming it differed from the products and methods described in these documents in the presence of a cauterised edge as defined in claim 1 and in the cauterising step

defined in claim 10. The problem was to provide an alternative blanket and a method for producing it. Confronted with this problem, the skilled person would not have found a pointer to the claimed solution in D7 or in D47.

VI. With its statement setting out the grounds of appeal, the appellant filed:

D49: Product drawing of product "Unit 5" x 7"" for Corning, dated 30 March 2005

D50: I.P. Shkarofsky, RCA Review, 1975, vol. 36, pages 336-68

D51: R.T. Horn, Laser Applications, Final Report from the Bendix Corporation, 1980

VII. The appellant's arguments which are relevant to the decision may be summarised as follows:

- D39 to D43, D47 and D49 to D51 should be admitted into the appeal proceedings.
- The claimed invention was insufficiently disclosed: the patent did not provide sufficient information to prepare a cauterised edge which was at the same time flexible and prevented shedding of the powder contained in the blanket. The patent provided evidence that the claims encompassed non-working embodiments.
- The blanket of claim 1 and the method of forming it of claim 10 were not novel over D7 and D21. A blanket was not necessarily a flexible product. Neither flexibility nor depth of the cauterised edge distinguished the claimed blanket from those of the prior art. D47, D49, D50 and D51 showed that

the conditions for operating the laser of D7 were the same as those used in the patent. D39 to D43 showed that the Microtherm panels of D21 had a cauterised edge having the claimed thickness.

- The claimed subject-matter did not involve an inventive step starting from D10 or D11 or, as an alternative, from D7, D23 or D25 as the closest prior art.

VIII. The patent proprietor's (respondent's) arguments which are relevant to the decision can be summarised as follows:

- D39 to D47 and D49 to D51 should not be admitted.
- The patent contained sufficient information to cut the blanket with a laser and to produce an edge having the claimed depth. Thus the claimed invention was sufficiently disclosed.
- The claimed subject-matter was novel over D7 and D21, which did not disclose a blanket, let alone a blanket comprising a cauterised edge having the claimed depth.
- The claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step over the teaching of D10 or D11, the closest prior art, in combination with D7. The inventive-step attacks formulated starting from D7, D12, D21, D23 and D25 should not be admitted into the appeal proceedings.

Requests

- IX. The appellant requested that the decision under appeal be set aside and that the patent be revoked.
- X. The respondent requested that the appeal be dismissed or, alternatively, that the patent be maintained on the basis of auxiliary request 1 filed with the reply to the statement setting out the grounds of appeal.

Reasons for the Decision

Main request

1. *Admission of documents*
- 1.1 The appellant contested the opposition division's decision not to admit D39 to D43 and D47. It requested that the decision be reviewed and the documents be admitted in appeal. Furthermore, it requested that D49 to D51, filed with the appellant's statement setting out the grounds of appeal, be admitted into the appeal proceedings.
- 1.2 D39 to D43, D47 and D49 to D51 were filed by the appellant in the context of novelty attacks, to substantiate the argument that the cauterised edge of the products described in D7 and D21 fell within the claimed scope. However, since, as concluded below, these products are not "insulation blankets", the question of whether they contain a claimed cauterised edge becomes irrelevant. Likewise, this question is not relevant for assessing inventive step. Consequently, the question of admittance of the aforementioned documents can be left unanswered.

2. *Sufficiency of disclosure*

- 2.1 The appellant argued that the claimed invention was insufficiently disclosed. The patent did not provide sufficient information to form the claimed cauterised edge, namely an edge having the claimed depth, which formed a barrier preventing shedding of insulating powder and which was at the same time also flexible. Furthermore, the patent did not provide sufficient guidance to determine the depth of the edge and the percentage of the edge surface needed to prevent shedding of the powder and degradation of the insulating value.
- 2.2 The appellant's arguments are not convincing.
- 2.3 Claim 1 requires the depth of the cauterised edge to be between 0.05 and 3 mm. This is the thickness of a layer of cauterised material extending from the surface of the cauterised exposed face inwards: see e.g. paragraphs [0018] and [0032] of the patent. This means that the thickness is measured from that surface of the exposed edge toward the inside, in a direction parallel to the facer layers.
- 2.4 The patent teaches that an insulation blanket according to the invention can be obtained by cutting a blanket using a laser. The high temperature of the laser beam cuts the blanket and simultaneously cauterises the exposed edge. Parameters for operating the laser are given: see paragraphs [0037] to [0045]. Furthermore, the patent teaches that, alternatively, the cauterised edge can be obtained by exposing a cut edge to a flame.

- 2.5 There is no evidence that a layer of cauterised material having the claimed thickness on the exposed edge of an insulation blanket cannot be obtained when an insulation blanket as described in claim 1 is cut using a laser. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the claimed cauterised edge would not be suitable to create a barrier which prevents shedding of the insulating powder through that edge.
- 2.6 Drawing attention to paragraph [0030] of the patent, paragraph [0041] as filed (paragraph [0035] of the patent) and figure 5, the appellant argued that claim 1 encompassed insulation blankets in which a portion of the exposed edge was not covered by a layer of cauterised material. Shedding of the insulating powder could not be prevented in these blankets.
- 2.7 This argument is not convincing either. The claims must be read with the eye of a skilled person, relying on the teaching of the patent and common general knowledge. Furthermore, they must be read with a mind willing to understand the claimed invention.
- 2.8 The skilled person would understand that, according to the invention, at least a substantial portion of the exposed edge is required to be covered by a layer of cauterised material, preventing the shedding of the insulating powder contained behind it. Furthermore, they would understand that the portion of the edge which needs to be covered may be varied depending e.g. on the thickness of the blanket and of the particles of powder, and moreover that the wording "minimising degradation of the insulating value due to loss or shedding of the insulating powder" used in claim 1 means that the loss or shedding is substantially reduced. A similar reading has to be applied to

claim 10. There is no evidence that this effect cannot be obtained in an insulation blanket as defined in claim 1. The skilled person would understand the invention and avoid embodiments which do not make technical sense. The appellant has also argued that the blanket in the lower picture of figure 5 contained a "series of sharp edges", and that no explanation was given for this structure. However, it appears that this shape is formed when the blanket is cut while compressed, as described in paragraph [0041], and then left to expand. There is no evidence that in this configuration too the shedding of powdered material cannot be minimised.

2.9 During the oral proceedings held before the board, the appellant submitted that there were other passages in the opposed patent showing that the claimed invention encompassed non-working embodiments, in particular:

- Paragraph [0025] stated that *"Due to the nature of the microporous blanket 100, cutting the blanket by using a knife, scissor laser, water-jet and/or lasers can sometimes lead to fall-out of the internal fumed silica 106 and/or other particles"*.
- Paragraph [0031] provided embodiments in which discontinuous cauterised portions were formed on the edge to prevent the edge from becoming brittle.
- Paragraph [0040] showed that the use of nitrogen purge during laser cutting improved the quality of cauterisation compared with that obtainable using air or oxygen.

- 2.10 As countered by the respondent, none of these paragraphs provides evidence that the claimed invention cannot be carried out.
- 2.11 Paragraph [0025] shows that shedding of particles may occur even if a laser is used for cutting. However, this does not mean that, relying on the teaching of paragraphs [0037] to [0045] of the patent, which relate to the use of a laser, and common general knowledge, the skilled person would not be able to operate the laser so as to obtain a cauterised edge having the claimed structural and functional properties.
- 2.12 Paragraphs [0031] and [0040] provide further indications as to how the flexibility of the claimed cauterised edge can be maximised. Yet they do not provide evidence that, relying on the other paragraphs of the patent, the skilled person would not be able to form a cauterised edge having the claimed structure and adequate functional properties.
- 2.13 For these reasons, relying on the teaching of the opposed patent and common general knowledge, the skilled person would be able to carry out the invention. Accordingly, the ground for opposition under Article 100(b) EPC does not prejudice the validity of the patent.

3. *Novelty*

- 3.1 The appellant argued that the insulation blanket of claim 1 and the method of claim 10 were not novel over the teaching of D7 and D21.

Document D7

- 3.2 D7 discloses blocks of microporous thermal insulation material: claim 1 and column 1, lines 5-10. The blocks are primarily made from inorganic particles, such as silica aerogel, and contain minor amounts of reinforcing ceramic fibers: column 2, lines 44-51. The blocks are provided with a "cover layer": column 3, lines 1-12. Furthermore, they contain a "protective skin" which is formed when the side of a block is cut using a laser beam: claim 1; column 1, line 61 to column 2, line 27; column 2, line 52 to column 3, line 12; column 4, lines 9-15.
- 3.3 According to column 2, lines 6 to 9, blocks having the desired shape are prepared from a workpiece using the laser.
- 3.4 However, as decided by the opposition division, D7 fails to disclose an "insulation blanket" as defined in claims 1 and 10.
- 3.5 Analogously to what was set out by the opposition division, the board considers that the term "insulation blanket" identifies an object having substantial flexibility, which renders it suitable to be applied around - and to be adapted to - the shape of an object, in order to provide insulation.
- 3.6 The appellant referred to definitions of the word "blanket" given in two dictionaries, D34 and D35. In so far as these documents refer to insulating products, they refer to a "covering on a bed or elsewhere for warmth" (D34), to a "large usually oblong piece of woven fabric used as bed covering" and to a "piece of fabric used as a body covering" (D35). These are all,

de facto, flexible products which can be bent or flexed around an object or a human body, and whose shape can be substantially changed.

- 3.7 This interpretation is confirmed by the description of the opposed patent, which teaches that the insulation blanket remains flexible at the cut edge, that the blanket "can be bent or flexed around an object" and can "be flexed, handled, and bent, without a significant loss of internal materials": paragraphs [0013], [0019], [0020] and [0034].
- 3.8 These characteristics of an "insulation blanket" are clearly incompatible with those of the product described in D7. This is a "shaped block" whose desired shape is "cut from a workpiece using a laser beam": see column 2, lines 8 and 9 and the figures. It is also noted that the problem underlying D7 is to provide blocks made of materials whose shape cannot be adapted by bending to accommodate curved and undulating surfaces: column 1, lines 35 to 41.
- 3.9 During the oral proceedings, the appellant drew attention to claim 3 of D7, which referred to a protective layer of material comprising a porous envelope. However, this reference to a porous envelope cannot be construed to mean that the block disclosed in this document is flexible.
- 3.10 For these reasons, the blocks of microporous thermal insulation material of D7 cannot be considered an "insulation blanket" as defined in claim 1.
- 3.11 For these reasons, D7 does not directly and unambiguously disclose the claimed insulation blanket of claim 1 and the method of claim 10.

Document D21

- 3.12 D21 discloses Microtherm[®] insulating panels having an edge produced by laser cutting: see page 2 and photos on page 5. However, like the blocks described in D7, the panels of D21 cannot be considered "insulation blankets" as defined in claims 1 and 10.
- 3.13 The appellant submitted that according to page 3 of D21 the panels can have a thickness of 3 to 10 mm. In its opinion these have sufficient bendability and rollability to qualify as "blankets". It also referred to page 8, mentioning a "slatted panel" sufficiently flexible to be bent around a pipe. However, even taking into account the teaching of these pages, the skilled person would not consider the panels of D21 "blankets". This is in particular because, as already decided by the opposition division, page 9 of D21 clearly states that the panel is "handled as a flat sheet which is entirely self-supporting" and that "Flexing or bending the panel will cause the core to crack". A self-supporting panel which cannot be bent and cracks upon bending cannot be considered a "blanket". The "slatted panel" shown in D21 cannot be considered a blanket either. This is, in fact, made of a plurality of individual rigid panels joined by connections which allow flexibility in one dimension. Although an "insulation blanket" and that "slatted panel" may be made for a similar purpose, the skilled person would clearly identify them as different products.
- 3.14 For these reasons, D21 does not directly and unambiguously disclose the insulation blanket of claim 1 and the method of claim 10.

4. *Inventive step*

Non-admittance of certain attacks

- 4.1 In its notice of opposition, the appellant stated that D1, D12, D13 and D14 were all suitable starting points for an inventive-step analysis. However, it only developed a reasoning starting from D12 as closest prior art. Concerning D1, D13 and D14, it merely stated that it "reserved the right to develop arguments starting from any of these documents": see pages 52 to 57 of the notice of opposition. Yet no arguments relating to these documents were presented during the opposition proceedings.
- 4.2 In its communication issued in preparation for the oral proceedings, the opposition division expressed the preliminary opinion that the claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step over D12.
- 4.3 During the oral proceedings the appellant continued to rely on D12 as closest prior art and, in addition, raised an objection starting from documents D10 and D11 as the closest prior art. Having heard the parties, the opposition division decided that the claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step starting from D12 or, alternatively, from D10 and D11 as closest prior art.
- 4.4 In its statement setting out the grounds of appeal, the appellant did not pursue its previous first line of attack based on D12. It still relied on D10 and D11, and raised new inventive-step attacks starting from D7, D23 or D25 as closest prior art. In its submissions dated 7 November 2023 it stated that it could not "take the risk not to address inventive step on the basis of

D21 and D7 as closest prior art", and developed further attacks starting from these documents.

- 4.5 The respondent requested that none of the new attacks be admitted.
- 4.6 According to the appellant, the new attacks should be admitted because they addressed the argument, presented for the first time by the opposition division of its own motion during the oral proceedings, that the "insulation blanket" was a feature distinguishing the claimed subject-matter from the prior art.
- 4.7 These arguments are not persuasive. During the oral proceedings held before the opposition division, the appellant was not confronted with amended claims. The claims were still those as granted, which had been attacked in the notice of opposition. Furthermore, in the inventive-step reasoning of the decision under appeal, the "insulation blanket" is not considered a technical feature distinguishing the claimed subject-matter from the teaching of D12 and D10/D11, and the problem is formulated as to provide an *"alternative insulation blanket and a method for its manufacture, without shedding of the insulation powder"*.
- 4.8 The appellant could certainly try to rebut the opposition division's finding that the claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step over D12 D10 and D11. However, in its appeal it did not even contest the opposition division's finding that the claimed subject-matter involved an inventive step over D12, which had been its first line of attack. Rather, it raised new attacks, starting from different documents, namely D7, D21, D23 and D25. By raising these new inventive-step objections, the appellant did not pursue revision of

the decision under appeal. Rather, it created a new case on which no decision has been taken yet. Such a case should have been presented at an earlier stage, during the opposition proceedings.

- 4.9 For these reasons, the board does not admit into the appeal proceedings the attacks starting from D7, D21, D23 and D25 as closest prior art (Articles 12(2), 12(4) and 12(6) RPBA).

Attack starting from D12

- 4.10 The opposition division found that the claimed subject-matter involves an inventive step over D12. This finding was not contested by the appellant and the board does not see any reason for deviating from the opposition division's conclusions.

Attack starting from D10/D11

- 4.11 The appellant contested the opposition division's finding that the claimed subject-matter involves an inventive step starting from D10 or D11 as closest prior art. The parties did not contest that these documents can be considered the closest prior art.
- 4.12 D10 and D11 are two brochures from "ThermoDyne", describing the "Excelflex[®]" insulation blanket. Since the disclosure of D11 does not go beyond that of D10, reference will only be made to this latter document.
- 4.13 The insulation blanket disclosed in D10 comprises a powder made of insulating microporous ceramic particles encapsulated between two layers of a "high temperature cloth". As shown in the figure on the first page of

D10, the blanket is flexible and can be rolled to adapt to the shape of an object.

Distinguishing features

- 4.14 D10 indicates that "complex shapes can be easily made by cutting "Excelflex[®]" with a sharp knife, a razor, die or laser": see page 1, second column, last paragraph. However, D10 does not disclose any concrete example of an insulation blanket cut by laser. There is no evidence that any such blanket has actually been made. Furthermore, as conceded by the appellant, D10 discloses neither the conditions needed to operate a laser nor a cauterised edge sufficient to encase the insulating powder contained in the interior of the blanket. A cauterised edge having a depth of between 0.05 and 3 mm is not disclosed either.
- 4.15 In view of the scarce information in D10 concerning the materials making up the insulation blankets, and the total lack of information concerning the conditions for operating the laser, it is thus concluded that D10 does not disclose the claimed cauterised edge.
- 4.16 This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that D10 provides that the edge of the insulation blanket is sealed by sewing on an edge strip: see page 1, right-hand column, last paragraph and figure on the first page of D10, which shows an "Excelflex[®]" insulation blanket in which the edge is closed by a sewn edge strip. This sewn sealing edge strip would not be necessary if the face obtained by laser cutting were already suitable to protect the exposed edge and to minimise the shedding of the insulating powder.

4.17 Accordingly, as already decided by the opposition division, the subject-matter of claims 1 and 10 differs from the teaching of D10 in the presence of the cauterised edge defined in these claims.

Technical effect

4.18 There is no evidence that the insulation blanket of claim 1 and the method for making the insulation blanket of claim 10 are associated with any technical effect going beyond the teaching of D10.

Underlying technical problem

4.19 In the absence of any such technical effect, the underlying technical problem can be seen, similarly to what has been proposed by the appellant, as being to provide "alternative sealing for the cut" of the blanket of D10.

Non-obviousness of the claimed solution

4.20 The appellant argued that, when confronted with the underlying problem, the skilled person would have found in D7 the incentive to use a laser to cut the blanket of D10 and to form protective sealing on the face of the cut. D10 and D7 related to similar products, containing similar insulating powder, namely fumed silica, encapsulated within two layers. Furthermore, D7 taught that laser cutting was suitable to obtain "complex shapes" (columns 1 and 2) and a "continuous protective skin" (columns 3 and 4), leaving very little residue (column 4) and a reduction in the manufacturing costs (column 3). The skilled person would have understood from column 1 of D7 that the protective skin

of the blocks had the function of preventing the shedding of the powder contained therein.

4.21 Moreover, the skilled person would have understood from D7 that the "flexibility of the insulating panel is unimportant". This was because, when it was cut by laser, the workpiece was secured to a table. Thus it did not matter "whether the workpiece was flexible, rigid or an ultrathin blanket".

4.22 Consequently, according to the appellant, when confronted with the underlying technical problem, the skilled person would have turned to D7 and followed the instructions given in that document to cut the blanket described in D10. By using a laser and implementing the operating conditions described in D7, the skilled person would have prepared the blanket of claim 1 and carried out the method described in claim 10 of the opposed patent. As shown in paragraph [0038] of the patent, such conditions induced the melting and recrystallisation of the materials making up a blanket and the formation of the claimed sealing on the face of the cut. Consequently, in its opinion, starting from D10 and following the teaching of D7, the skilled person would have arrived at the proposed solution without the need for an inventive step. Similar considerations applied taking into consideration D21 as an alternative to D7.

The board does not agree with the appellant's conclusions.

4.23 As noted by the opposition division and the respondent, D10 and D7 relate to substantially different products. The blocks of D7 are rigid materials, which cannot be flexed or adapted to the shape of an object, while the

blanket described in D10 is very flexible, and can be bent and rolled: see figure on the first page of D10.

- 4.24 D10 provides that the edge of the blanket is sealed by a strip of textile material sewn over the edge. As shown in the figures, this textile strip encases and protects the face of the cut, thereby preventing shedding of the insulating powder. At the same time, the strip is flexible and can be bent, like the rest of the structure of the blanket. These are properties that the skilled person would have had to maintain when searching for alternative sealing for the cut.
- 4.25 It is undisputed that D7 discloses the formation of a protective layer over the surface of the described blocks of insulating material. However, the skilled person would not have expected the face of the cut in D7 to be flexible and suitable to prevent the shedding of the powder contained in a flexible insulation blanket such as that disclosed in D10. Contrary to the appellant's submissions, D7 does not focus on, and actually does not even mention, the problem of preventing the shedding of powder contained in the disclosed blocks.
- 4.26 For these reasons, the skilled person would not have turned their attention to D7. Even less would they have tried to adapt the operating conditions of the laser of D7, with the expectation of forming a cauterised edge having the claimed depth and the claimed properties.
- 4.27 The appellant has briefly referred to D21, as a secondary document, as an alternative to D7. However, the teaching of D21 does not go beyond that of D7. Thus the same considerations apply.

4.28 Consequently, the subject-matter of claims 1 and 10 and of the dependent claims, which are narrower in scope, involves an inventive step.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is dismissed.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



K. Götz-Wein

A. Haderlein

Decision electronically authenticated