

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 20 February 2025**

Case Number: T 0558/23 - 3.2.04

Application Number: 09703583.6

Publication Number: 2244555

IPC: A01J5/017, G06T7/00, A01K1/12,
G01S17/10, G01S17/89

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
ARRANGEMENT AND METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE POSITION OF AN
ANIMAL

Patent Proprietor:
DeLaval Holding AB

Opponent:
Octrooibureau Van der Lely N.V.

Headword:

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

Keyword:

Inventive step - main request (no) - auxiliary request (yes)
Late-filed objection - admitted (no)

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 0558/23 - 3.2.04

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.04
of 20 February 2025

Appellant: DeLaval Holding AB
(Patent Proprietor) Box 39
147 21 Tumba (SE)

Representative: Jennings, Michael John
AA Thornton IP LLP
8th Floor, 125 Old Broad Street
London EC2N 1AR (GB)

Appellant: Octrooibureau Van der Lely N.V.
(Opponent) Cornelis van der Lelylaan 1
3147 PB Maassluis (NL)

Decision under appeal: **Interlocutory decision of the Opposition
Division of the European Patent Office posted on
16 January 2023 concerning maintenance of the
European Patent No. 2244555 in amended form.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman A. Pieracci
Members: J. Wright
K. Kerber-Zubrzycka

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeals were filed by the proprietor and opponent against the interlocutory decision of the opposition division finding that, on the basis of auxiliary request 3, the patent in suit met the requirements of the EPC.

In particular, the opposition division decided that the subject-matter of this request involved an inventive step.

II. The opposition division decided that the subject matter of claim 1 of the main request (claim 1 as granted) did not involve an inventive step.

III. The Board issued a communication dated 20 September 2024 setting out its observations on the relevant issues, in preparation for oral proceedings. Oral proceedings before the Board took place on 20 February 2025.

The appellant-proprietor requests that the decision under appeal be set aside and that the patent be maintained in amended form according to the main request (claims as granted) or according to the first or the seventh auxiliary request, all refiled with the statement setting out the grounds of appeal and an amendment to the description filed with letter of 25 May 2023.

The appellant-opponent requests that the decision under appeal be set aside and that the patent be revoked.

IV. Independent claim 1 of the main request reads as follows:

"1. A milking system comprising a milking stall (5) for housing an animal (8) during milking thereof, and an arrangement (24, 25) provided for determining the position of the animal in the milking stall, the milking system further comprising a robot (14) for attaching teat cups (11) to the teats of the animal, said robot being operatively connected to the arrangement for determining the position of the animal and adapted to move the teat cups towards the udder of the animal based on the determined position of the animal characterized in that said arrangement comprises:

- a three-dimensional camera (24), located above the animal and directed downwards towards the animal and provided to record a three-dimensional image of the animal; and
- image processing means (25) provided for detecting the animal and determining its position in at least one spatial dimension based on said three-dimensional image (27) of the animal, wherein
- said image processing means is provided to form a three-dimensional surface representation of a portion of the animal from the three-dimensional image of the animal; to analyze the surface of the three-dimensional surface representation; and to determine the position of the animal based on the analysis of the surface of the three-dimensional surface representation".

Claim 1 of auxiliary request 1 reads as for the main request except that after the wording "- image processing means (25) provided for detecting the animal and determining its position in at least one spatial

dimension based on said three-dimensional image (27) of the animal" the comma is replaced by a semicolon and the following wording is inserted:

"and - a camera (21) to determine positions of the teats of the animal present in the milking stall"

Claim 1 of auxiliary request 7 reads as for auxiliary request 1 except that after the wording "to analyze the surface of the three-dimensional surface representation", the following wording is inserted: ", wherein said analysis includes the localization of the spinal ridge (8c) of the animal;"

V. In the present decision, reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 2008/030086 A1

D2 and its translation into English: "Report of study and investigation concerning milking system for milk cow aiming at resource saving and high productivity breeding", March 1984, Tokyo Japan.

VI. The arguments of the parties relevant to the decision are set out in the following *reasons for the decision*.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The appeals are admissible.
2. Background

The patent relates to milking systems comprising a milking stall and an arrangement and method for determining an animal's position in the stall for the purpose of performing milking with a robot (see

published patent specification, paragraph [0001] and claim 1).

3. Main request, claim 1 inventive step starting from D1 in combination with D2
 - 3.1 Without prejudice to the question of admissibility of the main request, the Board finds it lacking in inventive step and therefore not allowable.
 - 3.2 It is not disputed that D1 represents prior art under Article 54(2) EPC (cf. impugned decision, reasons, point 19).
 - 3.2.1 D1 discloses a milking system comprising a milking stall (see abstract and figure). D1's arrangement comprises a 3 dimensional (3D) camera that makes a 3D image of the animal (see page 2, lines 13 to 21 and page 3, lines 10 to 16 and lines 25 to 29 and page 10, lines 18 to 28, page 13, lines 31 to last line).
 - 3.2.2 Pixels generated by a 3D camera comprises depth as well as image data. Needless to say, such image and depth data is generated with respect to a known 3D frame of reference. D1 specifically discloses (see page 13, lines 31 to 33) that, after a cow has entered the milking parlour a 3D camera takes *at least one shot* [3D image] *of the entire cow*. Therefore, although, alternatively, the camera may capture *at least the udder and preferably also the hind legs of the cow*, it is not so that D1 *only* discloses taking 3D pictures of discrete elements of the cow's body as the appellant-opponent has suggested, let alone that D1's camera only measures the distance between teats and teatcups.

Moreover, capturing 3D data on the surface of a cow in a milking stall with reference to a known frame of reference is nothing other than determining the position of the animal in the milking stall.

3.2.3 It is not disputed that D1's milking system comprises a robot for attaching teat cups to the teats of an animal (see for example page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 3).

3.2.4 In the Board's view, D1's system does so based on the determined position of the animal. Whilst it is true that D1 discloses calculating distances from the sensor to a plurality of points on the teats (see for example D1, claims 5 and 6), in the context of a 3D camera, the reference to *points* can but mean their X,Y,Z coordinates, so the data used is not merely distance but also position in the X,Y plane. This means that D1's system uses the position of the animal, its teats being part of the animal. This is all the more true in the case of D1 since, as the appellant-opponent has pointed out, to prevent injury to the animal, other parts of the animal are important for navigating D1's bulky robot arm to the teats: in particular the legs are to be avoided. To this end, D1 (see page 14, lines 1 to 5) uses the 3D camera to replace more conventional sensors for determining where the animal is. Thus, whether the robot navigates on the basis of the position of the animal obtained by the 3D camera taking a shot of the entire animal or only a part of it (cf. page 13, lines 31 to last line), it amounts to navigating based on the determined position of the animal.

3.2.5 It is not disputed that D1 does not disclose that its 3D camera is located *above* the animal: D1's camera 100 can be located on the robot arm or on fencing near the

milking parlour (see page 17, lines 13 to 15). Moreover, since it should initially capture at least the udder and possibly the hind legs (cf. page 13, lines 31 to last line), the Board agrees with the appellant-proprietor that it is rather disclosed as being located to view a side of the animal.

- 3.2.6 That said, D1's [side viewing] 3D camera provides a *three-dimensional image* of the animal. In the Board's opinion, D1 also discloses the image processing means defined in the last three features of claim 1 (albeit processing a different view of the animal). In this regard, the Board does not interpret the features as specifying a process in which the animal's udder position is indirectly determined in order to direct the robot arm to make an *early movement* towards the udder before the teats can be seen as the appellant-proprietor has argued. Nor, therefore, that D1's direct viewing of the udder would lead to a slower movement of the robot arm towards it than would be obtained by this indirect determination.

Whilst it is true that a camera positioned above the animal as claimed will not be able to see the udder, since the claim says nothing about determining the position of the udder, the argument that the claimed features in combination might implicitly define an earlier cognition of the udder than would be possible for a camera viewing the udder from the side and thus a quicker movement of the robot arm towards the udder is moot.

- 3.2.7 Rather, it suffices to note that, just as is claimed, D1 must have image processing means for detecting the animal and, as already explained, for determining its position. If this were not so, it could not distinguish

an animal from an empty milking stall, let alone recognise the spatial position of its udder or legs amongst other things (cf. D1, page 13, lines 25 to last line). Furthermore, since D1's 3D camera defines depth information between itself and what it views (see for example page 2, lines 13 to 16 and page 3, lines 10 to 16), D1 also discloses that its image processing means *forms a three-dimensional surface representation of a portion of the animal and analyses this to determine the position of the animal.*

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 only by its camera's location - namely above the animal.

3.3 Development of the objective technical problem

3.3.1 The opposition division (see impugned decision, reasons point 20.1 and 20.2) considered that the patent did not mention any particular advantage associated with the differing feature (3D camera located above the animal), and that therefore it was merely an alternative position and that the problem could be formulated as finding an alternative position for the camera to identify the animal's position.

3.3.2 The patent (see published specification, paragraph [0011]) explains that with this camera position (viewing from above the animal), the longitudinal position of the animal can be determined and that this can include the back and backside of the animal. In the Board's view, a sideward viewing 3D camera, as is disclosed in D1, would also be able to determine the longitudinal position of the animal and view its back and backside. Moreover, the next paragraph of the patent explains that, in other arrangements - not

according to the invention - the camera can be located at different positions and directed towards the animal in different directions, without explaining why these might be objectively inferior or less preferable.

The appellant-proprietor has disagreed with this, arguing that locating the camera above the animal has the technical effect of making the claimed system faster and more accurate amongst other things, and that the objective technical problem should therefore reflect this.

3.3.3 In order for an alleged technical effect of an invention to be taken into account for the problem solution approach, it must have its basis in the application as filed. In this regard, the appellant-proprietor has referred to the published international application, page 2 lines 18 to 23, which discloses that, as well as overcoming problems associated with a certain prior art (not D1), a *further object* of the invention is to provide an arrangement that is fast and accurate amongst other things, and that this object is attained by the present invention as claimed. Contrary to how the appellant-proprietor has argued, since this part of the application does not refer to specific claims, it must be considered in its broadest context, that is the context of claim 1 and not dependent claim 3 where the camera location *above* the animal is first defined.

3.3.4 The more general independent claim 1 of the application merely defines a three-dimensional camera. Therefore, if the invention in general provides an effect of fast and accurate operation, then this can only come from using a 3D camera as such, which is known from D1. Therefore, the operating speed and accuracy achieved by

the invention is not objectively any different from that of D1. By the same token, in the published application, page 4, lines 1 to 10 and page 8, line 29 to page 9, line 8, it is explained that localising the spinal ridge/the highest point on the spinal ridge of the animal is advantageous for accurately determining the animal's position. Although it is true that the spinal ridge can be seen from above, merely positioning a camera above an animal does not identify or localise the animal's spinal ridge or its highest point. To do so would require specific additional processing, as page 4, lines 1 and 2 of the published application make clear. As the opponent has pointed out, such processing is not claimed. Therefore, any improvement from so doing is not objectively obtained by the differing claim feature (camera above).

- 3.3.5 Therefore, the appellant-proprietor's arguments have not convinced the Board that the opposition division was incorrect in considering that the location of the camera above the animal was merely an alternative to locating it at the side, as D1 discloses.
- 3.4 Starting from D1 and considering the differing feature (camera located above), the objective technical problem can therefore be formulated as: How to modify D1's system to provide an alternative location for the 3D camera. Contrary to how the appellant-proprietor has argued, this does not contain pointers to the solution since it does not suggest a location.
 - 3.4.1 The opposition division considered (see its decision, section 20.2) that D2 (cf. section 4, page 12 onwards with figure 1-8) disclosed the idea of locating a camera above an animal for detecting the position of the animal and therefore the combination of D1 and D2

would lead the skilled person to subject matter of claim 1 as a matter of obviousness. The Board agrees.

- 3.4.2 In this regard, the cited section explains how, by viewing a cow from above, a cow's posture within the stall, that is its position, can be determined, from which teat positions, which are inherent for each cow, can be determined. Therefore, the skilled person would recognise the location of the camera above the animal as a suitable alternative to D1's side location. In this regard, the Board has not been convinced by the appellant-proprietor's argument that the skilled person would not apply this idea to D1 since it relies on image processing of a 2D (plane) image whereas D1's camera generates a three dimensional surface representation.

A 3D surface representation contains all the information of a 2D plane image (with additional depth information). Therefore, the skilled person would realise that, if even a 2D image from above an animal contains sufficient information to derive location information pertaining to the underside of the cow (teat location), then this will be even more true for an information richer 3D image.

- 3.4.3 The appellant-proprietor has also argued that, howsoever the skilled person might modify D1's arrangement, they would not place the 3D camera above the animal because an essential element of D1's teaching is to view the teats, which can only be seen with a sideward pointing camera.

As the opponent has pointed out, in the passage of D1 bridging pages 13 and 14, no mention is made of locating the teats. Rather, merely the position of the

animal is determined, in particular with reference to the udder and hind legs. Therefore, viewing the teats is not explained there to be essential in the step of locating the animal, which can be derived from a single shot of the entire animal. Moreover, whilst it is true that only one camera 100 is mentioned in this part of D1, and at least figures 1 to 3 show this to be located on the robot arm, D1 explains that it does not need to be located there, it can be fixed and in a different position (see page 17, lines 13 to 15 - near the milking parlour, for example on fencing).

Furthermore, as explained on page 17, penultimate line to page 18, line 8, according to a variant of D1's arrangement, a plurality of 3D cameras can be used. In the Board's view, the skilled person reads this contextually: It follows on from the discussion of the one 3D camera arrangement referred to higher up on page 17 (lines 22 to 24) - including the information to use one 3D camera to carry out the *great number of [milking] tasks [...] as described above*, thus including locating the animal as described on the passage bridging pages 13 and 14.

In the plurality of 3D cameras variant mentioned on pages 17 and 18, a [first] 3D camera can observe the entire cow and another take detailed shots - for example of the teats. Whatever the significance of these two cameras needing to be synchronised might be, since the second camera views the teats, it cannot be essential that the first camera also does so. In the light of D2's teaching, it could alternatively be positioned above the animal to determine the animal's position. Therefore, the Board is not convinced that the skilled person would consider having D1's first 3D camera located to view the side of the animal as being

an essential feature which the skilled person would not consider changing.

3.5 For all these reasons, the appellant-proprietor's arguments have not convinced the Board that the opposition division erred in concluding (decision, reasons, section 20.2) that the subject matter of claim 1 lacks an inventive step over D1 in combination with D2. Therefore, the main request fails.

4. Auxiliary request 1

4.1 Without prejudice to the question of admissibility of this request, the Board considers that claim 1 lacks inventive step.

4.2 Claim 1 adds the feature of - *a camera (21) to determine positions of the teats of the animal present in the milking stall*. This feature is disclosed in D1, for example on page 18, first two lines, where a [second] 3D camera takes detailed shots of the teats. In the context of a 3D camera working in a known spatial frame, this boils down to determining the position of the teats as claimed. The appellant-proprietor has not explained why this might not be so. Rather, it has merely explained that it remained of the opinion that it would not be obvious to move the first 3D camera to a position above the animal in the light of D2's teaching. This argument is the same as it already presented for the main request, which the Board found not to be convincing.

4.3 The Board concludes that, starting from D1, in the light of D2's teaching, the subject matter of claim 1 lacks an inventive step for the same reasons as apply

to the main request. Therefore, the first auxiliary request fails.

5. Auxiliary request 7, claim 1 (claim 1 as maintained), inventive step

5.1 Claim 1 of auxiliary request 7 reads as for claim 1 of auxiliary requests 2 and 3 in opposition proceedings. The opposition division decided to maintain the patent in amended form according to the latter request.

In its decision, amongst other things, the opposition division considered inventive step of this claim starting from D1 with D2 (see the impugned decision, section 30.1). It found that neither D1 nor D2 disclosed the feature of localising the spinal ridge of the animal and concluded that the subject-matter of claim 1 involved an inventive step over the combination of D1 with D2.

5.2 The Board agrees with this aspect of the impugned decision. With regard to this, the Board wrote the following in its communication (see section 14):

"Without prejudice to the question of admissibility of this request, it adds to auxiliary request 2 the idea of the processing means provided to form a 3D surface representation of the animal and to analyse it for determining the animal's position, being such that the analysis includes localising the spinal ridge of the animal. With regard to this feature, the appellant-opponent (see its reply of 25 September 2023, page 12) has referred to its comments on the version of the patent as upheld in its grounds of appeal (see page 18 onwards), which also has this (spinal ridge) feature.

Following on from the discussion of inventive step of the second auxiliary request, it is not disputed that D1 does not disclose the added feature of localising the spinal ridge of an animal. At most D1 discloses (see for example the paragraph bridging pages 17 and 18) that substantially [an] entire cow may be viewed, but the identification of anatomical bone structures is not disclosed.

The appellant-opponent argues that the added feature (analysing a 3D surface representation including localisation of the spinal ridge) is known from D2. The Board disagrees.

For a start, D2 does not disclose analysing any 3D surface representation because it only looks at plan projection images of a cow, thus 2D images (see for example page 17). For this reason alone, the feature is not disclosed in D2. Moreover, in the Board's view, D2 does not disclose the localisation of a spinal ridge by any other means.

The spinal ridge is the prominent bony structure that runs along the top of the backs of certain animals, such as cows. The usual meaning of the word localisation (see Oxford English Dictionary on-line meaning 3) is: "The action of associating something with a particular place or location; the action of determining the location of something or someone; an instance of this".

In the claim context of forming a three dimensional surface representation and analysing this to localise the spinal ridge, the Board understands localisation to mean *determining location*.

Whilst it may well be that the proximal end of the tail of a cow coincides with the start of the spinal ridge, D2 does not disclose to determine any other point along the spinal ridge which might define how it extends and thus enable its localisation. Rather D2 discloses finding the centre of gravity of images of cows (see page 17, first complete paragraph). The Board agrees with the appellant-opponent (see its appeal grounds, page 20 last paragraph but two) that the centre of gravity of the plan view images of a cow as described in D2 is a single point equatable to the point at which a cut out plan projection image of the cow would be able to balance on a needle tip. D2 does not explicitly disclose that this centre of gravity lies on the spinal ridge (cf. D2, page 17, lines 5 to 10). At most, it only explains using the centre of gravity to define an orientation and posture of a cow.

The Board also does not consider the feature to be implicitly disclosed in D2. In this regard, the appellant-opponent has referred to the lower figure on page 16 of D2 and argued (see its appeal grounds, bottom of page 19) that, however the cow moves its head, the hind half of the animal hardly bends. Whether or not this is so, the centre of gravity of the image will inevitably move to the left if the cow bends its head to the left and vice versa, even if its rear part is symmetrical as the appellant-opponent alleges (cf. its appeal grounds, last paragraph on page 19). Therefore, the Board is not convinced by the appellant-opponent's argument that finding the centre of gravity of a plan view of an animal is to find a point on its spinal ridge.

For these reasons, the Board is not convinced that D2 discloses the localisation of the spinal ridge of an animal (cow) as the appellant-opponent has concluded (see its appeal grounds, top of page 20). Rather, the Board agrees with the opposition division's finding that this feature is not disclosed (see impugned decision, reasons, point 30.1).

Since neither D1 nor D2 discloses to analyse a three dimensional surface to perform the localisation of an animal's spinal ridge, however obvious their combination might be, it would not lead to the subject matter of claim 1 of auxiliary request 3. The same applies to the independent method claim, claim 9, which has corresponding features expressed in terms of method steps".

5.3 Neither in written proceedings nor at the oral proceedings before the Board did the appellant-opponent explain why the Board's opinion that D2's disclosure of constructing a line between the proximal end of the tail and the centre of gravity of an image does not constitute locating the spinal ridge might have been wrong. Therefore, the Board confirms this aspect of its communication.

5.4 However, in its letter of 28 January 2025 and at the oral proceedings before the Board, the appellant-opponent did take issue with the idea expressed in this part of the Board's communication that identifying a single point on the spinal ridge was not sufficient to localise it. The appellant-opponent argued that locating the proximal end of the tail (cf. D2, page 17, first and second complete paragraphs) amounted to localising the spinal ridge, so the combination of D1

with D2 would lead the skilled person to a system which performed an analysis including localisation of the spinal ridge, and thus to the subject matter of claim 1, as a matter of obviousness.

- 5.5 Whether or not the tail is part of the spinal ridge as the appellant-opponent has argued, its proximal end coincides with the start of the animal's back so the Board agrees that it might be considered to be a point on the spinal ridge.
- 5.6 In explaining that identifying a single point - the proximal end of the tail - was to localise the spinal ridge, the appellant-proprietor drew a parallel with the Board's statement in its communication, last sentence of section 6.2: *In the Board's view, viewing just a part of an animal, as D1 likewise discloses, also amounts to determining the animal's position, since one body part is inseparable from the rest of the animal.*
- 5.6.1 This statement was concerned with the idea of viewing a body part of an animal, not a single point on the animal. Therefore, whatever its relevance to the present request might otherwise be, it is not equatable to the idea that identifying a single point on the spinal ridge might be to localise it. Therefore, the argument is moot.
- 5.7 The appellant-opponent's further arguments, based on an analogy of the spinal ridge to a water pipe, have not convinced the Board that it was wrong to have considered that, in the present claim context, more than one point along the spinal ridge needs to be known in order to localise it.

- 5.7.1 In particular, according to the appellant-opponent's water-pipe analogy, if a person's goal were to be to tap into a water pipe, then the pipe could be said to be localised when a single point along it was known, this being sufficient to draw water from it. However, if their goal were to be avoiding penetrating a concealed pipe when putting a nail into a wall, then its entire extent would need to be known. In that context, so the appellant-opponent argued, the pipe would only be localised when all the points along it were known. The appellant-opponent concluded that, in its broadest sense, localising a water pipe means to know a single point along it and by analogy, the same is true for localising the spinal ridge in claim 1.
- 5.7.2 This is not convincing because, in the claim context, the analysis that includes localising the spinal ridge is used to determine *the position* of the animal, which includes its orientation amongst other things. This cannot be derived from knowing a single point on the spinal ridge but would rather require knowing how it extended beyond that point. Therefore, *localisation* in the claim context is, if anything, rather akin to the appellant-opponent's scenario of putting a nail into the wall, according to which all the points along a hidden pipe would need to be known. Therefore, the appellant-opponent's argument that in the claim context, only one point on the spinal ridge need be known to localise it, is not convincing.
- 5.8 It follows that the Board agrees with the opposition division's finding that the present claim 1 involves an inventive step starting from D1 with D2.

5.9 In written proceedings, the appellant-opponent raised a further inventive step objection against present claim 1, namely one based on the combination of D2 with D13, formulated for auxiliary request 3 in its appeal grounds, point 5.2.

5.9.1 In its communication (see section 14.1), the Board commented on admissibility of this objection as follows:

"14.1 In its appeal grounds, see points 5.2, the appellant-opponent argued that the subject matter of claim 1 of the version of the patent upheld by the opposition division (now auxiliary request 7) also lacked inventive step starting from D2 and D13. By its reference to these arguments in its letter of 25 September 2023, the appellant-opponent raises corresponding objections against auxiliary request 3 for the first time in appeal. According to the undisputed minutes (see sections 5 and 6) the opponent only raised objections starting from D1 in combination with D2. This is also reflected in the impugned decision (see sections 30.1, 32 and 33). Therefore the inventive step objection starting from D2 is an amendment to the appellant-opponent's case in opposition proceedings.

Had the appellant-opponent wished to have an objection based on D2 in combination with D13 directed against claims having the spinal ridge feature considered in appeal, it should have already raised it in the opposition proceedings. Since it did not do so, the Board intends not to admit this objection into the appeal proceedings in accordance with Articles 12(4) and 12(6) second sentence RPBA".

- 5.9.2 In the absence of any written or oral comments on this aspect of the communication, the Board saw no reason to deviate from its intention not to admit this objection into the appeal proceedings, therefore it will not be considered.
6. No further objections were raised against auxiliary request 7. Since the arguments of the appellant-opponent have not convinced the Board that the opposition division was wrong to conclude that the patent could be maintained with the set of claims according to auxiliary request 3, which is the same as present auxiliary request 7, and a further objection is not considered, the patent can be maintained with claims according to auxiliary request 7.
- 6.1 The description according to auxiliary request 7 was refiled with the appellant-proprietor's grounds of appeal and further amended with its letter of 23 May 2023, so that it is now different from the version held to be allowable by the opposition division. Therefore, the impugned decision must be set aside.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

1. The decision under appeal is set aside.
2. The case is remitted to the opposition division with the order to maintain the patent as amended in the following version:

Description:

Paragraphs 1 to 8, 10 to 13, 15 to 19, 21 to 36, 38 to 51 of the patent specification

Paragraphs 9, 14, 20 and 37 according to the seventh auxiliary request filed with the letter of 25 May 2023

Claims:

No. 1 to 11 according to the seventh auxiliary request filed with the letter of 16 May 2023

Drawings:

Figures 1 to 4 of the patent specification.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



G. Magouliotis

A. Pieracci

Decision electronically authenticated