Internal distribution code:

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

Datasheet for the decision of 25 November 2025

Case Number: T 0957/23 - 3.3.09

Application Number: 15822146.5

Publication Number: 3170803

IPC: C07C17/20, C07C17/25, C07C21/18

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
METHOD FOR PRODUCING TRANS-1-CHLORO-3,3,3-TRIFLUOROPROPANE

Patent Proprietor:
Central Glass Company, Limited

Opponent:
ARKEMA FRANCE

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 123(2), 83, 54, 56
RPBA 2020 Art. 13(2)

Keyword:

Amendments (main request) - allowable (no) - auxiliary request - allowable (yes)
Late-filed auxiliary request - admitted (yes)
Sufficiency of disclosure - (yes)
Novelty - auxiliary request (yes)
Inventive step - auxiliary request (yes)

Decisions cited:

Catchword:

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

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 0957/23 - 3.3.09

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.09
of 25 November 2025

Appellant: (Opponent)	ARKEMA FRANCE 420, Rue d'Estienne d'Orves 92700 Colombes (FR)
Representative:	Bandpay & Greuter 11 rue Christophe Colomb 75008 Paris (FR)
Respondent: (Patent Proprietor)	Central Glass Company, Limited 5253 Oaza Okiube Ube-shi Yamaguchi 755-0001 (JP)
Representative:	dompatent Partnerschaft von Patentanwälten und Rechtsanwälten mbB Deichmannhaus am Dom Bahnhofsvorplatz 1 50667 Köln (DE)
Decision under appeal:	**Interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 23 March 2023 concerning maintenance of the European Patent No. 3170803 in amended form.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman	A. Haderlein
Members:	A. Zellner
	L. Basterreix

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The opponent lodged an appeal against the opposition division's interlocutory decision which held the main request underlying said decision to be allowable.

II. An opposition was filed on the basis of Article 100(a) EPC for lack of novelty and lack of inventive step (Articles 54 and 56 EPC), and on the basis of Article 100(b) and (c) EPC.

III. During the opposition proceedings, the patent proprietor defended its patent in amended form. The opposition division concluded that the main request (filed as "Main request A" on 15 December 2022) was allowable. In particular, the opposition division concluded that:

(a) features in the claims of the main request A had a basis in the application as originally filed,
(b) the claimed invention was sufficiently disclosed for it to be carried out by a skilled person,
(c) the method of claim 1 was novel over that disclosed in D1, D2, D4 and D9,
(d) document D3 was the closest prior art, and disclosed a method for producing trans-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene in the absence of chlorine; the problem underlying the claimed invention was to provide an improved method for preparing trans-1-chloro-3,3,3- trifluoropropene efficiently from intermediate products including those having low reactivity; the problem was solved in view of the available evidence in table 3 of the patent and the subsequent experimental evidence filed by the patent proprietor; the use of chlorine

for that purpose was neither taught nor suggested and the claimed solution was thus inventive.

IV. The following documents are referred to:

D1: GB 2 313 118 A
D2: US 2014/005446 A1
D3: WO 98/12161
D4: EP 0 939 071 A1
D9: EP 2 341 040 A1
D10: EP 3 404 006 B1

V. Claim 1 of the main request (patent as maintained by the opposition division, "Main Request A") reads as follows:

"A method for producing trans-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene, characterized in that the method includes:
reacting a halogenated hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms in a gas phase with hydrogen fluoride at 150°C or higher and 600°C or lower in the presence of chlorine, and
wherein the halogenated hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms is at least one selected from the group consisting of 1,1,3,3-tetrachloro-1-fluoropropane (241fa), 1,3,3-trichloro-1,1-difluoropropane (242fa), cis-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene (1233zd(Z)), 3,3-dichloro-1,1,1-trifluoropropane (243fa),
and 3-chloro-1,1,1,3-tetrafluoropropane (244fa)."

VI. Dependent claim 2 of the main request reads as follows:

"The production method according to Claim 1 wherein a hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms is further added, and

the hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms is at least one selected from the group consisting of 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropropane (245fa), trans-1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene (1234ze(E)), cis-1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene (1234ze(Z)), 1,1,3,3-tetrafluoropropene (1234zc) and 3,3,3-trifluoropropine."

VII. With its reply to the appeal, the respondent filed a number of auxiliary requests of which only auxiliary request 25 is relevant to the present decision. Claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 is identical to claim 1 of the main request.

VIII. At the oral proceedings before the board, the respondent withdrew all requests but the main request and auxiliary request 25.

IX. The appellant's arguments can be summarised as follows.

- The subject-matter of claim 1 and a number of dependent claims of the main request extended beyond the content of the application as filed.

- There was a lack of sufficiency of disclosure, a number of starting materials not having been shown to yield trans-1233zd.

- There was a lack of novelty over D1, D4 and D9.

- There was a lack of inventive step starting from D3, D4 or D7. In particular, the claimed process differed by the reaction taking place in the presence of chlorine. It was not credible that there was an improvement over D3, in particular because D3 was carried out using a catalyst whereas

the tests according to the patent in suit were carried out in the absence of a catalyst. Moreover, the tests in the patent concerned a complex composition and did not show an effect over a single compound as claimed. The problem to be solved was the provision of an alternative process. This problem was solved in an obvious way.

- D10 should not be admitted.

- The auxiliary requests were not admissible and/or not allowable.

X. The respondent's arguments can be summarised as follows.

- The subject-matter of independent claim 1 and the dependent claims objected to did not go beyond the application as filed.

- The requirements of sufficiency, novelty and inventive step were met. In particular, the difference in relation to D3 included the presence of chlorine and the problem to be solved was a more efficient method for producing 1233zd(E). The solution was not rendered obvious by the prior art.

- The inventive step objections based on D4 and D7 as the closest prior art should not be admitted into the proceedings.

XI. The appellant (opponent) requested that the decision under appeal be set aside and that the patent be revoked.

XII. The respondent (patent proprietor) requested that the appeal be dismissed or that the patent be maintained with the claims of auxiliary request 25.

Reasons for the Decision

Main request (patent as held allowable by the opposition division)

Amendments (Article 123(2) EPC)

1. The appellant argued that the opposition division's decision that *inter alia* claim 2 of the main request had a basis in the application as filed was erroneous and that the main request was thus not allowable.

2. The board concludes that claim 2 of the main request does not meet the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC. The reasons are as follows.

2.1 Dependent claim 2 of the main request is directed to the production method according to claim 1, wherein a hydrocarbon compound selected from a list of four individual compounds is *"... further added ..."*. According to the respondent, paragraphs [0036] and [0038], as well as [0015] to [0018] and [0056] of the application as filed, provided a basis for the claim.

2.2 It is correct that the compounds in claim 2 can be found in paragraph [0038] of the application as filed. This paragraph, however, does not disclose that the compounds are *"added"*. Paragraph [0036], on the other hand, discloses that a hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms can be *"... used together with [the] starting material employed ..."*. The term *"added"* in

claim 2 does not specify the time at which the selected compound is to be added, or indeed whether it is already present at the start of the reaction and thus used together with the halogenated hydrogen compound having 3 carbon atoms which is used as starting material. Paragraphs [0036] and [0038] thus cannot provide a basis for claim 2.

2.3 Paragraph [0015] of the application as filed discloses that a hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms of formula (3) *"... is further added **and reacted** in a gas phase with hydrogen fluoride ..."* (emphasis added by the board), which is different from the wording used in claim 2 of the main request. The board is also not convinced that the disclosure of paragraphs [0015] to [0018] can be combined with the disclosure of the specific compounds of claim 2 as disclosed in paragraph [0039], which relates to the disclosure in paragraph [0036]. Paragraphs [0015] to [0018] furthermore do not relate to the individual compounds of claim 1 of the main request. The board further notes that paragraph [0056] does not refer to any particular compounds at all, in contrast to claims 1 and 2 of the main request. Since claim 2 does not contain the additional feature *"and reacted"*, paragraphs [0015] to [0018] and [0056] thus cannot form a basis for the claim either.

3. For these reasons, the main request does not meet the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC and, for this reason alone, is not allowable.

Auxiliary request 25

Admission (Article 13(2) RPBA)

4. The appellant argued that auxiliary request 25 should not be admitted into the proceedings because it was late filed.

5. It is not contested that auxiliary request 25 was filed after the board's communication under Article 15(1) RPBA. According to Article 13(2) RPBA, an amendment to a party's appeal case made at that stage of the appeal proceedings shall, in principle, not be taken into account unless there are exceptional circumstances, which have been justified with cogent reasons by the party concerned.

6. Auxiliary request 25 differs from the main request in that dependent claims 2 and 4 to 11 were deleted. Auxiliary request 25 only consists of two claims, *i.e.* independent claim 1, which is identical to claim 1 of the main request, and dependent claim 2, which corresponds to claim 3 of the main request. According to established case law, the deletion of dependent claims is an amendment within the meaning of Article 13(2) RPBA (see the Case Law of the Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office, chapter V.A.4.2.3.d)).

7. Due to the deletion of dependent claim 2 in particular, as well as dependent claims 4 to 6, which have also been objected to by the appellant for lack of support in the application as filed, and due to the fact that the only independent claim of auxiliary request 25 is identical to the only independent claim of the main request, the amendment neither leads to an altered factual situation, nor does it require a re-evaluation of the matter at issue. The board thus considers that admitting auxiliary request 25 into the proceedings is consistent with the principles of procedural economy and fair proceedings (see the Case Law of the Boards of

Appeal of the European Patent Office, chapter V.A. 4.2.3.d), last paragraph).

8. Auxiliary request 25 is, for these reasons, admitted into the appeal proceedings (Article 13(2) RPBA).

Amendments (Article 123(2) EPC)

9. The appellant argued that the application as filed did not disclose combining the features of claims 1, 3 and 4 of the application as filed to form claim 1 of auxiliary request 25.

10. The board disagrees.

10.1 Claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 differs from claim 1 as filed in the additional feature that reacting a halogenated compound having 3 carbon atoms in a gas phase with hydrogen fluoride is carried out *"... at 150°C or higher and 600°C or lower ..."* in the presence of chlorine, and in that *"... the halogenated hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms is at least one selected from the group consisting of 1,1,3,3-tetrachloro-1-fluoropropane (241fa), 1,3,3-trichloro-1,1-difluoropropane (242fa), cis-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene (1233zd(Z)), 3,3-dichloro-1,1,1-trifluoropropane (243fa), and 3-chloro-1,1,1,3-tetrafluoropropane (244fa) ..."*. According to claim 1 as filed, said halogenated carbon was represented by general formula (1).

10.2 The feature relating to reaction temperature is the only temperature range of dependent claim 4 as filed. The combination of this range with the features of claim 1 as filed is thus directly and unambiguously disclosed. The board also notes that paragraph [0043]

of the description as filed discloses this range as the broadest possible range.

10.3 According to dependent claim 3 as filed, the halogenated hydrocarbon compound reacted in the method according to claim 1 is selected from a group consisting of 15 compounds. Claim 1 has been amended to a method wherein the halogenated hydrocarbon compound is selected from the group consisting of 5 of the compounds disclosed in claim 3 as filed. The restriction of the starting materials to only 5 of those disclosed in claim 3 as filed does not generate undisclosed subject-matter, since it merely reduces the length of the list of possible compounds from 15 to 5.

10.4 Also, the combination of the features of dependent claim 4 as filed and (some of) the features of claim 3 as filed does not generate undisclosed subject-matter either.

11. For these reasons, claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 is based on the application as filed and the request meets the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC.

Sufficiency (Article 83 EPC)

12. The appellant argued that the contested patent did not disclose the reaction of all of the starting materials listed in claim 1, in particular of 243fa, 244fa or cis-1233zd, with HF. These compounds had at least as many fluorine atoms (three or four) as the product sought (three), and could therefore not lead to the latter by reaction with HF. The experimental data of the patent itself (tables 2 and 3) as well as the additional experimental data submitted by the respondent during the opposition proceedings on

15 December 2022 (examples 7 and 8) showed that the amount of the aforementioned compounds even increased during the course of the reaction. Since the contested patent did not provide any clarification on this issue, the claimed invention was not sufficiently disclosed.

13. The appellant's argument is not convincing. It is correct that the amount of starting materials in the reaction fluids of the examples referred to by the appellant does not decrease for every compound. It is also correct - and confirmed by the respondent during the oral proceedings before the board - that the reaction mechanism is not explained in the contested patent. However, there is no evidence that specific compounds do not react in the course of the allegedly complex reaction. On the other hand, the experimental data referred to do show that the target compound is produced when a mixture of compounds listed in claim 1 and including the three compounds referred to by the appellant is used as starting material. On the basis of the available data, it is not possible to draw the conclusion that individual compounds used on their own would not yield the target compound. The board also notes that the appellant failed to provide any relevant experimental data.

14. The board thus concludes that the contested patent does not lack sufficiency, and that auxiliary request 25 meets the requirements of Article 83 EPC.

Novelty (Article 54 EPC)

15. The appellant argued that the method according to claim 1 was not novel in view of the disclosure of documents D1, D4 and D9.

16. The board concludes that this is not correct. The reasons are as follows.

16.1 Claim 20 of document D1 discloses the preparation of 1233zd from 240fa, which is not one of the compounds used as a starting material in claim 1 of auxiliary request 25.

16.2 The claims of D1 do not disclose any of the reagents of claim 1 of auxiliary request 25.

16.3 Example 1 of D1 discloses the preparation of trans-1233zd from 240fa and the concomitant formation of 243fa, which is a reagent in claim 1 of auxiliary request 25. The appellant argued that claim 1 did not require trans-1233zd to be obtained from 243fa, but only the latter to be present in the reaction media. However, claim 1 nevertheless requires 243fa to react, which is not disclosed in document D1. The claimed method is therefore novel in view of the disclosure of document D1.

16.4 In document D4, 1233zd(E) is not the product of the disclosed process, but the starting material, whereas present claim 1 requires 1233zd(E) to be produced.

16.5 Examples 8 and 9 of D4 are carried out in the presence of chlorine (see footnote in the table on page 12). The starting materials are, respectively, those obtained in example 7 and in example 8, as disclosed in the table.

16.6 Of the compounds in that table, only 1233zd(Z), denoted CTFP(c), is one of the compounds in claim 1. Example 7 generates some 1233zd(E), as its proportion increases from 0.6% to 3.0%. However, no reaction of 1233zd(Z) is

apparent, as its proportion remains constant.

16.7 The appellant argued that the patent in suit showed that 1233zd(Z) must inevitably react under the conditions in D4 to yield the claimed product which is to be produced. The issue, however, is whether D4, in combination with common general knowledge, directly and unambiguously discloses that reaction. The board does not see that this is the case.

16.8 The appellant argued that paragraph [0014] of document D4 disclosed 243fa and 244fa as reagents and that paragraph [0016] disclosed 1233zd(E). However, the board notes that none of these compounds is disclosed in combination with a process in the presence of chlorine. The appellant also referred to example 1 of D4. However, the process in example 1 lacks chlorine and is thus not according to claim 1.

16.9 Lastly, the appellant referred to the general disclosure in document D4. The board, however, does not see how the features in claim 1 could be disclosed in combination. The sole mention of the use of chlorine in D4 is in examples 8 and 9 and in paragraph [0032], but this is not disclosed in combination with any of the specific compounds of claim 1 of auxiliary request 25.

16.10 The board thus concludes that the process disclosed in document D4 is not according to claim 1.

16.11 Like D1, document D9 discloses the preparation of 1233zd from 240fa, which is not a compound used as starting material in the method according to claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 (see abstract and example 1 of D9). According to the appellant, paragraph [0095] of D9 discloses a process in the presence of chlorine. This

disclosure, however, is made in the context of the reaction of 1233zd to yield 1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene (1234ze). The appellant argued that the second step of the method disclosed in D9 necessarily involved the presence of cis-1233zd, which would have inevitably reacted to form trans-1233zd in view of the disclosure of the patent. However, as in relation to D1, the issue is whether this reaction is disclosed in the prior art, D9. The board concludes that this is not the case.

17. For these reasons, claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 is novel and the request meets the requirements of Article 54 EPC.

Inventive step (Article 56 EPC)

Patent in dispute

18. The patent relates to a method for producing trans-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene from a halogenated hydrocarbon compound having 3 carbon atoms (see paragraph [0001]). According to paragraphs [0005] and [0011] of the description, the presence of e.g. 242fa as an intermediate in the fluorination reaction reduces productivity due to its accumulating in the reaction vessel as a result of its low fluorination rate. The patent intends to solve this problem by a gas-phase fluorination reaction in the presence of a catalytic amount of chlorine (see paragraph [0013]).

Closest prior art

19. In agreement with the parties, the opposition division considered document D3 to be the closest prior art. The appellant argued before the board that D4 and D7 are also suitable starting points for evaluating inventive

step.

20. The board concludes as follows.

20.1 Document D3 also relates to a gas-phase process for the preparation of 1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene (see page 1, lines 13 to 16) by either fluorinating 1,1,1,3,3-pentachloropropane with HF in the gas phase in the presence of a fluorination catalyst (see claim 8) or by fluorinating one or more of the intermediate products 242fa, 243fa and/or 244fa (see claim 10 and page 11, lines 12-21). The document is thus a suitable starting point for the evaluation of inventive step.

20.2 According to the impugned decision, the parties agreed at the oral proceedings before the opposition division that document D3 was the closest prior art (see page 2, penultimate paragraph). No objection starting from any of documents D4 or D7 as closest prior art was submitted in the course of the opposition proceedings. According to Article 12(6) RPBA, objections which should have been submitted in the proceedings leading to the decision under appeal are not admitted by the board, unless the circumstances of the appeal case justify their admittance. No such circumstances apply in the present case. In particular, the objections are not in response to any change in the respondent's case. Claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 is identical to claim 1 of main request A, which was filed by the respondent during the opposition proceedings on 12 December 2022 and thus within the period set by the opposition division with the summons to attend oral proceedings. The appellant would have had sufficient time to submit these objections during the opposition proceedings. The board thus concludes that the lack of inventive step objections which start from D4 or D7 are not admitted

into the proceedings (Article 12(6) RPBA).

Differing features

21. Claim 10 and page 11, line 12 *et seq.*, of D3 disclose the preparation of 1233zd from 243fa, 244fa and 242fa by reaction with HF. The process is to be carried out in analogy with that starting from 240fa (page 11, lines 12 to 16) at 200°C to 330°C (page 8, line 4) in the vapour phase over a catalyst (page 8, lines 8 and 9). D3 does not disclose carrying out the process in the presence of chlorine. This was undisputed.

Technical effect

22. Table 3 of the contested patent shows that the addition of chlorine leads to an improvement in the formation of 1233E. In particular, reacting a composition (*"reaction fluid"*) comprising a mixture of all of the compounds listed as starting materials in claim 1, and a small amount (0.36%) of the target compound 1233E, with HF in the presence of chlorine leads to the formation of a product mixture comprising between 28.65% and 69.04% of 1233E (see examples 1 to 6). In the absence of chlorine, only 9.52% of 1233E is comprised in the reaction product mixture (see comparative example 1). It is correct, as submitted by the appellant, that the presence of chlorine in comparative example 2 also leads to a relatively low amount of 1233E. The board notes, however, that this example is carried out at a temperature which is outside the claimed range, and is considerably lower than the temperature of examples 1 to 6 and comparative example 1.

23. Examples 7 and 8 (see the experimental data submitted on pages 32 to 34 of its reply to the grounds of

appeal, which had already been filed by the respondent during the opposition proceedings on 15 December 2022) also led - both in the presence of chlorine - to the formation of more 1233E than the corresponding comparative examples 3 and 4, which were performed in the absence of chlorine.

24. These examples show that the presence of chlorine in a reaction under conditions according to claim 1 leads to an increase in the formation of 1233E. The board also notes that, contrary to the process disclosed in D3, in the patent no catalyst was present in any of the examples according to claim 1.

25. The appellant argued that the examples were not convincing because they all used a composition comprising all of the halogenated hydrocarbon compounds of claim 1. The claim, however, also covered embodiments wherein any of these compounds alone had to lead to the formation of 1233E. For compounds containing three or more fluorine atoms, such as 243fa, 244fa or 1233Z, this was not credible because more fluorine would be added during the treatment with HF. Furthermore, table 3 of the contested patent also showed that the amount of at least 243fa, 244fa and 1233Z increased during the reaction. No 1233E was thus formed starting from these compounds. The appellant concluded that there was no technical effect shown for the whole scope of claim 1.

26. This argument is not convincing. Firstly, examples 7 and 8 show that, under conditions according to claim 1, the amount of 243fa (for example 7 only), 244fa and 1233Z decreases when chlorine is present, and increases in the absence of chlorine (see comparative examples 3 and 4). Furthermore, due to the complexity of the

starting composition used in the examples as also referred to by the appellant, it may not be entirely clear how each compound as such reacts, and which of the products is transformed to the final product 1233E. Finally, there are no experimental data showing that, under the conditions of claim 1, the compounds highlighted by the appellant do not form 1233E.

27. The technical effect caused by the presence of chlorine can thus be seen in an increased formation of 1233E in a reaction performed under conditions of claim 1.

Technical problem

28. As stated above, the claimed method differs from the method disclosed in document D3 in the presence of chlorine. The claimed method does not exclude the use of a catalyst. This is also confirmed by paragraph [0040] of the contested patent. The experimental data referred to in the previous paragraphs do, however, show that a technical effect is achieved even when no catalyst is used. On the other hand, document D3 discloses the reaction in the presence of a vapour phase catalyst (see page 1, lines 12 to 16). The technical problem can thus be seen in the provision of a method for producing trans-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene from selected halogenated hydrocarbon compound(s) having 3 carbon atoms in the gas phase with hydrogen fluoride without requiring the use of a catalyst.

Claimed solution

29. The claimed solution is the method of claim 1, characterised by the presence of chlorine in the gas phase reaction of selected halogenated hydrocarbon

compound(s) with hydrogen fluoride.

Success of the claimed solution

30. The experimental data in the contested patent and examples 7 and 8 show that the technical problem is effectively solved.

Non-obviousness of the claimed solution

31. Making reference to D9, D7, D5 or D4, the appellant argued that adding chlorine to the reaction media would have been obvious, as the prior art teaches that it can prevent catalyst deactivation.

32. The board does not agree. It is correct that the prior art suggests the addition of chlorine in order to extend the catalyst lifetime (see D9, paragraph [0095]; D7, page 4, lines 10 to 12; D5, column 2, lines 39 to 44; D4, paragraph [0032]). However, this teaching is limited to reactions which use a catalyst. In the absence of a catalyst, there was no need to react a halogenated hydrocarbon with HF in the presence of chlorine. The prior art thus does not prompt the skilled person to provide a method based on the method disclosed in document D3 which, however, can be performed without the use of a catalyst, and to perform such a reaction in the presence of chlorine. The skilled person would not randomly add additional reagents, such as chlorine, if there were no need.

33. The board concludes that the method according to claim 1 of auxiliary request 25 involves an inventive step. The request therefore meets the requirements of Article 56 EPC.

Conclusion

34. Since the main request does not meet the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC, it is not allowable. The arguments put forward by the appellant do not, however, preclude the contested patent from being maintained on the basis of auxiliary request 25.

35. Neither the parties nor the board raised any objections against the adapted description as discussed at the oral proceedings before the board.

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 in the following version:
- claims 1 and 2 of auxiliary request 25 filed with letter dated 21 March 2025,
- description, paragraphs [0001] to [0009] and [0011] to [0054] of the patent specification and paragraph [0010] reading:
"The embodiment of the present invention is reflected in independent claim 1. The preferred embodiment of the present invention is reflected in dependent claim 2.", and
- figure 1 of the patent specification.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

A. Wille A. Haderlein

Decision electronically authenticated