



- 5 To the extent that the invention can be understood from the wording of the claims as interpreted by the description and drawings, there can be no question that the invention lacks novelty with respect to the earlier application. There appears to be nothing disclosed in the two paragraphs of description to assist the applicant avoid anticipation by his earlier application.
- 6 The examiner's objection to clarity of claims is also well founded, in that the claims recite advantages of the invention as opposed to the precise technical matter for which the applicant seeks protection.
- 7 I have found that the invention as it is currently claimed is neither clear nor inventive. I therefore refuse the application under section 18(3).

**Appeal**

- 8 Any appeal must be lodged within 28 days after the date of this decision.

**Huw Jones**

Deputy Director, acting for the Comptroller