

GHQ, Box 91
February 14, 1949
File 436-R41-/

E.R. Powell, Manville

Patent Interference in Flame Jet Fiberization

In further reply to yours of January 4th and confirming our discussion at Manville, we understand that the proposal is to apply a continuous bead of molten material to the rim of a disc, either by dipping or otherwise, and subject the advancing end of the bead to the action of a high temperature blast which reduces the glass to a highly molten state and shreds it into fine fibers.

The most pertinent of the Owens-Corning patents is Slayter #2,175,225. The patentee forms an elongated glass rod or semi-solid glass stream and shreds it into fine fibers by a high temperature blast. Some of the claims are rather broadly drawn to a process which consists of flowing a stream of glass from a pool and applying a high temperature blast to the advancing end of the stream while the latter is integrally connected with the pool to re-melt the tip of the advancing stream and blow it into elongated filaments. From the information that we have now on hand, it would appear that your proposal would be covered by these claims as the continuous bead of glass on the rim of the disc is, in effect, a stream. However, the coverage is not as clean cut as it would be if we used the coarse fiber or glass rod feed of Slayter.

The U.S. patent, which presumably will issue corresponding to British patent #590,258, might also be involved, although we cannot determine this until we know the actual scope of its claims.

Hoffman patent #2,405,306 is drawn to a gaseous burner of the type which we understand you expect to use for the blase and would also be involved. This patent is not assigned to Owens-Corning as far as we are aware.

Another patent which must be taken into consideration is Slayter #2,133,236, which contains claims covering a mass of fine fibers of presumably the size which you would produce.

Other patents may require consideration when the details of the method and apparatus are worked out.

The question of infringement of the patents is not important as long as only laboratory work is involved. Commercial operation would, however, require policy decisions which are beyond our scope.

ESU:pm

E.S. Olson

cc: E.R. Williams, Mvl.

S. Spell, Mvl.

MTC 017435

436-7241-

PATENT DEPARTMENT	
GHQ	
HANDLE	
0	1
JAN 6 - 1949	
NOTE	
	12

Research Center
January 4, 1949
File: 436-R12a

E. S. Olsen- GH

Patent Interference in
Flame Jet Fiberization

We are considering making the necessary investments in equipment and time to try duplicating Owens-Corning AA fiber. The suggestion has been made that we blow fiber from a disc either supplied by a molten stream or dipping into a molten bath in place of the coarse fiber feed used by Owens-Corning. The question has come up whether the use of the disc avoids the claims of the patents on file, such as:

Hoffman	2,405,036
Slayter	2,175,225
McClure	2,172,153
X United Kingdom patent 590,258	
U.S. application filed 4/17/44.	

We do not know yet exactly what form the disc structure must take in order to be operative. We hope that the glass may be in the form of a bead on the rim of the disc and that it may be blasted from this rim without appearing as a coarse fiber. We assume that a high speed and temperature blast, attained either as shown or in some other way, will be used.

If this successful, will it avoid any substantial part of the art? Would we be involved any more seriously if we used the coarse fiber feed which the competitive patents show?

E. R. Powell

E. R. Powell

/ahm

V. C. Kline - GH
E. R. Williams
H. T. Coss
S. Speil
file

MTC 017436