BESCHWERDEKAMMERN	BOARDS OF APPEAL OF	CHAMBRES DE RECOURS
DES EUROPÄISCHEN	THE EUROPEAN PATENT	DE L'OFFICE EUROPEEN
PATENTAMTS	OFFICE	DES BREVETS

## Internal distribution code:

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

## DECISION of 21 September 2004

Case Number:	T 0778/01 - 3.2.6
Application Number:	91102759.7
Publication Number:	0443627
IPC:	A61F 13/15
Tongues of the propositions:	

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention: Absorbent structure

# Patentee: KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.

## Opponents:

The Procter & Gamble Company Stockhausen GmbH & Co. KG Nippon Shokubai Company Limited

## Headword:

-

**Relevant legal provisions:** EPC Art. 113(2)

#### Keyword:

"Basis of decision - no longer approval of the text of the patent"

**Decisions cited:** T 0230/84, T 0534/01

## Catchword:

-



Europäisches Patentamt European Patent Office Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

#### Case Number: T 0778/01 - 3.2.6

#### DECISION of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.6 of 21 September 2004

Appellant:	Stockhausen GmbH & Co. KG
(Opponent II)	Postfach 570
	D-47705 Krefeld (DE)
Poprogontativo	Kahlhäfer Hermonn Dinl Dhu

Representative: Kahlhöfer, Hermann, Dipl.-Phys. Patentanwälte Kahlhöfer Neumann Herzog Fiesser Karlstrasse 76 D-40210 Düsseldorf (DE)

Respondent: KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC. (Proprietor of the patent) 401 North Lake Street Neenah, Wisconsin 54956 (US)

Representative:

Dixon, Philip Matthew Frank B. Dehn & Co. 179 Queen Victoria Street London EC4V 4EL (GB)

Party to the proceedings:The Procter & Gamble Company(Opponent I)One Procter & Gamble PlazaCincinnati, Ohio 45202(US)

Representative: Boon, Graham Anthony Elkington and Fife LLP Prospect House 8 Pembroke Road Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 1XR (GB)

<b>Party to the proceedings:</b> (Opponent III)	Nippon Shokubai Company Limited 1-1, Koraibashi 4-chome Chuo-ku Osaka-shi Osaka 541 (JP)
Representative:	Glawe, Delfs, Moll & Partner Patentanwälte Postfach 26 01 62 D-80058 München (DE)
Decision under appeal:	Interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 28 May 2001 concerning maintenance of European patent No. 0443627 in amended form.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman:	Ρ.	Alting van Geusau	
Members:	G.	Pricolo	
	Μ.	J. Vogel	

#### Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is from the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division posted on 28 May 2001 concerning maintenance of the European patent No. 0 443 627 in amended form, granted in respect of European patent application No. 91 102 759.7.
- II. The appellant (opponent II) lodged an appeal, received at the EPO on 7 July 2001, against this decision and simultaneously paid the appeal fee. The statement setting out the grounds of appeal was received at the EPO on 28 September 2001.
- III. In a letter dated 7 September 2004 the patent proprietor (respondent) stated: "in accordance with the procedure approved in T 230/84, we withdraw our approval of the text of the above patent as granted with the intent that the patent should be revoked".

## Reasons for the Decision

- 1. The appeal is admissible.
- 2. Although the patent proprietor stated that it no longer approved the text in which the patent was granted, the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division being based on an amended text different from that of the patent as granted, this statement, taken together with the explicit declaration of the intent that the patent be revoked (which is reinforced by the reference to decision T 230/84, according to which the patent was revoked following withdrawal of the patent proprietor's

approval with the text of the patent as granted), can only be seen as the expression of the patent proprietor's intention to prevent any text whatever of the patent from being maintained.

3. Therefore, considering that Article 113(2) EPC states that the EPO confines its considerations in proceedings to the text of the European patent "submitted to it, or agreed" by the patent proprietor, and that the patent proprietor no longer approves the text in which the patent was maintained by the Opposition Division and does not submit an alternative text, there is no text on the basis of which the Board can consider the appeal. As a consequence, the patent must be revoked (cf. T 230/84; T 534/01).

# Order

## For these reasons it is decided that:

- 1. The decision under appeal is set aside.
- 2. The patent is revoked.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

A. Wallrodt

P. Alting van Geusau