# DES EUROPÄISCHEN THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

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

## Internal distribution code:

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

DECISION of 6 March 2003

T 0902/01 - 3.3.1 Case Number:

Application Number: 96927644.3

Publication Number: 0871625

C07D 403/06 IPC:

Language of the proceedings: EN

## Title of invention:

Preparation of triazoles by organometallic addition to ketones and intermediates therefor

#### Applicant:

Pfizer Research and Development Company, N.V./S.A., et al

#### Opponent:

#### Headword:

Preparation of triazoles/PFIZER

#### Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 111(1)

#### Keyword:

"Removal of ground of appeal during prosecution of appeal remittal to the first instance for further prosecution"

### Decisions cited:

G 0010/93

#### Catchword:



Europäisches Patentamt European Patent Office

Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Case Number: T 0902/01 - 3.3.1

DECISION
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.1
of 6 March 2003

Appellant: Pfizer Research and

Development Company, N.V./S.A.

La Touche House

International Financial Services Centre

Dublin 1 (IE)

Representative: Ruddock, Keith Stephen

Pfizer Limited

European Patent Department

Ramsgate Road

Sandwich

Kent CT13 9NJ (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the

European Patent Office posted 23 March 2001

refusing European patent application

No. 96 927 644.3 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. J. Nuss

Members: P. F. Ranguis

R. T. Menapace

- 1 - T 0902/01

## Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The present appeal lies from the Examining Division's decision to reject the European patent application No. 96 927 644.3 (publication No. 871 625) on the ground that Claim 37 of the then pending request (Claims 1 to 39 as originally filed) did not involve an inventive step.
- II. In the reasons for the decision, the Examining Division held, by reference to the previous communications dated 16 June 2000 and 14 November 2000, that the subjectmatter of Claims 1 to 36, 38 and 39 was novel and involved an inventive step over the cited prior art.

However, the Examining Division held that the subjectmatter of Claim 37 could not be considered as involving an inventive step.

III. In his letter dated 11 February 2003, the Appellant informed the Board of his decision not to pursue any longer the subject-matter of the refused Claim 37 and requested that the case be remitted to the first instance with the order to grant a patent on the basis of Claims 1 to 36 as originally filed and Claims 37 and 38 (former Claims 38 and 39) submitted with the response dated 11 February 2003. The Appellant also submitted amended pages 13 and 14 of the description.

#### Reasons for the Decision

- 1. The appeal is admissible.
- 2. Proceedings before the Boards in ex parte cases are

0625.D .../...

primarily concerned with examining the contested decision (cf. G 10/93, OJ EPO 1995, 172, point 4 of the reasons). It is moreover established jurisprudence of the Boards of Appeal that an appeal is to be considered well founded if the Appellant no longer seeks grant of the patent with a text as refused by the Examining Division and if he proposes a text for grant which clearly overcomes the objections on which the decision under appeal lies.

- 3. The sole ground of rejection relates to the lack of inventive step of Claim 37 as originally filed (cf. point II above). Since in the sole pending request, original Claim 37 was deleted, the reason for the refusal of the application is thereby removed.
- 4. Remittal Article 111(1) EPC

Having regard to the fact that the function of the Board of Appeal is primarily to give a judicial decision upon the correctness of the earlier decision taken by the first instance, the Board makes use of its competence under Article 111(1) EPC and remits the case to the first instance for further prosecution.

5. Since the Appellant's request succeeds, there is no need for the Board to consider its precautionary, i.e. subsidiary, request for oral proceedings

0625.D .../...

- 3 - T 0902/01

## Order

# For these reasons it is decided that:

1. The decision under appeal is set aside.

2. The case is remitted to the first instance for further prosecution.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

N. Maslin A. Nuss