BESCHWERDEKAMMERN PATENTAMTS

BOARDS OF APPEAL OF DES EUROPÄISCHEN THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

CHAMBRES DE RECOURS DE L'OFFICE EUROPÉEN DES BREVETS

Internal distribution code:

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

Datasheet for the decision of 16 November 2022

Case Number: T 1584/19 - 3.3.04

Application Number: 09791127.5

Publication Number: 2326329

A61K31/517, A61K31/7068, IPC:

A61K45/06, A61P35/00

Language of the proceedings: ΕN

Title of invention:

Antineoplastic combinations of 4-anilino-3-cyanoquinolines and capecitabine

Patent Proprietor:

Wyeth LLC

Opponent:

Hexal AG

Headword:

Antineoplastic combinations / WYETH

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 113(2)

Keyword:

Basis of decision - text or agreement to text withdrawn by patent proprietor



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 Fax +49 (0)89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 1584/19 - 3.3.04

DECISION
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.04
of 16 November 2022

Appellant: Hexal AG

(Opponent) Industriestraße 25 83607 Holzkirchen (DE)

Representative: Elkington and Fife LLP

Prospect House 8 Pembroke Road

Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 1XR (GB)

Respondent: Wyeth LLC

(Patent Proprietor) 235 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10017 (US)

Representative: Jones Day

Rechtsanwälte, Attorneys-at-Law, Patentanwälte

Prinzregentenstraße 11 80538 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the

European Patent Office posted on 21 March 2019 rejecting the opposition filed against European

patent No. 2326329 pursuant to

Article 101(2) EPC

Composition of the Board:

Chairwoman R. Hauss
Members: S. Albrecht

M. Blasi

- 1 - T 1584/19

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal, duly lodged by the opponent (appellant), lies against the opposition division's decision rejecting the opposition against European patent EP 2 326 329.
- II. The appellant requested that the decision under appeal be set aside and the patent be revoked.
- III. The patent proprietor (respondent) replied to the appeal, requesting that the appeal be dismissed or, as an auxiliary measure, that the patent be maintained in amended form on the basis of the claims of a first auxiliary request filed on 12 December 2018.
- IV. The board appointed oral proceedings in conformity with the parties' requests and, in a communication pursuant to Article 15(1) RPBA, provided its preliminary appreciation of some matters concerning the appeal.
- V. During oral proceedings on 16 November 2022, the respondent declared that it no longer approved the text in which the patent was granted and that it withdrew the first auxiliary request.

Reasons for the Decision

- 1. The appeal complies with Articles 106 to 108 EPC and Rule 99 EPC and is admissible.
- 2. Pursuant to Article 113(2) EPC, the European Patent Office shall examine, and decide upon, the European patent only in the text submitted to it, or agreed, by the proprietor of the patent.

- 2 - T 1584/19

- 3. Such an agreement is deemed not to exist if the patent proprietor as in the present case expressly declares that it no longer approves the text in which the patent was granted and withdraws all pending requests relating to an amended version of the patent.
- 4. There is therefore no longer any text of the patent in the proceedings on the basis of which the board can consider compliance of the patent as granted or amended with the requirements of the EPC. No other issues are to be decided upon in the present appeal case.
- 5. In these circumstances, the proceedings are to be terminated by a decision ordering revocation of the patent, without examination as to patentability (Case Law of the Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office, 10th edition 2022, IV.D.2).

- 3 - T 1584/19

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

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

The Registrar:

The Chairwoman:



I. Aperribay

R. Hauss

Decision electronically authenticated