

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 1 March 2022**

Case Number: T 0950/21 - 3.3.08

Application Number: 17163434.8

Publication Number: 3241902

IPC: C12N15/11, C12N15/63,
C07K19/00, C12N15/10,
C12N15/90, A61K38/46, A61K48/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR RNA-DIRECTED TARGET DNA
MODIFICATION AND FOR RNA-DIRECTED MODULATION OF TRANSCRIPTION

Patent Proprietor:

The Regents of the University of California
University of Vienna
Charpentier, Emmanuelle

Opponents:

Pohlman, Sandra M.
HGF Limited
Griebeling, Onno
Truscott, Glyn, John

Headword:

RNA-directed target DNA modification and RNA-directed
modulation of transcription/THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA/UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA/CHARPENTIER, EMMANUELLE

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:

Missing statement of grounds of appeal

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



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 0950/21 - 3.3.08

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.08
of 1 March 2022

Appellant: The Regents of the University of California
(Patent Proprietor 1) 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607 (US)

Appellant: University of Vienna
(Patent Proprietor 2) Universitätsring 1
1010 Vienna (AT)

Appellant: Charpentier, Emmanuelle
(Patent Proprietor 3) Department Of Regulation in Infection Biology
Max Planck Institute for Infection Biology
Charitéplatz 1
10117 Berlin (DE)

Representative: Bühler, Dirk
Maiwald Patentanwalts- und
Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH
Elisenhof
Elisenstraße 3
80335 München (DE)

Respondent: Pohlman, Sandra M.
(Opponent 1) df-mp Dörries Frank-Molnia & Pohlman
Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB
Fünf Höfe
Theatinerstraße 16
80333 München (DE)

Representative: Pohlman, Sandra M.
df-mp Dörries Frank-Molnia & Pohlman
Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB
Theatinerstrasse 16
80333 München (DE)

Respondent: HGF Limited
(Opponent 2) 1 City Walk
Leeds Yorkshire LS11 9DX (GB)

Representative: HGF
HGF Limited
1 City Walk
Leeds LS11 9DX (GB)

Respondent: Griebeling, Onno
(Opponent 3) Sportweg 10
5037 AC Tilburg (NL)

Representative: Griebeling, Onno
Octrooibureau Griebeling BV
Sportweg 10
5037 AC Tilburg (NL)

Respondent: Truscott, Glyn, John
(Opponent 4) Elkington & Fife LLP
Prospect House
8 Pembroke Road
Sevenoaks
Kent TN13 1XR (GB)

Representative: Greaves Brewster LLP
Copa House
Station Road
Cheddar, Somerset BS27 3AH (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 29 June 2021
revoking European patent No. 3241902 pursuant to
Article 101(3) (b) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman B. Stolz
Members: D. Pilat
R. Winkelhofer

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of an Opposition Division posted on 29 June 2021 to revoke the European patent 3 241 902 with the title "METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR RNA-DIRECTED TARGET DNA MODIFICATION AND FOR RNA-DIRECTED MODULATION OF TRANSCRIPTION".
- II. The patentees (hereinafter "appellants") filed a notice of appeal on 19 April 2021 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. By a communication dated 6 December 2021, which was received by the appellants on 8 December 2021, the board informed them that apparently no written statement of grounds of appeal had been filed, and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellants were informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.
- IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

1. No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rules 99(2) and 126(2) EPC.
2. Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chair:



L. Malécot-Grob

B. Stolz

Decision electronically authenticated