BESCHWERDEKAMMERN PATENTAMTS

BOARDS OF APPEAL OF OFFICE

CHAMBRES DE RECOURS DES EUROPÄISCHEN THE EUROPEAN PATENT 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 23 November 2021

Case Number: T 1884/16 - 3.3.01

06023696.5 Application Number:

Publication Number: 1769795

A61K31/44, A61K31/535, IPC:

> A61K31/65, A61K31/435, A61K31/505, A61K31/47

Language of the proceedings: ΕN

Title of invention:

Aryl urea compounds in combination with other cytostatic or cytotoxic agents for treating human cancers

Patent Proprietor:

Bayer HealthCare LLC

Opponent:

Altmann, Andreas

Headword:

Sorafenib in combination with other cytostatic or cytotoxic agents/BAYER

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 113(2)

Keyword:

Basis of decision - text or agreement to text withdrawn by patent proprietor - patent revoked

Decisions cited:

T 0186/84, T 0073/84



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 1884/16 - 3.3.01

DECISION
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.01
of 23 November 2021

Appellant: Altmann, Andreas

(Opponent) Herzog Fiesser & Partner

Patentanwälte Isartorplatz 1 80331 München (DE)

Representative: Elkington and Fife LLP

Prospect House 8 Pembroke Road

Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 1XR (GB)

Respondent:

(Patent Proprietor)

Bayer HealthCare LLC

100 Bayer Boulevard

Whippany, NJ 07981 (US)

Representative: Weickmann & Weickmann PartmbB

Postfach 860 820 81635 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the

European Patent Office posted on 7 June 2016 rejecting the opposition filed against European patent No. 1769795 pursuant to Article 101(2)

EPC.

Composition of the Board:

- 1 - T 1884/16

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The opposition division rejected the opposition against European patent No. 1 769 795.
- II. The opponent (appellant) lodged an appeal against this decision. It requested that the decision under appeal be set aside and the patent be revoked.
- III. The patent proprietor (respondent) requested that the appeal be dismissed. Its main request was that the patent be maintained as granted. Alternatively, a patent was to be maintained in amended form on the basis of the sets of claims of any of auxiliary requests I to VII, all submitted with the reply to the statement setting out the grounds of appeal.
- IV. With its letter of 18 November 2021 the respondent informed the board that it no longer approved the text of the granted patent, that all requests filed so far were withdrawn, that no amended text would be submitted, and that, therefore, revocation of the patent was expected.

Reasons for the Decision

- 1. The appeal is admissible.
- The respondent withdrew its agreement to the text of the granted patent, withdrew any requests filed so far and confirmed that it did not intend to submit any other text for the maintenance of the patent.

Article 113(2) EPC stipulates that the EPO may decide upon a European patent only in the text submitted to

- 2 - T 1884/16

it, or agreed to by the patent proprietor. However, this substantive requirement for maintaining the contested patent is not fulfilled in the present case. There is therefore no text of the patent on the basis of which the Board can consider the appeal of the appellant (see T 73/84, OJ EPO, 1985, 241, reasons point 2).

3. The patent is therefore to be revoked, without going into the substantive issues (see T 186/84, OJ EPO 1986, 79, reasons point 5).

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:



M. Schalow

T. Sommerfeld

Decision electronically authenticated