### 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 19 July 2022

Case Number: T 2068/19 - 3.2.02

11776826.7 Application Number:

Publication Number: 2632518

IPC: A61M5/50, A61M5/20, A61M5/315,

A61M5/32

Language of the proceedings: ΕN

#### Title of invention:

INJECTION DEVICES

#### Patent Proprietor:

Owen Mumford Limited

#### Opponents:

PFIZER LIMITED SHL Group AB Ypsomed AG Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH

#### Headword:

#### Relevant legal provisions:

EPC R. 84(1), 100(1)

#### Keyword:

Lapse of patent in all designated states - termination of appeal proceedings

#### Decisions cited:

T 0708/01

#### 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 2068/19 - 3.2.02

## DECISION of Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.02 of 19 July 2022

Appellant: Owen Mumford Limited
Brook Hill Woodstock

(Patent Proprietor) Oxford, Oxfordshire OX20 1TU (GB)

Representative: Branderhorst, Matthijs Pieter Arie

Marks & Clerk LLP Fletcher House Heatley Road

The Oxford Science Park Oxford OX4 4GE (GB)

Appellant: Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH

(Opponent 4) Industriepark Höchst

Bldg. K801

65926 Frankfurt am Main (DE)

Representative: Schmidt, Christian

 ${\tt ZSP}$  Patentanwälte PartG mbB

Hansastraße 32 80686 München (DE)

Party as of right: PFIZER LIMITED Ramsgate Road

(Opponent 1) SANDWICH, KENT CT13 9NJ (GB)

Representative: Pfizer

European Patent Department

23-25 avenue du Docteur Lannelongue

75668 Paris Cedex 14 (FR)

Party as of right: SHL Group AB

(Opponent 2) Box 1240

Augustendalsvägen 19 131 28 Nacka Strand (SE) Representative: Vossius & Partner

Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte mbB

Siebertstrasse 3 81675 München (DE)

Party as of right: Ypsomed AG

(Opponent 3)

Brunnmattstrasse 6

3401 Burgdorf (CH)

Representative: SSM Sandmair

Patentanwälte Rechtsanwalt

Partnerschaft mbB Joseph-Wild-Straße 20 81829 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Interlocutory decision of the Opposition

Division of the European Patent Office posted on

10 May 2019 concerning maintenance of the European Patent No. 2632518 in amended form.

#### Composition of the Board:

Chairman M. Alvazzi Delfrate

Members: S. Böttcher

C. Schmidt

- 1 - T 2068/19

#### Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeals of the patent proprietor and of opponent 4 are directed against the decision of the opposition division posted on 10 May 2019 that, account being taken of the amendments made by the patent proprietor during the opposition proceedings, the European patent No. 2 632 518 and the invention to which it relates were found to meet the requirements of the Convention.
- II. With communication of 2 November 2021, the parties were informed that the patent had lapsed in all designated Contracting States. The appellant/patent proprietor and the appellant/opponent 4 were requested to inform the board within a period of two months after notification of the communication, whether they requested the appeal proceedings to be continued or not.
- III. With a letter dated 16 December 2021 appellant/opponent 4 requested that the appeal proceedings be continued only if the appellant/patent proprietor would also request to continue it.
- IV. No answer to the communication was received by the appellant/patent proprietor within the two months period.

#### Reasons for the Decision

1. As mentioned above the patent has lapsed in all designated Contracting States.

- 2 - T 2068/19

- 2. In such a case, according to Rule 84(1) EPC, which is to be applied in opposition appeal proceedings (Rule 100(1) EPC), the opposition appeal proceedings may be continued at the request of the appellant/opponent filed within two months of a communication from the European Patent Office informing him of the lapse.
- 3. In analogy to Rule 84(1) EPC, the opposition appeal proceedings may be continued at the request of the appellant/patent proprietor filed within two months of a communication from the European Patent Office informing him of the lapse (e.g. T 0708/01, point 1 of the Reasons).
- 4. A continuation of the appeal proceedings was requested by appellant/opponent 4 only in case the proprietor would also request continuation. However, the proprietor did not file such a request. Therefore, the appeal proceedings are to be terminated.

#### Order

#### For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal proceedings are terminated.

- 3 - T 2068/19

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



D. Hampe

M. Alvazzi Delfrate

Decision electronically authenticated