## 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 8 August 2024

Case Number: T 1388/22 - 3.3.04

11801741.7 Application Number:

Publication Number: 2654789

A61K39/395, A61P35/00, IPC:

C07K16/30, C07K16/28

Language of the proceedings: ΕN

#### Title of invention:

Antibodies against human CD39 and use thereof

#### Patent Proprietors:

Orega Biotech INSERM - Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale

#### Opponents:

AbbVie Inc. Tizona Therapeutics D Young & Co LLP Boult Wade Tennant LLP

#### Relevant legal provisions:

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

#### Keyword:

Lapse of patent in all designated states - continuation of appeal proceedings (no)

#### Decisions cited:

T 0708/01, T 0520/10, T 0606/10



# 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 1388/22 - 3.3.04

# DECISION of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.04 of 8 August 2024

Appellants:

(Opponent 2)

(Patent Proprietors)

Orega Biotech

15 Chemin du Saquin

L'Espace Européen - Bâtiment G

69130 Ecully (FR)

and

INSERM - Institut National de la Santé et de la

Recherche Médicale 101, rue de Tolbiac 75013 Paris (FR)

Representative: Cabinet Laurent & Charras

Le Contemporain

50 Chemin de la Bruyère 69574 Dardilly Cedex (FR)

Respondent 1: AbbVie Inc.

(Opponent 1)

1 North Waukegan Road
North Chicago II (00)

North Chicago, IL 60064 (US)

Representative: Mewburn Ellis LLP

Aurora Building Counterslip

Bristol BS1 6BX (GB)

Respondent 2: Tizona Therapeutics

4000 Shoreline Court Suite 200

South San Francisco, California 94080 (US)

Representative: Hutter, Anton

Venner Shipley LLP 5 Stirling House Stirling Road

The Surrey Research Park Guildford GU2 7RF (GB)

Respondent 3: D Young & Co LLP

(Opponent 3) 120 Holborn

London EC1N 2DY (GB)

Representative: Høiberg P/S

Adelgade 12

1304 Copenhagen K (DK)

Respondent 4: Boult Wade Tennant LLP

(Opponent 4) 5th Floor, Salisbury Square House

8, Salisbury Square London EC4Y 8AP (GB)

Representative: Boult Wade Tennant LLP

Salisbury Square House 8 Salisbury Square London EC4Y 8AP (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the

European Patent Office posted on 1 April 2022 revoking European patent No. 2 654 789 pursuant

to Article 101(3)(b) EPC

Composition of the Board:

**Chairwoman** M. Pregetter

Members: B. Rutz

M. Blasi

- 1 - T 1388/22

#### Summary of Facts and Submissions

- The present appeal was lodged by the patent proprietors against the decision of the opposition division revoking the patent.
- II. As apparent from the entries in the European Patent Register, European patent EP 2 654 789 has lapsed with effect for all the designated Contracting States in the course of the present appeal proceedings.
- III. With a communication dated 27 February 2024 the board gave the patent proprietors the opportunity to request continuation of the appeal proceedings within two months from the notification of this communication.
- IV. No reply by the patent proprietors was received. The three-month period specified in Rule 133(1) EPC has also expired.

#### Reasons for the Decision

1. If a European patent has lapsed in all designated Contracting States, opposition proceedings may be continued at the request of the opponent (see Rule 84(1) EPC). According to Rule 100(1) EPC, this also applies in appeal proceedings following opposition proceedings. However, if - as in the present case - the patent proprietors are the appellants, it would be inappropriate to allow the opponent(s) (respondent(s)) to decide whether the appeal proceedings shall be continued. For this reason, Rule 84(1) EPC has to be applied mutatis mutandis in such opposition appeal proceedings (see also the case law cited in decision T 606/10 of 12 May 2011, point 1.3 of the Reasons), so

- 2 - T 1388/22

that it is the patent proprietors who can request that the appeal proceedings be continued (see also decision T 708/01 of 17 March 2005, point 1 of the Reasons and T 520/10 of 11 June 2013, point 1 of the Reasons).

2. As the patent proprietors have not replied within the given time limit to the communication by the board providing the opportunity to request continuation of the appeal proceedings (see Section III., supra), the appeal proceedings are to be terminated.

#### Order

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

The appeal proceedings are terminated.

The Registrar:

The Chairwoman:



I. Aperribay

M. Pregetter

Decision electronically authenticated