



30 September 2019

Enlarged Board of Appeal
European Patent Office
80298 Munich
Germany
Attn. Mr Wiek Crasborn, registry
EBAamicuscuriae@epo.org

Dear Sirs,

Re: Amicus Curiae Brief on questions referred to the Enlarged Board of Appeal in case G3/19

We are writing to provide Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO)'s view on the question referred to the Enlarged Board of Appeal in G3/19. IPO is pleased to be able to provide comments.

IPO is an international trade association representing companies and individuals in all industries and fields of technology that own or are interested in intellectual property rights. IPO currently represents 175 corporations and 280 law firms with more than 12,000 individuals who are involved in the association either through their companies or as inventor, author, executive, or attorney members.

The members of the IPO Boards of Directors, which approved the filing of this brief, are listed in an appendix to this letter. IPO procedures require approval of positions in briefs by a two-thirds majority of directors present and voting.

Legal Summary and Background

Following decision T 1063/18 of 5 December 2018, the EPO President referred a question to the Enlarged Board of Appeal according to Art 112 1 (b) EPC. Questions have been raised about the admissibility of that referral because it involves different decisions given by two different Boards of Appeal on a single question. As the referral itself indicated, how to resolve the situation is not so clear. Given the importance of the issue, IPO would suggest that the Enlarged Board of Appeal take the case, or if it sees admissibility problems, provide guidance as it did in G 3/08. IPO agrees with the EPO President's statement, citing G1/97 and G 2/02, that the Enlarged Board of Appeal should use this referral as a possibility to "fill lacunae in the law, in particular where situations arise for which the legislator has omitted to provide."

Summary of answers to questions:

IPO respectfully suggests that the questions referred to the Enlarged Board of Appeal be answered as follows:

President
Henry Hadad
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.

Vice President
Daniel J. Staudt
Siemens

Treasurer
Karen Cochran
Shell Oil Company

Directors
Eric Aaronson
Pfizer Inc.
Brett Allen
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Ronald A. Antush
Nokia USA Inc.
Estelle Bakun
Exxon Mobil Corp.
Scott Barker
Micron Technology, Inc.
Thomas Beall
Corning Inc.
Steven Caltrider
Eli Lilly and Co.
John Cheek
Tenneco Inc.
Cara Coburn
Roche, Inc.
Robert DeBerardine
Johnson & Johnson
Buckmaster de Wolf
General Electric Co.
Anthony DiBartolomeo
SAP AG
Daniel Enebo
Cargill, Incorporated
Yen Florczak
3M Innovative Properties Co.
Louis Foreman
Enventys
Scott M. Frank
AT&T
Darryl P. Frickey
Dow Chemical Co.
Gary C. Ganzi
Evoqua Water
Technologies LLC
Tanuja Garde
Raytheon Co.
Krish Gupta
Dell Technologies
Bill Harmon
Uber
John Harris
Ford Global Technologies LLC
Heath Hoglund
Dolby Laboratories
Thomas R. Kingsbury
Bridgestone Americas
Holding Co.
Laurie Kowalsky
Koninklijke Philips N.V.
William Krovatin
Merck & Co., Inc.
Michael C. Lee
Google Inc.
Kelsey Milman
Caterpillar Inc.
Micky Minhas
Microsoft Corp.
Jeffrey Myers
Apple Inc.
Ted Naccarella
InterDigital Corp.
Ross Oehler
Johnson Matthey
Ken Patel
Procter & Gamble Co.
KaRan Reed
BP America, Inc.
Paik Saber
Medtronic, Inc.
Matthew Sarbaroria
Oracle Corp.
Manny Schechter
IBM, Corp.
Jessica Sinnott
DuPont
Thomas Smith
GlaxoSmithKline
Todd N. Spalding
Alexion Pharmaceuticals
John Stewart
Intellectual Ventures
Management, LLC
Brian R. Suffredini
United Technologies, Corp.
Gillian Thackray
Thermo Fisher Scientific
Joerg Thomaier
Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH
Mark Wadzzyk
Qualcomm, Inc.
Stuart Watt
Amgen, Inc.
Ariana Woods
Capital One

General Counsel
Michael D. Nolan
Milbank Tweed

Executive Director
Jessica K. Landacre

1. *Having regard to Article 164(2) EPC, can the meaning and scope of Article 53 EPC be clarified in the Implementing Regulations to the EPC without this clarification being a priori limited by the interpretation of said Article given in an earlier decision of the Boards of Appeal or the Enlarged Board of Appeal?*

Suggested Answer:

The meaning and scope of Article 53 EPC—and subsequently any other article of the EPC—can only be clarified in the Implementing Regulations to the EPC as long as it is not a violation of an interpretation of said Article given in earlier decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

The meaning and scope of Article 53 EPC—and subsequently any other article of the EPC—can be clarified in the Implementing Regulations to the EPC regardless of interpretations of said Article given in earlier decisions of the Board of Appeal.

The first question should be generalized. IPO is aware of the genesis of Art 53 EPC, and especially Rules 26 to 34 of the Implementing Regulations and the associated political situation. Nevertheless, Article 53 as such does not differ from any other article of the EPC as do Rules 26 to 34.

Therefore question 1 should be answered for Articles and Rules *per se*.

The question concerning the hierarchy of Rules of the Implementing Regulations and jurisdiction of the different bodies of the European Patent Office are not clearly codified in the European Patent Convention, nor the *travaux préparatoires*.

When looking at the caselaw, very few decisions have dealt with the relation between the legal text building up the European Patent Systems and the EPO's jurisdiction.

In its decision G2/08, the Enlarged Board of Appeal stated that its previous decisions (here the very first decision of the Enlarged Board, the *Swiss-Type* decision G1/83) may become obsolete when the applicable articles of the EPC are changed. Thus, a change in the EPC overrules jurisdiction of the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

IPO notes that in the T 39/93 (which is cited by the T 1063/18), a statement was made concerning the hierarchy of the Implementing Regulations and decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal (3.3):

“[The] meaning of an Article of the EPC (here, Art. 114), on its true interpretation as established by a ruling of the Enlarged Board of Appeal cannot, in the Board's view, be overturned by a newly drafted Rule (here: Rule 116) of the Implementing Regulations, the effect of which is to conflict with this interpretation. This is because, according to Art. 164(2) EPC, in the case of conflict between the

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

provisions of this Convention (the EPC Article) and those of the Implementing Regulations, the provisions of this Convention shall prevail.” (emphasis added)

However, IPO notes that the G 6/95, which finally ruled about the Rule 116, did not cite the T 39/93 nor make any statement concerning whether the Enlarged Board of Appeal endorses this view.

IPO is aware that the T 39/93 is cited in the G 2/07. However, it is unclear that the assumption made in the president’s referral that the G 2/07 does not endorse the T 39/93 is correct. This becomes apparent when the whole passage 2.4. of this decision is taken into account:

“Based on the assumptions that the approach to the interpretation of Article 53(b) EPC adopted by the boards of appeal prior to the introduction of Rule 23b(5) EPC 1973 reflected the true meaning of that Article, and that Rule 23b(5) EPC 1973 was aimed at a very narrow construction of Art. 53 (b) EPC 1973, and one which was hardly to be reconciled with the previous interpretation of that Article, the referring Board considers that Rule 23b(5) EPC 1973 is in conflict with Art. 53(b) EPC 1973, contrary to Art. 164(2) EPC. Reference is made by the referring Board to decision T39/93 (OJ EPO 1997, 134, point 2.3 of the Reasons), in which it was held that, in view of Art. 164(2) EPC, the meaning of an Article of the EPC on its true interpretation as established – in that case – by a ruling of the Enlarged Board of Appeal cannot be overturned by a newly drafted rule of the Implementing Regulations. As will be set out below, this reasoning is based on assumptions which are not endorsed by the Enlarged Board, so that a problem of conflict between Rule 26(5) EPC and Article 53(b) EPC in the sense described by the referring Board does not arise.”

IPO is of the opinion that the Enlarged Board of Appeal has not taken a position concerning whether it follows the approach of the T 39/93 or not. Rather, it does not follow the initial assumptions that the interpretation prior to Rule 23 b (5) was the true interpretation of Art. 53 (b) EPC. Whether the approach of the T 39/93 is correct was left open.

IPO is aware that also the T 315/03 (“Harvard Mouse”) contains a statement Art 164(2):

“The Boards also have jurisdiction to give effect to Art. 164(2) EPC to refuse enforcement of a Rule of the Convention which conflicts with an Article. But none of these powers mean that the Boards have any power, express or necessarily implied, to prevent the operation of correctly enacted legislation and, as regards the passage of legislation, the choice between Articles and Implementing Regulations is one exclusively for the legislator.” (emphasis added)

IPO does not believe this statement (which is again an *obiter dictum*) provides efficient clarity. As a result, question 1 must be answered by using analogies to other jurisdictions and policy considerations.

IPO suggests that decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeals—the highest decision-making body within the European juridical system—should be given the most weight.

It cannot—and should not—be that decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal cannot be overturned by an amendment of the European Patent Convention. That would make the Enlarged Board of Appeal a higher authority than civil law. Decision G 2/08 cited above, which has made this clear.

On the other hand, if a decision of the Enlarged Board of Appeal could be overturned by an amendment of the Implementing Regulations, this would give the Administrative Council the unfettered ability to overturn any case that it does not like. The Implementing Regulations of the European Patent Convention can be amended rather easily, and giving the Implementing Regulations higher status than decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal would *de facto* place the Administrative Council in a position of authority over the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

In most member states of the European Patent Convention, it is not possible to overturn decisions of high-ranking decision-making bodies by issuing legal texts that have a lower hierarchy than laws. For example, in Germany a regulation (“Verordnung”) may not overturn decisions of the Bundesgerichtshof.

As a result, decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal should have a higher rank than Implementing Regulations.

The situation is different for decisions of the Boards of Appeal. Because the legal framework of the European Patent Convention allows different Boards to issue inconsistent decisions, decisions of the Boards should not block Implementing Regulations. That should be a privilege only of the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

Thus question 1 should be answered as follows:

The meaning and scope of Article 53 EPC—and subsequently any other article of the EPC—can only be clarified in the Implementing Regulations to the EPC as long as it is not a violation of an interpretation of said Article given in earlier decisions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

The meaning and scope of Article 53 EPC—and subsequently any other article of the EPC—can be clarified in the Implementing Regulations to the EPC regardless of interpretations of said Article given in earlier decisions of the Board of Appeal.

The referral does not address which body of the European Patent Office, i.e. the Boards of Appeal or Enlarged Board of Appeal, is competent to decide whether a violation of Art 164(2) has occurred. The only decision giving a statement—albeit in an *obiter dictum*—in this regard is T 315/03, which has never been confirmed by the Enlarged Board of Appeal or another Board.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

For the reasons discussed above, IPO respectfully suggests that the Enlarged Board of Appeal should have the sole privilege to decide about violations of Art 164(2). As a consequence, Boards would refer relevant cases to it. We would welcome guidance from the Enlarged Board of Appeal in this respect.

2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, is the exclusion from patentability of plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process pursuant to Rule 28(2) EPC in conformity with Article 53(b) EPC which neither explicitly excludes nor explicitly allows said subject-matter?


Suggested Answer:

This question is obsolete since the answer to question 1 is no.

Because the question to Answer 1 is yes and the Enlarged Board of Appeal is involved, question 2 is moot.

IPO thanks the Enlarged Board of Appeal for the opportunity to provide comments.

Yours faithfully,



Henty Hadad
President

APPENDIX¹

Members of the Board of Directors Intellectual Property Owners Association

Eric Aaronson
Pfizer Inc.

Anthony DiBartolomeo
SAP SE

Brett Alten
Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Daniel Enebo
Cargill, Inc.

Ron Antush
Nokia Inc.

Yen Florczak
3M Innovative Properties Co.

Estelle Bakun
Exxon Mobil Corp.

Louis Foreman
Enventys

Scott Barker
Micron Technology, Inc.

Scott M. Frank
AT&T

Thomas R. Beall
Corning Incorporated

Darryl P. Frickey
Dow Chemical Co.

Steve Caltrider
Eli Lilly and Co.

Gary C. Ganzi
Evoqua Water Technologies,
LLC

John J. Cheek
Tenneco Inc.

Tanuja Garde
Raytheon Co.

Cara Coburn
Roche Inc.

Krish Gupta
Dell Technologies

Karen Cochran
Shell Oil Company

Henry Hadad
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.

Buckmaster de Wolf
General Electric Co.

Bill Harmon
Uber

Robert DeBerardine
Johnson & Johnson

¹IPO procedures require approval of positions in briefs by a two-thirds majority of directors present and voting.

John Harris
Ford Global Technologies LLC

Matthew Sarboraria
Oracle USA Inc.

Heath Hoglund
Dolby Laboratories

Manny Schechter
IBM Corp.

Thomas R. Kingsbury
Bridgestone Americas, Inc.

Jessica Sinnott
DuPont

Laurie Kowalsky
Koninklijke Philips N.V.

Thomas Smith
GlaxoSmithKline

William Krovatin
Merck & Co., Inc.

Todd N. Spalding
Alexion Pharmaceuticals

Michael C. Lee
Google Inc.

John Stewart
Intellectual Ventures
Management Corp.

Kelsey L. Milman
Caterpillar Inc.

Daniel Staudt
Siemens Corp.

Micky Minhas
Microsoft Corp.

Brian Suffredini
United Technologies Corp.

Jeffrey Myers
Apple Inc.

Gillian Thackray
Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.

Ted Naccarella
InterDigital Corp.

Joerg Thomaier
Bayer Intellectual Property
GmbH

Ross Oehler
Johnson Matthey Inc.

Mark Wadrzyk
Qualcomm Inc.

Ken K. Patel
Procter & Gamble Co.

Stuart L. Watt
Amgen, Inc.

KaRan Reed
BP America, Inc.

Ariana Woods
Capitol One

Paik Saber
Medtronic, Inc.