Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

European Patent Office
80298 MUNICH
GERMANY

Questions about this communication?
Contact Customer Services at www.epo.org/contact

Christoph Then
"Keine Patente auf Saatgut" e.V.
Frohschammerstr. 14
80807 München
ALLEMAGNE

Formalities officer
Moreno, Ramon

Date
20.03.2024

Reference	OPPO 01	Application No./Patent No.
		14712250.1 - 1118 / 2966992
Applicant/Proprietor		
Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.		

BRIEF COMMUNICATION

Subject:
- ☐ Your letter of
- ☐ Our telephone conversation of
- ☐ Communication of
- ☐

Enclosure(s):
- ☐ Letter from the proprietor of the patent of
- ☐ Letter from the opponent of
- ☐ Copy (copies)

Communication:

All annexes to the letter as well as the consolidated list of all opposition citations are available for inspection via the European Patent Register at **www.epo.org/register.** Should you wish to receive these documents in paper format, they will be supplied to you free of charge if specifically requested on receipt of this communication (OJ EPO 2022, A28).

☒ Attached Decision rejecting the opposition (Art. 101(2) EPC)

For the Opposition Division

Europäisches Patentamt • European Patent Office • Office européen des brevets

☒ **Registered letter**

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

European Patent Office
80298 MUNICH
GERMANY
Tel: +49 89 2399 0
Fax: +49 89 2399 4465

Christoph Then
"Keine Patente auf Saatgut" e.V.
Frohschammerstr. 14
80807 München
ALLEMAGNE

Formalities Officer
Name: Moreno, Ramon
Tel: +49 89 2399 - 2658
or call
+31 (0)70 340 45 00

Application No. / Patent No.	Ref.	Date
14 712 250.1 - 1118 / 2 966 992 / 01		20.03.2024
Proprietor Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.		

Decision rejecting the opposition (Art. 101(2) EPC)

The Opposition Division - at the oral proceedings dated 07.02.2024 - has decided:

The opposition(s) against the European patent EP-B- 2 966 992 is/are rejected.
The reasons for the decision are enclosed.

Possibility of appeal
This decision is open to appeal. Attention is drawn to the attached text of Articles 106 to 108 and Rules 97 to 98 EPC.

Opposition Division:

Chairman:	Mundel, Christophe
2nd Examiner:	Marchesini, Patrizia
1st Examiner:	Obel, Nicolai

Moreno, Ramon
Formalities Officer
Tel. No.: +49 89 2399-2658

Enclosure(s): 8 page(s) reasons for the decision (Form 2916)
Wording of Articles 106 - 108 and Rules 97 - 98 EPC (Form 2019)
Minutes of oral proceedings
Conlist

to EPO postal service: 15.03.24

I. Summary of Facts and Submissions

1 European patent 2 966 992 having the title "HIGH TEMPERATURE GERMINATING LETTUCE SEEDS" is based upon European patent application No. 14 712 250.1 filed on 17-03-2014. It claims priority of EP 13159494 filed on 15-03-2013 and US20131 836277 filed on 15-03-2013.

The mention of the grant of the patent has been published in the European Patent Bulletin of 06-06-2018. Proprietor of the patent (PP) is
Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.
Burgemeester Crezeelaan 40
2678 KX De Lier
NL.

2 Notice of opposition has been filed by
Christoph Then
"Keine Patente auf Saatgut" e.V.
Frohschammerstr. 14
80807 München
DE
on 01-03-2019.

3 Opponent (O1) requested revocation of the patent in its entirety based on the ground of Article 100(a) in conjunction with Article 53(b) and 56 EPC and the ground of Article 100(b). O1 requested oral proceedings if the patent was not to be revoked.

4 The following evidence has been submitted within the opposition period:

D1 to D5 have been submitted with the notice of opposition.

The documents are numbered according the the annexed consolidated list.

5 In a letter received on 05-12-2022, PP requested the rejection of the opposition (Article 101(2) EPC).

6 On 26-07-2023 the opposition division (OD) issued summons to attend oral proceedings on 07-02-2024.

7 In a letter received on 04-12-2023, O1 provided further arguments and submitted D6 to D8.

8 In a letter dated 07-12-2023, PP maintained the position set out with the initial response to the filed opposition.

9 On 07-02-2024 oral proceedings were held. At the end of the oral proceeding the chairman announced that the opposition was rejected.

10 The decision is based on the following request:

Description, Paragraphs

1-112 of the patent specification

Claims, Numbers

1-10 of the patent specification

Drawings, Figures

1A-1C of the patent specification

11 Claim 1 of the opposed patent reads:

A seed lot of the species Lactuca sativa L. wherein the seeds belonging to the seed lot comprise a mutation, which when homozygously present, provides the seeds in an unprimed state with the capability to germinate at a high temperature, and which seed lot is characterized in that the GT50 Dark of said seed lot is at least 6.2°C higher than the GT50 Dark of a seed lot of seeds not comprising the mutation, and wherein said mutation is present in seeds of which a representative sample has been deposited under accession number NCIMB 41915, NCIMB 41916, NCIMB 41917, NCIMB 41918, NCIMB 41919, NCIMB 41922, and NCIMB 41926 and is located on linkage group 3, between markers HTG-1 (SEQ ID NO: 1) and HTG-2 (SEQ ID NO: 2) or is present in seeds of which a representative sample was deposited under accession number NCIMB 41923 and is located on linkage group 3, between markers HTG-3 (SEQ ID NO: 3) and HTG-4 (SEQ ID NO: 4), and wherein the seeds belonging to the seed lot are not exclusively obtained by an essentially biological process.

II Reason for the Decision

Admissibility of D6 to D8

12 OD admits D6 to D8 into the proceedings because they are filed within the time limit of Rule 116(1) EPC and represent evidence which is *prima-facie* relevant with regard to objections raised under Article 100(a) EPC in conjunction with Article 53(b) and 56 EPC and Article 100(b) EPC.

12.1 PP considered that the documents were not to be admitted because the were late filed and the documents could and should have been filed earlier.

12.1.1 Regarding D6, this document represents a legal analysis and interpretation of Article 53(b) in light of the EU Biotechnology Directive 98/44. This document is dated March 2023 i.e after the limit date for filing the notice of opposition and could thus not be filed with the notice of opposition. Article 53(b) EPC is a ground of opposition from the onset of the present proceedings and a document which explains the position of the opponent is deemed *prima-facie* relevant. Furthermore, the document is only 8 pages and most facts are the same as relied upon by the enlarged board of appeal in G1/98, G2/07, G2/12 and G3/19. OD considers also D6 represents a *bona fide* response to the preliminary opinion expressed by OD in the summons to oral proceedings. D6 is thus admitted into the proceedings.

12.1.2 D7 represents evidence regarding whether the markers can identify the right locus and this is *prima-facie* relevant for discussing whether the technical problem can be solved (Article 56 EPC) and whether the invention can be worked (ground Article 100(b)) EPC. D7 is thus admitted into the proceedings.

12.1.3 D8 describes a different plant (Arabidopsis) having a similar phenotype. OD considers that this document represents a genuine attempt by O1 to respond to the preliminary opinion which considered the subject matter of the claims to be inventive.

<u>Article 100(a) EPC in conjunction with Article 53 (b) EPC</u>

13 OD considers that the claimed plants do not represent subject matter within the exceptions to patentability in the sense of Article 53(b) EPC.

13.1 O1 has argued that plant varieties cannot be patented and has in this respect referred to the Biotech directive 98/44/EC and G1/98. O1 has taken the position that the claimed plants all represent specific varieties in the sense of Rule 26(4) EPC and has referred to D1 to D3 as evidence that a trait such as germination at high temperatures is a complex trait not linked to a single locus.

13.1.1 OD is the opinion that the opposed patent provides lines with the trait as well as means in the form of markers for following the introgression of the trait. Example 4 provides evidence that the trait can be transferred between *Lactuca sativa* species and the trait is inherited in a 1:3 ratio typical for a monogenic recessive trait. This represents convincing evidence that the trait cannot only be transferred to specific varieties or groups of varieties but to a large group of plants not limited to specific varieties.

OD does not find that the claims are limited to a number of plant varieties. A plant variety is not defined through a single trait such as GT50 because for qualifying as plant variety the plant has to fulfil the requirements of Rule 26(4) (a) to (c) and this cannot be considered the case of a F3 plant as made in example 4 of the opposed patent. Such a plant is not having defined characteristics (plural) resulting from a genotype nor will it be suitable for being propagated unchanged. Hence, plants within the scope the claims are not limited to plant varieties.

13.2 O1 has argued that plants claimed by the contested patent are not transgenic and with reference to D6, O1 argued that plant varieties referred to in G1/98 is only concerned with transgenic plants. O1 took in this respect the position that all plants resulting from traditional breeding were to be excluded from patentability. In this respect O1 has argued that the claims are directed to plants made using an essentially biological process and according to G2/07 and G1/08 such processes are within the exceptions to patentability in the sense of Article 53(b) EPC.

13.2.1 OD cannot read the conclusion of G1/98 as being only concerned with transgenic plants and O1 has not pointed to passages within G1/98 which would render such a reading of the decision credible.

The position of O1 that plants made using an essentially biological process are excluded from patentability is contradicted by the conclusions of G3/19 which renders it obvious that plants as a result of an essentially biological process are only excluded from patentability after entering into force of Rule 28(2) EPC. The limit date for this is in G3/19 given as 01-07-2017 and the opposed patent was filed prior to said date.

OD considers that at the time of filing of the opposed patent G2/12 is applicable and this decision (conclusions 1 and 2) states:

The scope of application of the term "essentially biological processes for the production of plants" in Article 53(b) EPC is interpreted to the effect that product inventions where the claimed subject-matter is directed to plants or plant material such as a fruit or plant parts other than a plant variety, as such, are not excluded from being patented.

This interpretations of applicability of Article 53(b) for patents having an effective filing date prior to 01-07-2017 has also been confirmed in T0420/19.

Hence OD concludes that the plants of the opposed patent cannot be considered as being within the exceptions to patentability.

Article 100(a) EPC in conjunction with Article 56 EPC

14 OD considers that the subject matter of the opposed patent is inventive because the skilled person would not arrive at the claimed subject matter in light of the cited prior art. OD defines the problems-solution as following:

Regarding the closest prior art, OD considers this to be a document directed to increased germination at high temperatures for lettuce plants.

D1 (abstract) describes LsNCED4 from lettuce as providing increased germination at temperatures increased by 2-3ºC and mapped the locus to LG6 (fig. 3).

D2 is by the same authors as D1 and describes the same trait and locus.

D3 (abstract) teaches that the genetic background can have an effect for the activity of a specific gene of interest.

D4 (abstract) describes LsNCED4 and its biochemical activity. Effects regarding priming and imbibition of seeds were investigated for the two genes LsGA3ox1 and LsACS1.

D5 (abstract) describes for lettuce the QTL Htg9.1 and this allowed germination at temperatures up to 33ºC. The trait was mapped to chromosome 9 (D5, fig. 2).

D8 (abstract) identifies high temperature resistant germination mutants in Arabidopsis.

It is considered that either D1 or D5 represent the most promising springboard because they disclose the same plant (lettuce) with increased temperature tolerance for germination.

The subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 and D5 in that the increase is at least 6.2ºC while D1 reports an increase of 2-3ºC and D5 reports an increase of 5ºC. The locus identified in the opposed patent is on LG3 while D1 identified a locus on LG6 and D5 identified a locus on LG9.

The effect of the locus is that lettuce can be germinated at elevated temperatures.

The problem to be solved can thus be regarded as providing further lettuce plants with germination at elevated temperatures.

This problem can be considered solved in light of the opposed patent (table 2).

OD has not identified prior art which would point the person skilled in the art to the solution of using a QTL on LG3 for increasing GT50 in lettuce.

14.1 O1 has argued that the prior art teaches that different genetic elements can confer a trait as defined in the claims (increased temperature resistance for germination). According to O1, the opposed patent does not provide the technical elements required for increasing seed germination at high temperatures and this results in the claims not meeting the requirements of Article 56 EPC.

14.1.1 OD is of the opinion that the opposed patent (table 2, example 4 and fig. 1A to C) demonstrates that the deposited lines allow to produce plants with increased GT50 Dark of at least 6.2°C. No convincing evidence has been brought forward that the technical problem is not solved.

14.2 O1 with reference to D7 argued that the provided markers HTG-1 and HTG-2 are not specific and the technical problem is thus not solved.

14.2.1 OD considers the objection to be relevant under sufficiency of disclosure (see below) in light of GL F-III.12

14.3 O1 took the position that D1, D5 and D8 all describe plants with increased germination at higher temperatures and the person skilled in the art would thus just have to look for a further plant and would thus arrive at the proposed solution.

14.3.1 OD cannot follow this argument because O1 has not brought forward any evidence that the person skilled in the art would arrive at the solution proposed in claim 1 if attempting to solve the technical problem, see GL G-VII.5.3. In the opposed patent (examples 1 and 2) it is described that the phenotype was generated through random mutagenesis and no evidence has been provided showing that the person skilled in the art would know that a) a phenotype of a GT50 Dark of at least 6.2°C could be generated and b)would know that said

phenotype would be located on LG3. The provided deposited lines and markers of claim 1 provide technical means for solving the technical problem which the person skilled the art would not be aware of at the time of filing nor would the person skilled in the art have the means for arriving at the proposed solution when combining elements from the prior art because these refer to other linkage groups (D1 and D5) and a teaching from Arabidopsis (D8) cannot be extrapolated one to one to a completely different plant since no homology regarding markers or the underlying genotype is provided allowing to transfer the knowledge from Arabidopsis to lettuce.

The subject matter is thus considered not obvious in light of the cited prior art.

Article 100(b) EPC

15 OD finds that the opposed patent (examples 1-4 and Fig 1A to 1C) render it credible that the invention can be worked over the full breadth of the claims because claim 1 provides markers for following the trait as well as a deposited lines carrying the trait "GT50 Dark of at least 6.2°C".

15.1 O1 has stated that the markers HTG1 and HTG2 are not specific for the locus on LG3 and the person skilled in the art can thus not work the invention. Furthermore, O1 argued that since the genetic determinant causing the phenotype is not provided it is an undue burden to reproduce the claimed invention.

15.1.1 Regarding the markers, OD finds that D7 discloses alignments of HTG-1 and HTG-2 with the lettuce genome which demonstrate that said markers have the highest similarity to segments of chromosome 3 (corresponding to LG3) while the similarity for chromosome 2 (HTG1) and chromosome 9 (HTG-2) is substantially lower 83% (chr. 2) vs 100% (chr. 3) identity for HTG-1 and 82% (chr. 9) vs 97.6% (chr. 3) for HTG-2. From D7, OD concludes that although the markers of claim 1 might have some similarity to other genomic regions, no doubt exists that using them would arrive at identifying the correct plants. In this respect it is also noted that table 1 and §0093 identify the SNP's for various wild type backgrounds. OD finds that no substantiated doubt supported by verifiable evidence point to a lack of sufficiency regarding the provided markers.

15.1.2 OD finds that the opposed patent is not required to identify the genetic determinant causing the phenotype because claim 1 provides deposited lines and markers allowing to introduce the trait into a lettuce plant of interest. This is also illustrated in example 4 of the opposed patent. The subject matter of the claims is thus sufficiently disclosed.

III Decision

16 No grounds of oppositions prejudice maintenance of the patent as granted. The opposition is rejected (Art. 101(2) EPC).

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

14712250.1

CONSOLIDATED LIST - KONSOLIDIERTE LISTE - LISTE RÉCAPITULATIVE

P: Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.
1: “Keine Patente auf Saatgut!” e.V.

	CITATIONS-ENTGEGENHALTUNGEN-CITATIONS	P	1
D1	Argyris J., et al., (2011) A gene encoding an abscisic acid biosynthetic enzyme (LsNCED4) collocates with the high temperature germination locus in lettuce (sp;), Theor Appl Genet 122:95-108		-
D2	Argyris J., et al., (2008) "Genetic Variation for Lettuce Seed Thermoinhibition Is Associated with Temperature-Sensitive Expression of Abscisic Acid, Gibberellin, and Ethylene Biosynthesis, Metabolism, and Response Genes”, PLANT PHYSIOLOGY, vol. 148, no. 2, pages 926-947		-
D3	Chandler C.H., et al., (2013) Does your gene need a background check? How genetic background impacts the analysis of mutations, genes, and evolution. Trends in Genetics, Vol. 29, No. 6: 358-364		-
D4	Schwember A. R. & Bradford K.J. (2010) “A genetic locus and gene expression patterns associated with the priming effect on lettuce seed germination at elevated temperatures", Plant Mol Biol 73:105-118		-
D5	Yoong F.-Y., et al., (2016) Genetic Variation for Thermotolerance in Lettuce Seed Germination Is Associated with Temperature-Sensitive Regulation of ETHYLENE RESPONSE FACTOR1 (ERF1), Plant Physiology , Vol. 170, pp. 472-488		-
D6	Correct legal interpretation of Article 53(b), EPC, within the context of the EU patent directive 98/44, Legal analysis provided by No Patents on Seeds!, March 2023		D6
D7	Blast Analyse der Bereiche zwischen HTG1 und HTG2, bzw. HTG3 und HTG4. Quelle: https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi?PROGRAM=blastn&PAGE_TYPE=BlastSearch&LINK_LOC=blasthome		D7
D8	Tamura et al., 2006		D8

Article 106
Decisions subject to appeal

(1) An appeal shall lie from decisions of the Receiving Section, Examining Divisions, Opposition Divisions and the Legal Division. It shall have suspensive effect.

(2) A decision which does not terminate proceedings as regards one of the parties can only be appealed together with the final decision, unless the decision allows a separate appeal.

(3) The right to file an appeal against decisions relating to the apportionment or fixing of costs in opposition proceedings may be restricted in the Implementing Regulations.

Rule 97
Appeal against apportionment and fixing of costs

(1) The apportionment of costs of opposition proceedings cannot be the sole subject of an appeal.

(2) A decision fixing the amount of costs of opposition proceedings cannot be appealed unless the amount exceeds that of the fee for appeal.

Rule 98
Surrender or lapse of the patent

The decision of an Opposition Division may be appealed even if the European patent has been surrendered in all the designated Contracting States or has lapsed in all those States.

Article 107
Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings

Any party to proceedings adversely affected by a decision may appeal. Any other parties to the proceedings shall be parties to the appeal proceedings as of right.

Article 108
Time limit and form

Notice of appeal shall be filed, in accordance with the Implementing Regulations, at the European Patent Office within **two months** of notification of the decision. Notice of appeal shall not be deemed to have been filed until the fee for appeal has been paid. Within **four months** of notification of the decision, a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed in accordance with the Implementing Regulations.

Further information concerning the filing of an appeal

(a) Notice of appeal can be filed in accordance with Rule 1 and Rule 2(1) EPC, by delivery by hand, by post, or by technical means of communication. The filing has to comply with the details and conditions and, where appropriate, any special formal or technical requirements laid down by the President of the European Patent Office (R. 99(3) EPC).

(b) The addresses of the filing offices of the European Patent Office are as follows:

(i) European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Germany

Fax: +49 89 2399-4465

(ii) European Patent Office
Postbus 5818
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk (ZH)
The Netherlands

Fax: +31 70 340-3016

(iii) European Patent Office
D-10958 Berlin
Germany

Fax: +49 30 259 01-840

(c) The notice of appeal must contain the name and address of the appellant in accordance with the provisions of Rule 41(2)(c) EPC, an indication of the decision impugned, and a request defining the subject of the appeal. In the statement of grounds of appeal the appellant shall indicate the reasons for setting aside the decision impugned, or the extent to which it is to be amended, and the facts and evidence on which the appeal is based (R. 99(1) and (2) EPC). The notice of appeal and any subsequent submissions stating the grounds for appeal must be signed (R. 50(3) EPC).

(d) The fee for appeal is laid down in the Rules relating to Fees. The schedule of fees and expenses of the EPO or a reference to the current version is regularly published in the Official Journal of the European Patent Office under the heading "Guidance for the payment of fees, expenses and prices". Fee information is also published on the EPO website under www.epo.org/ fees.

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

European Patent Office
80298 MUNICH
GERMANY
Tel: +49 89 2399 0
Fax: +49 89 2399 4465

Christoph Then
"Keine Patente auf Saatgut" e.V.
Frohschammerstr. 14
80807 München
ALLEMAGNE

Formalities Officer
Name: Moreno, Ramon
Tel: +49 89 2399 - 2658
or call
+31 (0)70 340 45 00

Application No. / Patent No.	Ref.	Date
14 712 250.1 - 1118 / 2 966 992 / 01		20.03.2024
Proprietor Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.		

Provision of a copy of the minutes in accordance with Rule 124(4) EPC

The attached copy of the minutes of the oral proceedings is sent to you in accordance with Rule 124(4) EPC.

Europäisches Patentamt • European Patent Office • Office européen des brevets

Moreno, Ramon
Formalities Officer
Tel. No.: +49 89 2399 - 2658

Enclosure(s): Copy of the minutes (Form 2309)

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

European Patent Office
80298 MUNICH
GERMANY
Tel: +49 89 2399 0
Fax: +49 89 2399 4465

Application No.: 14 712 250.1

Patent No.: EP-B-2 966 992

Minutes of the oral proceedings before the OPPOSITION DIVISION

The proceedings were public.

Proceedings opened on 07.02.2024 at 09:00 hours

Present as members of the opposition division:

Chairman:	Mundel, Christophe
1st member:	Obel, Nicolai
2nd member:	Marchesini, Patrizia
Minute writer:	Marchesini, Patrizia

Present as or for the party or parties:

- For the Proprietor(s): Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V.

  Mrs Petronella van Someren
  Mr Kevin van den Hof
  Ms Eva Murakeözy
  Ms Lily Truong
  Mr Jerre Gijsbert Edens
  Mr Fokko Smakman

- For the Opponent 1: "Keine Patente auf Saatgut!" e.V.

  Mr Christoph Then

The identity of the person/s (as well as, if applicable, that of the witness or witnesses) and, where necessary, the authorisation to represent/authority to act were checked.

Essentials of the oral proceedings and relevant statements of the parties:

1 The oral proceedings held via video conference were opened at 9:09.

2 The chairman (C) stated that the parties were duly summoned, and informed the parties that recording was not allowed. The parties confirmed they had received the OD's contact details in case of technical issues.

3 C invited the parties to confirm their requests. They were the following:

Opponent (O): Revocation of the patent in its entirety based on grounds 100(a) with reference to Articles 53(b), 56 and 83 EPC, 100(b) and 100(c).

Patentee (P): Rejection of opposition (Article 101(2) EPC).

4 C inquired if the parties had any further requests. Both O and P replied in the negative.

5 Admissibility of documents D5 to D8 was discussed. O argued the documents were timely introduced in response to the opinion of the opposition division and do not introduce any new informations. P argued the documents were late filed and could have been introduced before as they were already available.

6 After a 10 minutes deliberation break C announced that documents D5-D8 were admitted in the proceedings.

7 The subject-matter of the claims was assessed in view of Art. 53(b) EPC.

8 O argued that the patent only covers non-patentable plants with the characteristics of a variety and no transgenic plants are possible as the gene responsible for the phenotype is not known.

9 P referred to the limit date given in Decision G3/19 which makes the subject-matter of the claims not excluded from patentability. P further argued that claim 1 is directed to "seed lot" therefore not a variety, moreover the seed lot comprises a mutation which is a technical feature. P added that Rule 26(4) defines plant variety and makes very clear that plant material does not fall in the plant variety definition.

10 After a 15 minutes deliberation break C announced that the claims are patentable under Art. 53(b) EPC as the patent was filed before the limit date given Decision G3/19.

11 The subject-matter of the claims was assessed in view of Art. 56 EPC.

12 O argued that the patent does not disclose any new inventive technical feature compared to the disclosure of D1 and D5 as it merely shows that it is possible to select seeds from thousands of randomly mutated lettuce seeds which have an improved germination capacity at elevated temperatures. The markers are present in the plants and can be found by routine methods.

13 P argued that no prior art documents point to marker on linkage group 3, and the position of the marker is important as it is defined in the claims.

14 After a 15 minutes deliberation break C announced that claims 1 comply with the requirements of Article 56 EPC.

15 The subject-matter of the claims was assessed in view of Art. 83 EPC.

16 O argued that the markers are too far apart and lead to technical uncertainty if HTG1 and HTG2 are specific for linkage group 3 which puts an undue burden to reproduce the invention as claimed. O further argued that as the gene responsible for the phenotype is not known it is an undue burden to reproduce the claimed invention.

17 P argued that no experimental data was provided from O to refute the feasibility of the invention.

18 After a 15 minutes deliberation break C announced that claims 1 comply with the requirements of Article 83 EPC.

19 C inquired if any points were still outstanding for this case and if any of the parties had technical difficulties during the proceedings.

20 Both parties replied in the negative.

21 C announced that the opposition is rejected since none of the grounds of opposition mentioned under Article 100 EPC prejudices maintenance of the patent as granted..

22 C closed the proceedings at 11h13.

After deliberation of the opposition division,

- the chairman announced the following **decision** :

"The opposition is rejected."

The party/parties was/were informed that the minutes of the oral proceedings and a written reasoned decision (including an indication of the possibility of appeal) will be notified to him/them as soon as possible.

The chairman **closed the oral proceedings** on 07.02.2024 at 11:13 hours.

signed:

Mundel, Christophe
. . . . . .
Chairman

signed:

Marchesini, Patrizia
. . . . . .
Minute Writer

Enclosure(s):