



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT



THE GEORGE  
WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY  
LAW SCHOOL  
WASHINGTON DC

## MIPLC Studies

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Christoph Ann,  
Technische Universität München

Prof. Robert Brauneis,  
The George Washington University Law School

Prof. Dr. Thomas M.J. Möllers,  
University of Augsburg

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus,  
Max-Planck-Institute for Intellectual Property,  
Competition and Tax Law

Volume 1

Eva Willnegger

# Patents in the Food Sector

A Retrospective with Special Emphasis on the TRIPs Agreement



**Nomos**

**MIPLC**

Munich  
**Intellectual  
Property**  
Law Center

Augsburg  
München  
Washington DC

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://www.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://www.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: München, Univ., Diss., 2008

ISBN 978-3-8329-3636-5

1. Auflage 2008

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2008. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

## PREFACE

My special thanks are directed to Prof. Dr. Dres.h.c. Joseph Straus, director of the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property, Competition and Tax Law in Munich, who supervised this dissertation. After I studied Crop Sciences, Prof. Straus also gave me the opportunity to familiarize myself with the legal aspects of agriculture, especially patent law. He fostered my studies by means of a generous research scholarship of the Max Planck Society. Prof. Straus made it possible for me to participate in international conferences concerning the protection of biotechnological inventions and plant varieties. His expertise in the field of patent law inspired me to a great extent in writing several articles in this area.

I am most obliged to PD Dr. Ulrich Schmoch, director of the Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research in Karlsruhe, for helping me to collect the data on food-related patent applications.

Moreover, I would like to thank Dr. Friedrich Baumbach, patent attorney in Berlin, who patiently supervised my first steps in patent law.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Rudolf Nirk, lawyer at the Federal Court of Justice in Karlsruhe, for his extremely valuable advice and motivation.

My final thanks are directed to Prof. Dr. Jürgen F. Strube, Chairman of the Supervisory Board of BASF SE, for his extraordinary support relating to my future career.

The most important contribution to this thesis, however, has been provided by my husband Ludwig. Without him I definitely would not be in the position in which I am today.

Heidelberg, June 18, 2008

Eva Willnegger



# Contents

|                                                                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Abbreviations                                                                                          | 13        |
| Index of Tables                                                                                        | 15        |
| German Index of Tables                                                                                 | 16        |
| Introduction                                                                                           | 17        |
| <b>Part I. Patentability of food from 1877 to 2005 in Germany compared to Brazil, China, and India</b> | <b>19</b> |
| A. Patentability of food in Germany                                                                    | 20        |
| I. The exemption in the German Patent Act of 1877                                                      | 20        |
| 1. German Patent Act of 1877                                                                           | 20        |
| 2. The scope of the exemption                                                                          | 22        |
| 3. Reactions to the exemption                                                                          | 24        |
| II. The Amending Act of 1891 and the <i>Kongorot</i> decision                                          | 26        |
| III. The patentability of food in the Amending Act of 1967                                             | 28        |
| IV. Consequences of the patentability of food in Germany                                               | 30        |
| 1. Food-related patent applications in the technological and economic sense                            | 31        |
| 2. Rise in food-related German patent applications                                                     | 36        |
| a. Overview                                                                                            | 36        |
| b. Dairy and confectionary                                                                             | 37        |
| c. Feed                                                                                                | 38        |
| d. Plants                                                                                              | 38        |
| 3. Rise in food biotechnology-related German patent applications                                       | 41        |
| a. Overview                                                                                            | 41        |
| b. Plant biotechnology                                                                                 | 42        |
| c. Feed biotechnology                                                                                  | 43        |
| d. Biotechnology in other segments of the food sector                                                  | 43        |
| 4. Development of the German food sector and food prices                                               | 47        |
| V. Assessment of the exemption in Germany from 1877 to 1967                                            | 48        |
| B. Patentability of food under the TRIPs Agreement                                                     | 51        |
| I. Negotiations with respect to food                                                                   | 53        |
| 1. The approach of India                                                                               | 55        |
| 2. The approach of Brazil                                                                              | 56        |
| 3. The approach of the U.S.                                                                            | 56        |
| 4. The approach of the European Communities                                                            | 57        |
| 5. Further negotiations                                                                                | 57        |
| 6. Intermediate result                                                                                 | 59        |

|                                                                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 7. Summary                                                                            | 61  |
| II. Contents with respect to food                                                     | 63  |
| III. Consequences                                                                     | 66  |
| C. Patentability of food in Brazil, China, and India                                  | 67  |
| I. Implementation of the TRIPs Agreement in Brazil                                    | 67  |
| II. Implementation of the TRIPs Agreement in China                                    | 69  |
| III. Implementation of the TRIPs Agreement in India                                   | 71  |
| IV. Consequences of the patentability of food-related substances                      | 75  |
| 1. Rise of food-related patent applications                                           | 75  |
| 2. Rise of food biotechnology-related patent applications                             | 77  |
| 3. Development of the food sector and food prices in Brazil                           | 79  |
| 4. Development of the food sector and food prices in China                            | 81  |
| 5. Development of the food sector and food prices in India                            | 83  |
| D. Nestlé and patentability of food                                                   | 85  |
| E. Assessment                                                                         | 89  |
| <b>Part II. Innovation in today's food sector</b>                                     | 91  |
| A. Innovation related to the production of agricultural raw materials                 | 92  |
| I. Innovation related to the production of plant-derived agricultural raw materials   | 93  |
| II. Innovation related to the production of animal-derived agricultural raw materials | 99  |
| B. Innovation related to the production of processed food                             | 101 |
| I. Use of microorganisms in the production of processed food                          | 101 |
| II. Functional food                                                                   | 106 |
| III. Nutraceuticals                                                                   | 109 |
| C. Consumer acceptance of innovation in the food sector                               | 110 |
| <b>Part III. Intellectual property situation of today's food sector</b>               | 115 |
| A. Protection of inventions related to the production of plant-derived raw materials  | 115 |
| I. Protection under the plant variety protection system                               | 116 |
| 1. Plant variety as protectable subject matter                                        | 116 |
| 2. Conditions of protection                                                           | 117 |
| 3. Scope of protection                                                                | 119 |

|                                                                                                                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| a. Essentially derived plant varieties                                                                               | 120 |
| b. Exemptions to plant variety protection                                                                            | 121 |
| 4. Assessment                                                                                                        | 122 |
| II. Protection under the Patent System                                                                               | 123 |
| 1. Scope of protection                                                                                               | 124 |
| 2. Term of protection                                                                                                | 124 |
| 3. Limitations of protection                                                                                         | 127 |
| a. Research exemption and plant breeders' exemption                                                                  | 127 |
| b. Farm-saved seed and coincidental production                                                                       | 129 |
| c. Compulsory license                                                                                                | 130 |
| 4. Assessment                                                                                                        | 131 |
| III. Increase in patent applications for non-genetically modified plants                                             | 131 |
| 1. European patent on herbicide-resistant rice                                                                       | 132 |
| 2. Exemption to patentability of essentially biological processes and patentability of artificially induced mutation | 134 |
| 3. Assessment                                                                                                        | 134 |
| B. Protection of inventions related to the production of animal-derived raw materials                                | 136 |
| C. Protection of inventions related to the production of processed food                                              | 136 |
| I. Patentability of savor nuances                                                                                    | 137 |
| II. Food as a macromolecular substance and product-by-process claims                                                 | 138 |
| 1. Patentability of product-by-process claims                                                                        | 139 |
| 2. The scope of product-by-process claims                                                                            | 140 |
| a. The scope of product-by-process claims in Europe                                                                  | 141 |
| b. The scope of product-by-process claims in the U.S.                                                                | 142 |
| aa. The <i>Scripps</i> decision                                                                                      | 142 |
| bb. The <i>Atlantic</i> decision                                                                                     | 143 |
| III. Food as the product directly obtained by a patented process                                                     | 147 |
| 1. Comparison with the protection by product-by-process claims                                                       | 147 |
| 2. The product directly obtained by a process                                                                        | 148 |
| 3. Interpretation of “directly obtained”                                                                             | 148 |
| a. Narrow interpretation: chronological approach                                                                     | 148 |
| b. Broad interpretation: parameter approach                                                                          | 149 |
| 4. Interpretation applicable to food-related inventions                                                              | 150 |
| a. Literal interpretation                                                                                            | 150 |
| b. Legislative history of Art. 64(2) EPC                                                                             | 150 |
| c. Systematic interpretation                                                                                         | 152 |
| d. Teleological interpretation                                                                                       | 152 |
| e. Parameter approach appropriate                                                                                    | 153 |
| 5. Burden of proof with regard to the product directly obtained by a process                                         | 153 |
| 6. Biological inventions                                                                                             | 153 |
| 7. Case study on food products obtained by a patented process                                                        | 154 |



|                                                                      |         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| a. The biscuit patent – EP 445 929                                   | 155     |
| aa. Background                                                       | 155     |
| bb. The invention of the biscuit patent                              | 155     |
| cc. Claims and claim interpretation                                  | 156     |
| dd. Impacts for products obtained from the biscuit patent technology | 157     |
| b. Herbicide-tolerant plants – EP 546 090                            | 158     |
| aa. Background                                                       | 158     |
| bb. Technology underlying the patent                                 | 158     |
| cc. Scope with respect to Art. 64(2) EPC                             | 159     |
| c. Patent on transformation technology – EP 270 615                  | 160     |
| aa. Background                                                       | 161     |
| bb. The <i>Moloney</i> patent and its scope                          | 162     |
| 8. Summary on Art. 64(2) EPC                                         | 164     |
| <br>D. Summary                                                       | <br>165 |
| <br><b>Final Summary</b>                                             | <br>166 |

# **Zusammenfassung in deutscher Sprache**

|                                                                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Patente in der Nahrungs- und Genussmittelindustrie<br>– Eine Retrospektive unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des TRIPs<br>Übereinkommens                 | 167 |
| Einleitung                                                                                                                                               | 167 |
| <b>Teil I: Die Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln im Zeitraum von 1877<br/>bis 2005 in Deutschland im Vergleich zu Brasilien, China und<br/>Indien</b> | 168 |
| A. Die Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln in Deutschland                                                                                               | 168 |
| I. Der Patentierungsausschluss und seine Abschaffung                                                                                                     | 168 |
| II. Die Folgen der Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln                                                                                                  | 170 |
| B. Die Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln unter dem TRIPs<br>Übereinkommen                                                                             | 178 |
| I. Rechtlicher Rahmen                                                                                                                                    | 180 |
| II. Folgen der Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln                                                                                                      | 181 |
| C. Nestlé und die Patentierbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln                                                                                                   | 185 |
| D. Beurteilung                                                                                                                                           | 187 |
| <b>Teil II: Innovation im heutigen Nahrungsmittelsektor</b>                                                                                              | 188 |
| <b>Teil III: Die Schutzrechtssituation des Nahrungsmittelsektors</b>                                                                                     | 189 |
| A. Schutz von pflanzenbezogenen Erfindungen unter dem Sortenschutz                                                                                       | 189 |
| B. Schutz von pflanzenbezogenen Erfindungen unter dem Patentrecht                                                                                        | 189 |
| C. Schutz von Erfindungen in der Nahrungsmittelverarbeitung                                                                                              | 190 |
| Zusammenfassung                                                                                                                                          | 192 |
| Literature                                                                                                                                               | 193 |

