



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 6/2023 & I.A. 10451/2024**

CELLECTIS

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Vindhya S. Mani, Ms. Naina Gupta and Ms. Ardra Goodwin, Advs.

versus

THE ASSISTANT CONTROLLER OF PATENTS AND DESIGNS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nitinjya Chaudhry, CGSC with Mr. Rahul Mourya, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **08.12.2025**

1. Mr. Nitinjya Chaudhry, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent states that in view of the order dated 28.02.2025, it would be prudent if a hearing is conducted before the Controller, to examine the amended complete specification along with amended claims 1 to 11 filed pursuant to said order, and to consider if the objection raised under Section 3(i) of the Patents Act has been addressed or not by the Appellant through this amended complete specification and amended claims.
2. He states that the hearing can be conducted by the Controller within four (4) weeks after giving notice to the Appellant.
3. Learned counsel for the Appellant states that she has no objection to the aforesaid suggestion of the Respondent.
4. In view of the aforesaid submissions of the parties, the Controller is



directed to hold a hearing preferably within a period of four (4) weeks to examine the amended complete specification and amended claims in the context of compliance of Section 3(i) of the Patents Act, after granting an opportunity of hearing to the appellant and place its decision before this Court, prior to the next date of hearing.

5. List for further submissions on **18.02.2026**.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

DECEMBER 8, 2025/rhc