
Kluwer Patent Blog

Neurokine/HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES, European Patent Office (EPO Board of Appeal), 21 October 2009

Bart van Weezenbeek · Wednesday, October 21st, 2009 · Landmark European Patent Cases

In case of parallel proceedings before a national court and the Boards of Appeal, parties should inform both tribunals of this position as early as possible. In order to avoid duplication of proceedings, the parties should ask the appropriate tribunal for acceleration. Whether acceleration is requested by one party, or both or all parties in agreement, or by a national court, all parties must accept a strict procedural framework, including short time limits. Acceleration can have no effect on the equal treatment of all parties and cannot confer any advantage on any one party. An objection of lack of industrial application (Article 57 EPC) requires the same standard of proof as an objection of insufficient disclosure (Article 83 EPC), namely serious doubts substantiated by verifiable facts.


A [full summary](#) of this case has been published on [Kluwer IP Law](#).

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please subscribe [here](#).

Kluwer IP Law

The **2021 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 81% of the law firms expect to view technology as an important investment in their future ability to thrive. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer IP Law** can support you.



Kluwer IP Law

 Wolters Kluwer

This entry was posted on Wednesday, October 21st, 2009 at 2:51 am and is filed under [Biologics](#), [Case Law](#), [EPC](#), [Industrial application](#), [Revocation](#), [Sufficiency of disclosure](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.