

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## EPO: J 11/12, European Patent Office (EPO), Board of Appeal, 29 June 2016

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Monday, October 24th, 2016

The Legal Board of Appeal of the EPO rejected the decision of the examining division that additional claim fees were due at the start of examination for claims added with the response to the international search report under Rule 161(1) EPC, even if at the end of the 31 month period the claims did not give rise to a time limit under rule 162(2) EPC to pay additional claim fees. There was no justification for a mirror image of the practice of refunding claim fees when the number of claims is reduced within the time period of Rule 161(1) EPC.

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 **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. 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.

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

**Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.**

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT  
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer  
Leading change



This entry was posted on Monday, October 24th, 2016 at 1:47 pm and is filed under [EPO](#), [EPO Decision](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.