

Kluwer Patent Blog

EPO: T918/14, European Patent Office, Board of Appeal, 2 November 2016

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Thursday, December 29th, 2016

The Board of Appeal found that the examining division had committed a substantial procedural violation by raising tentative patentability objections rather than completing an improperly justified incomplete search. Thus tentative examination had improperly been used as a condition for completing the search, rather than completing the search first and examining later. This forced the applicant to file amendments on speculative grounds, without knowing the prior art. Refusal of further amendments under rule 137(3) was arbitrary and exceeded the division's discretion, because without a substantiated opinion from the examining division it was impossible to judge whether the amendments addressed deficiencies.

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](#).



Want to improve your IP strategy?

- Manual of Industrial Property
- IP Analytics
- Visser – Annotated European Patent Convention

230+ jurisdictions
36,000+ cases
100+ books
600+ IP law professionals as authors

Request a free demo now
KluwerIPLaw.com

 Wolters Kluwer

This entry was posted on Thursday, December 29th, 2016 at 11:52 am 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.