

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## EPO: T 1689/12, European Patent Office, Board of Appeal, 5 October 2016

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Wednesday, January 11th, 2017

Although it did not admit a broader claim 1, an EPO board of appeal allowed an auxiliary request wherein claim 1 as granted was replaced by a combination of independent claims from different first instance requests. This combination was admitted because the first instance department had had the opportunity to decide on both claims in the impugned decision. The opposition division had maintained the patent with the first claim and not admitted requests that included the second. Because the opponent did not appeal, the *reformatio in peius* ban prevented arguments against the second claim based on arguments against the first claim.

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 Wednesday, January 11th, 2017 at 2:31 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [EPO](#), [EPO Decision](#)

---

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