

Kluwer Patent Blog

Patent case: G.D. Searle v. Sandoz B.V., Netherlands

Bart van Wezenbeek (Millipede) · Tuesday, April 9th, 2019

The Court concluded that the compound darunavir was not protected by a patent within the sense of Art. 3 of the SPC directive because, following the CJEU decision in *Teva v Gilead*, it is necessary that the compound for which the SPC is granted can be specifically identified in the patent.

Case date: 08 January 2019

Case number: C/09/56199 / KG ZA 18-1112

Court: Provisions Judge of the District Court of The Hague

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 Tuesday, April 9th, 2019 at 10:30 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [CJEU](#), [Netherlands](#), [SPC](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both

comments and pings are currently closed.