
Kluwer Patent Blog

Ex parte Nintendo, European Patent Office (Appeals Court), 6 February 2009

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Friday, February 6th, 2009 · Landmark European Patent Cases

The Board reversed a refusal of the patent application for lack of technical contribution. The underlying decision had expressed the view that the idea of making chance encounters depend on time was a game rule, which is itself excluded from patentability and had been implemented in straightforward manner. In its classical sense game rules form the abstract formal structure of a game, describing the interplay between player actions and the choices offered within the game. According to the Board the claimed solution is not so much concerned with this rule per se, as with the particular manner in which it is realized. Also, the way in which the time dependent chance encounters are generated do not derive from a game rule in some wider sense. That is, as a condition or regulation that governs the internal as well as the external, explicit workings of the game. The Board is unable to identify such a game rule pertaining, say, to the inner logic of the game that might underlie the claimed time dependency of the appearance probability.

The [full summary](#) of this case has been posted 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 Friday, February 6th, 2009 at 9:08 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [EPC](#), [Exceptions to patentability](#), [Inventive step](#), [Mechanical Engineering](#)

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