
Kluwer Patent Blog

Raffvorhang, Federal Court of Justice (Bundesgerichtshof), 25 January 2011

Jochen Buehling (Krieger Mes Graf & v. der Groeben) · Tuesday, September 6th, 2011

This decision deals with the scope of the obligation of a plaintiff to concentrate actions in one case if these are directed against the same defendant regarding the same infringing device, but based on different patents and to what extent the plaintiff may choose to use a patent at a later stage. A later action is inadmissible by law if it concerns the same act of the defendant. The Federal Supreme Court gives further guidelines for interpretation of this statutory provision which is of great practical importance when considering the enforcement strategy.

Click [here](#) for the full text of this case.

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 Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 11:40 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Germany](#), [Procedure](#)

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