
Kluwer Patent Blog

R3/10, European Patent Office (EPO Enlarged Board of Appeal), 29 September 2011

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Friday, January 13th, 2012

The Enlarged Board of Appeal (EBA) allowed review of the conduct of the Technical Board of Appeal (TBA), since the TBA rejected a main request for lack of inventive step which had not yet been discussed during oral proceedings. The EBA decided that the petitioner had no reason to assume that the TBA would decide on more than had been orally discussed. The TBA had not made sufficiently clear that novelty and inventive step would be discussed and decided together, as confirmed by the minutes which recorded that the chairman indicated that the TBA would decide on 'patentability'.

Click [here](#) for the full text of this case. A summary of this case will be posted on <http://www.KluwerIPCases.com>.

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, January 13th, 2012 at 4:11 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [EPC](#), [Procedure](#)

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