
Kluwer Patent Blog

II Medinol Ltd v. Abbott Ireland and Abbot Vascular International BCBA & Others, High Court, Commercial List Dublin (High Court, Commercial List Dublin), 27 May 2011

Shane O'Brien (McCann Fitzgerald) · Monday, October 15th, 2012

The Court cited the parallel proceedings between the parties in the United Kingdom, where the approach of the EPO Board of Appeal in T331/87 Houdaille/Removal of Feature [1991] EPOR 194 was applied, and concluded that the changes in the patent amount to added matter.

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 Monday, October 15th, 2012 at 11:42 am and is filed under [Art. 123\(2\) of the European Patent Convention \(EPC\)](#), a European patent (application) may not be amended in such a way that it contains subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed. Adding subject-matter which is not disclosed would give an applicant an unwarranted advantage and could be damaging to the legal security of third parties. ([G 1/93](#), OJ 1994, 541) The ‘gold standard’ of the European Patent Office’s Board of Appeal is that “*any amendment can only be made within the limits of what a skilled person would derive directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge, and seen objectively and relative to the date of filing, from the whole of the documents as filed*” ([G 3/89](#), OJ 1993,117; [G 11/91](#), OJ 1993, 125).“>Added matter, [Case Law, Ireland, Validity](#)

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