
Kluwer Patent Blog

T1700/11, European Patent Office (Appeals Court), 15 November 2012

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Friday, March 8th, 2013

In an appeal against a decision by the Opposition Division to maintain the patent in amended form, the Board ordered the representative of the opponent to file an authorization. The representative did not do so in due time, but indicated that the opponent would take no further action. The Board held that the legal fiction of Rule 152(6) EPC meant that the opposition was deemed not to have been filed due to the representative's failure to file the authorization, and ordered a refund of the opposition fee.

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

A summary of this case will be posted on <http://www.Kluweriplaw.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, March 8th, 2013 at 11:10 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [EPC](#), [Mechanical Engineering](#), [Procedure](#)

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