
Kluwer Patent Blog

Actavis v. Sanofi, High Court Chancery Division, 20 September 2012

Katie Rooth (Bristows) · Friday, March 22nd, 2013

The High Court (Arnold J.) decided to refer further questions on the interpretation of Article 3 of the SPC Regulation to the CJEU, particularly in relation to the Article 3(a) requirement that “the product is protected by a basic patent in force”, suggesting an interpretation which focuses on the “inventive concept” of the patent rather than the particular wording of the claims despite the ruling in Medeva. In addition, the Court sought clarification on whether it is possible to obtain more than one SPC per patent, given the differing interpretations of the Biogen decision in light of Medeva.

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 22nd, 2013 at 5:01 pm and is filed under [Biologics](#), [Case Law](#), [SPC](#), [United Kingdom](#)

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