
Kluwer Patent Blog

Virgin Atlantic Airways Ltd v. Jet Airways (India) Ltd, High Court Chancery Division (High Court Chancery Division), 27 July 2012

Matthew Raynor (Bristows) · Friday, March 22nd, 2013 · Landmark European Patent Cases

The Court held that a decision by the EPO relating to the UK designation was not capable of challenge. In any event, the procedure chosen by the claimant to challenge the decision (an application to correct the UKIPO register based on Rule 50 of the Patents Rules 2007) was wrong, because it required the consent of the claimant (which would clearly not have been forthcoming). An application for rectification of the Register under section 34 Patents Act 1977 should have been used.

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 5:02 pm 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](#), [Inventive step](#), [Mechanical Engineering](#), [United Kingdom](#), [Validity](#)

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