

Kluwer Patent Blog

Dipeptidyl-Peptidase-Inhibitoren, Federal Court of Justice Germany, 11 September 2013

Thorsten Bausch (Hoffmann Eitle) · Monday, April 7th, 2014

- a) The applicant is not obliged to limit the protective scope to explicitly described embodiments, but may make certain generalisations to cover the entire invention.
- b) Whether a claim containing generalisations is enabled depends on whether the protective scope extends beyond the most generalized teaching solving the underlying problem.
- c) Functionally describing a group of compounds is not precluded by the fact that such wording encompasses not only compounds already known in the art or disclosed in the specification, but also compounds that may be provided in the future; even if their provision requires inventive activity.

The [full summary](#) of this case has been published on [Kluwer IP Law](#).

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, April 7th, 2014 at 8:00 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Germany](#), [Sufficiency of disclosure](#), [Validity](#)

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