
Kluwer Patent Blog

Finland: Actavis v. Novartis (Valsartan), Supreme Court of Finland, S2014/50, 30 June 2015

Johanna Lilja (Roschier) · Wednesday, October 28th, 2015

The Finnish Supreme Court held that the reversal of the burden of proof stipulated in Article 34 TRIPs as implemented in the Finnish Patent Act does not per se require a party to disclose its manufacturing process, but only to prove that it used a different process than that specified in the patent. The threshold of evidence is a matter of national law.

A [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 Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 2:14 pm and is filed under [\(Indirect\) infringement](#), [Enforcement](#), [Finland](#), [Kluwer Patent Cases](#), [Pharma](#), [TRIPS](#)

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