

Kluwer Patent Blog

Side note to “Why not take the shortcut?” The Swiss Supreme Court’s assessment of patent infringement under the doctrine of equivalence

Simon Holzer (MLL Meyerlustenberger Lachenal Froriep Ltd.) · Thursday, November 17th, 2016

In my latest Kluwer post I wrote about the **confusion caused by the most recent decision of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court concerning the doctrine of equivalence**.

This confusion **seems to have confused me as well**. With respect to the background of the decision, it was actually the technical judge’s expert opinion, which affirmed an infringement of the patent in suit, and the ruling of the Swiss Federal Patent Court dismissed the case by denying a literal infringement and an infringement by equivalent means (not the other way round as mentioned in my introduction). You find the amended version of the post [here](#). I hope this helps avoid at least that you get confused.

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 Thursday, November 17th, 2016 at 1:41 am and is filed under [literally fulfil](#) all features of the claim. The purpose of the doctrine is to prevent an infringer from stealing the benefit of an invention by changing minor or insubstantial details while retaining the same functionality. Internationally, the criteria for determining equivalents vary. For example, German courts apply a three-step test known as [Schneidmesser's questions](#). In the UK, the equivalence doctrine was most recently discussed in [Eli Lilly v Actavis UK](#) in July 2017. In the US, the function-way-result test is used.">Equivalents, Scope of protection, Switzerland
You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\) feed](#). Both comments and pings are currently closed.