
Kluwer Patent Blog

EPO: T918/14, European Patent Office, Board of Appeal, 2 November 2016

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Thursday, December 29th, 2016

The Board of Appeal found that the examining division had committed a substantial procedural violation by raising tentative patentability objections rather than completing an improperly justified incomplete search. Thus tentative examination had improperly been used as a condition for completing the search, rather than completing the search first and examining later. This forced the applicant to file amendments on speculative grounds, without knowing the prior art. Refusal of further amendments under rule 137(3) was arbitrary and exceeded the division's discretion, because without a substantiated opinion from the examining division it was impossible to judge whether the amendments addressed deficiencies.

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 Thursday, December 29th, 2016 at 11:52 am and is filed under [EPO](#), [EPO Decision](#)

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