
Kluwer Patent Blog

EPO: T 1689/12, European Patent Office, Board of Appeal, 5 October 2016

Lars de Haas (V.O.) · Wednesday, January 11th, 2017

Although it did not admit a broader claim 1, an EPO board of appeal allowed an auxiliary request wherein claim 1 as granted was replaced by a combination of independent claims from different first instance requests. This combination was admitted because the first instance department had had the opportunity to decide on both claims in the impugned decision. The opposition division had maintained the patent with the first claim and not admitted requests that included the second. Because the opponent did not appeal, the *reformatio in peius* ban prevented arguments against the second claim based on arguments against the first claim.

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, January 11th, 2017 at 2:31 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [EPO](#), [EPO Decision](#)

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