
Kluwer Patent Blog

Patent case: Astrazeneca v. Sandoz, the Netherlands

Bart van Wezenbeek (Hoffmann Eitle) · Tuesday, January 8th, 2019

For establishing inventive step it is not necessary that the prior art contains a pointer for combination, only that in the relevant prior art an incentive was present to combine the prior art.

Case date: 27 November 2018

Case number: C/09/534649/HA ZA 17-651C/09/533643/HA ZA 17-599200.237.828/01

Court: Court of Appeal of The Hague

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 Tuesday, January 8th, 2019 at 1:09 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Netherlands](#)

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