

---

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## Patent case: Sandoz International GmbH v. Eli Lilly and Company, Netherlands

Bart van Wezenbeek (Hoffmann Eitle) · Saturday, February 9th, 2019

Relevant prior art may prove not to be useful as a starting point for an attack on inventive step if the prior art teaching is negated by later studies before the effective date of the patent claims. In such a case, the skilled person would not have had an expectation of success.

Case date: 16 January 2019

Case number: C/09/533354 /HA ZA 17-581

Court: District Court 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 Saturday, February 9th, 2019 at 12:45 pm and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Inventive step](#), [Netherlands](#), [Prior art](#)

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