

---

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## Patent case: G.D. Searle v. Sandoz B.V., Netherlands

Bart van Wezenbeek (Hoffmann Eitle) · Tuesday, April 9th, 2019

The Court concluded that the compound darunavir was not protected by a patent within the sense of Art. 3 of the SPC directive because, following the CJEU decision in *Teva v Gilead*, it is necessary that the compound for which the SPC is granted can be specifically identified in the patent.

Case date: 08 January 2019

Case number: C/09/56199 / KG ZA 18-1112

Court: Provisions Judge of the 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 Tuesday, April 9th, 2019 at 10:30 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [CJEU](#), [Netherlands](#), [SPC](#)

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