Kluwer Patent Blog

Patent case: Raytheon Company, EPO

Bart van Wezenbeek (Hoffmann Eitle) · Friday, May 5th, 2023

From the company name of an appellant alone it can generally not be derived that the appellant does not meet the conditions of Rule 6(4,5) EPC for payment of the reduced appeal fee. This applies even where a company name is well-known. Where it is not clear from the file at the end of the appeal period whether or not an appellant at the point in time of payment of the reduced fee meets the conditions, no clear intention to pay the regular appeal fee can be detected that under the principles of T 152/82 would entitle the EPO to ex officio debit the amount of the regular fee.

An appellant who gives a debit order for payment of the reduced appeal fee even though it clearly does not meet the conditions of Rule 6(4,5) EPC commits an obvious mistake in the meaning of J 8/80 and G 1/12. Such an appellant is imputed to have had the clear intention to pay the regular fee, and no evidence to prove this intention is required.

Case date: 14 February 2023 Case number: T 1678/21 Court: European Patent Office (EPO), Board of Appeal

A full summary of this case has been published on Kluwer IP Law.

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.

1

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please subscribe here.

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.





19%

79%

19%

0

I

,%

The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer Leading change

This entry was posted on Friday, May 5th, 2023 at 2:38 pm and is filed under Case Law, EPC, EPO You can follow any responses to this entry through the Comments (RSS) feed. You can leave a response, or trackback from your own site.