

# Contents

<b>Patentability Requirements of Biotech Patents</b> . . . . .	1
Ulrich Storz	
1 Introduction . . . . .	1
2 Foreplay: Requirements Specific to Either the EPC or USC 35. . . . .	2
2.1 Industrial Application (Art. 57 EPC) and Exclusion of Methods of Treatment and Diagnosis (Art. 53 (c) EPC). . . . .	2
2.2 Sufficiency of Disclosure (Art. 83 EPC). . . . .	4
2.3 Enablement and Written Description Requirement (USC 35; § 112) . . . . .	6
2.4 Best Mode (USC 35; § 112). . . . .	8
3 Novelty and Inventive Step/Non-Obviousness: The Moving Target . . .	9
3.1 Novelty . . . . .	9
3.2 Inventive Step/Non-Obviousness . . . . .	11
References . . . . .	21
 <b>Law Enforcement of Biotech Patents</b> . . . . .	 23
Martin Quodbach	
1 Introduction . . . . .	23
2 Identifying the Infringing Object, Documentation of Evidence Against the Background of the Burden of Proof of the Patent Owner . . . . .	25
2.1 Preparing the Technical Facts of the Case (If the Claimant has Access to the Infringing Article) . . . . .	25
2.2 Gaining First Access to the Infringing Article. . . . .	26
3 Determination of the Scope of Protection of a Patent Claim, Evaluation of Patent Features . . . . .	27
3.1 General Rules of Patent Claim Interpretation . . . . .	27
3.2 Literal Scope of Protection of a Patent Claim and the Doctrine of Equivalents . . . . .	29
3.3 Restrictions of Disclosed Industrial Applications of Biosequences . . . . .	30
3.4 The Monsanto Versus Cefetra/Toepfer Case . . . . .	31
4 Determination of Jurisdiction/the Competent Court . . . . .	32
5 Choosing the Adequate Litigation Procedure . . . . .	33

5.1	Preliminary Injunctions Versus “Normal” Proceedings . . . . .	33
5.2	Border Seizure . . . . .	35
6	Procedural Problems Regarding Biotechnological Cases. . . . .	35
6.1	Staying of Infringement Proceedings on Grounds of Opposition Proceedings/Nullity Actions Against the Patent. . .	35
6.2	Dependency on Expert Opinions . . . . .	36
6.3	“Italian Torpedo” . . . . .	36
7	Legal Consequences of Infringing Biotechnological Patents . . . . .	37
7.1	Standards Set by the IPR Enforcement Directive. . . . .	37
7.2	Damages and National Case Law on Tort. . . . .	38
8	Conclusion . . . . .	39
	<b>Particular Aspects of US Patent Law in Biotechnologies . . . . .</b>	<b>41</b>
	Scott D. Marty, Derek E. Constantine and Matthew Parker	
1	Priority. . . . .	42
1.1	United States. . . . .	42
1.2	Europe . . . . .	44
1.3	The America Invents Act . . . . .	44
2	Novelty . . . . .	45
2.1	United States. . . . .	45
2.2	Europe . . . . .	48
2.3	The America Invents Act . . . . .	49
3	Written Description . . . . .	50
3.1	United States. . . . .	50
3.2	Europe . . . . .	51
3.3	The America Invents Act . . . . .	52
4	Information Disclosure Statements. . . . .	52
4.1	United States. . . . .	52
4.2	Europe . . . . .	54
5	Obviousness . . . . .	55
5.1	United States: Non-Obviousness . . . . .	55
5.2	Europe: Inventive Step. . . . .	57
6	Best Mode . . . . .	59
6.1	United States. . . . .	59
6.2	Europe: No Requirement . . . . .	59
7	Enablement. . . . .	60
7.1	United States. . . . .	60
7.2	Europe . . . . .	61
8	Patent-Eligible Subject Matter. . . . .	62
8.1	United States. . . . .	62
8.2	Europe . . . . .	64
	<b>About the Authors. . . . .</b>	<b>67</b>

Biopatent Law: European vs. US Patent Law

Storz, U.; Quodbach, M.; Marty, S.D.; Constantine, D.;  
Parker, M.

2014, VIII, 69 p. 7 illus., 5 illus. in color., Softcover

ISBN: 978-3-642-41292-9