

I ? 'ci Hwa YcZi UTXImUWicbg' &\$(I&\$\$.

Á

Note – where a first instance decision is upheld on appeal, the case is listed in the year of the first instance decision. Where a first instance decision is overturned on appeal, the case is listed in the year of the appeal

Case	Valid?
2004	
<i>Kirin-Amgen v Hoechst Marion Roussel</i> 2002 RPC 2 [2002] EWCA Civ 1096 [2004] UKHL 46	No – insufficient and lack of novelty
<i>Apotex Europe v SmithKline Beecham</i> [2003] EWHC 2939 (Pat) [2004] EWCA Civ 1568	Yes
<i>Cipla & Ors v Glaxo</i> [2004] EWHC 477 (Pat)	No – obvious
<i>Sandoz v Roche</i> [2004] EWHC 1313 (Ch)	Yes
<i>Abbott v Ranbaxy</i> [2004] EWHC 2723 (Pat)	No – added matter and lack of novelty
<i>Saint-Gobain Pam v Fusion Provida</i> [2004] EWHC 2469 (Ch) [2005] EWCA Civ 177	Yes
<i>Sabaf v Meneghetti</i> (2001) 24(10) I.P.D. 24069 [2002] EWCA Civ 976 [2004] UKHL 45	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Nikken Kosakusho v Pioneer</i> [2004] EWHC 2246 (Ch)	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Rockwater v Coflexip</i> [2003] EWHC 812 (Pat) [2004] EWCA Civ 381	Yes
<i>Burnden Group v Ultraframe</i> PCC 2004 [2005] EWCA Civ 867	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Ultraframe (UK) v Eurocell Building Plastics</i> [2004] EWHC 1785 (Pat) [2005] EWCA Civ 761	Yes
2005	
<i>Synthon v SmithKline Beecham</i>	No – lack of novelty

[2002] EWHC 2573 (Pat) [2003] EWCA Civ 861 [2005] UKHL 59	
<i>Ranbaxy v Warner-Lambert</i> [2005] EWHC 2142 (Pat) [2006] EWCA Civ 876	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Mayne Pharma v Teva</i> [2005] EWHC 2141 (Pat)	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Schering-Plough v Norbrook</i> [2005] EWHC 2532 (Pat)	Yes (partial)
<i>Lever Faberge v Colgate-Palmolive</i> [2005] EWHC 2655 (Pat)	No
<i>Halliburton Energy Services v Smith International (North Sea)</i> [2005] EWHC 1623 (Pat) [2006] EWCA Civ 1715	First patent: No – insufficient Second patent: No – insufficient
<i>E-Data v Getty Images</i> PCC	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Smith International v Specialised Petroleum Services Group</i> [2005] EWHC 686 (Pat)	Yes
2006	
<i>Merz v Allergan</i> [2006] EWHC 2686 (Pat)	No – added matter, lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Ivax v Akzo Nobel</i> [2006] EWHC 1089 (Pat)	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Ivax v Chugai</i> [2006] EWHC 756 (Pat)	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Novartis v Ivax</i> [2006] EWHC 2506 (Pat) [2007] EWCA Civ 971	First patent: No – lack of inventive step Second patent: Yes
<i>Mayne Pharma v Debiopharm</i> [2006] EWHC 1123 (Pat)	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Tamglass v Luoyang North Glass Technology</i> [2006] EWHC 65 (Pat)	Yes

<i>LG Philips v Tatung (UK)</i> PCC [2006] EWCA Civ 1774	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Pozzoli v BDMO</i> [2006] EWHC 1398 (Ch) [2007] EWCA Civ 588	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Research in Motion UK v Inpro Licensing</i> [2006] EWHC 70 (Pat) [2007] EWCA Civ 51	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>GE Healthcare v Perkinelmer Life Sciences</i> [2006] EWHC 214	No – lack of inventive step
2007	
<i>Teva v Merrell</i> [2007] EWHC 2276 (Ch)	No – all three patents invalid for lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Servier v Apotex</i> [2007] EWHC 1538 (Pat) [2008] EWCA Civ 445	No – lack of novelty
<i>Baxter v Abbott</i> [2007] EWHC 348 (Pat)	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>LB Europe v Smurfit Bag In Box</i> [2007] EWHC 510 (Pat) [2007] EWCA Civ 933	Yes
<i>Wobben v Vestas-Celtic Wind Technology</i> [2007] EWHC 2636 (Pat)	First patent: No – added matter, insufficient, lack of inventive step Second patent: No – added matter, lack of inventive step Third patent: No – lack of inventive step
<i>Monsanto Technology v Cargill International</i> [2007] EWHC 2257 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Queensland University v Siemens Magnet Technology</i> [2007] EWHC 2258 (Pat)	No – added matter, lack of inventive step
<i>European Central Bank v Document Security Systems</i> [2007] EWHC 600 (Pat) [2008] EWCA Civ 192	No – added matter

<i>Ferag v Muller Martini</i> [2006] EWHC 225 [2007] EWCA Civ 15	Yes
2008	
<i>Conor Medsystems v Angiotech</i> [2006] EWHC 260 (Pat) [2007] EWCA Civ 5 [2008] UKHL 49	Yes
<i>Actavis v Merck</i> [2007] EWHC 1311 (Pat) [2008] EWCA Civ 444	Yes
<i>Generics v Lundbeck</i> [2007] EWHC 1040 (Pat) [2008] EWCA Civ 311 [2009] UKHL 12	Yes
<i>Alan Nuttall v Fri-Jado UK</i> [2008] EWHC 1311 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Markem v Zipher</i> [2008] EWHC 1379 (Pat)	No – insufficient
<i>Eli Lilly v Human Genome Sciences</i> [2008] EWHC 1903 (Pat)	No – insufficient, lack of industrial applicability and inventive step
<i>Dr Reddy's Laboratories v Eli Lilly</i> [2008] EWHC 2345 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Actavis v Janssen Pharmaceutica</i> [2008] EWHC 1422 (Pat)	No – lack of novelty and inventive step
<i>Generics v Daiichi</i> [2008] EWHC 2413 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Ratiopharm v Napp Pharmaceutical Holdings</i> [2008] EWHC 3070 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Ancon v ACS Stainless Steel Fixings</i> [2008] EWHC 2489 (Pat)	Yes
<i>Thorn Security v Siemens Schweiz</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1161	Yes
<i>W L Gore & Associates GmbH v Geox</i> [2008] EWHC 2311 (Pat)	Both patents: Yes
<i>Corus UK v Qual-Chem</i> PCC [2008] EWCA Civ 1177	Yes

<i>Armour Group Plc v Leisuretech Electronics Pty Limited</i> [2008] EWHC 2797 (Pat)	No – lack of inventive step
<i>M-Systems Flash Disk Pioneers v Trek 2000 International</i> [2008] EWHC 102 (Pat)	No – insufficient, added matter
<i>Research in Motion UK v Visto</i> [2008] EWHC 335 (Pat)	No – excluded matter, lack of inventive step
<i>Qualcomm v Nokia</i> [2008] EWHC 329 (Pat)	First patent: No – lack of novelty and inventive step Second patent: No – insufficient, lack of inventive step
<i>Abbott Laboratories v Evysio Medical Devices</i> [2008] EWHC 800 (Ch)	First patent: No – lack of inventive step Second patent: No – lack of inventive step Third patent: Yes
<i>Aerotel v Wavecrest Group Enterprises</i> [2008] EWHC No. 1180 (Pat)	No – excluded matter, lack of inventive step
<i>Handi-Craft Company & Ors v B Free World & Ors</i> [2007] EWHC B10 (Pat) [2008] EWCA Civ 868	No – lack of inventive step
<i>Buhler v FP Spomax</i> [2008] EWHC 823 (Ch)	No – lack of inventive step