



Piers Acland KC

Called: 1993

Silk: 2010

Practice

Since his appointment as Queens Counsel in 2010, Piers has successfully made the transition from leading senior junior to successful IP silk. This was reflected in his nomination at the Chambers and Partners Bar Awards as "IP/IT Silk of the Year" during his first year as Silk.

Piers has a strong patent practice covering a wide variety of technology areas. His background in biochemistry means he is often in demand for pharmaceutical patent matters and since taking silk he has led some of the leading cases in this area.

Piers has been involved in numerous cases before all of the appropriate English courts and tribunals as well as the European Patent Office.

What the directories say

"He is incredibly sharp-witted and hard-working, and gets through the details with surgical precision." "I rate him as a fantastic, client-friendly barrister." – **Chambers and Partners**

'Always meticulously prepared, he has the trust of the judges and good judgement on which points to run and which to fight.' – **Legal 500**

Education and Qualifications

University College London 1984-7; BSc (Biochemistry) First Class Hons.

Imperial Cancer Research Fund 1987-91: PhD Molecular Virology

College of Law 1991-2: Common Professional Examination

Inns of Court School of Law 1992-3: Bar Vocational Course

Mansfield Scholar (Lincoln's Inn) 1991-2; Denning Scholar (Lincoln's Inn) 1992-3

Appointed Queens Counsel 2010

Recent & Reported Cases

***Modernatx, Inc. v Pfizer Ltd & or* [2025] EWCA Civ 1032**

This was the Court of Appeal decision in this litigation concerning Moderna's patent EP949, which was asserted against Pfizer/BioNTech's SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. The appeal considered the judgment of Meade J dated 2 July 2024 ([2024] EWHC 1695 (Pat)).

EP949 claims mRNA in which one of the usual nucleosides (uridine) is replaced with N1-methyl-pseudouridine ("m1Ψ"). At first instance, Meade J upheld the validity of EP949. Pfizer appealed, contending that EP949 lacks novelty over, alternatively is obvious in light of, a prior patent application.

The appeal was heard by LJJ Moylan, Arnold and Snowden. Arnold LJ gave the judgment of the court, in which he dismissed the appeal for largely the same reasons as the Judge's.

The Court of Appeal held that there is no distinction, as a matter of law or principle, between

the application of the law on novelty (including the test of “individualised description”) to items selected from a list, on the one hand, and classes of items, on the other. The CA’s judgment also:

- includes a useful reminder about the role of expert witnesses in patent cases, and
- summarises the applicable law on the identity of the skilled person, confirming that it is appropriate for judges to assess the extent to which the parties’ expert witnesses embody the attributes of the skilled person.

Lufthansa Technik AG v Astronics Advanced Electronic Systems & Anor (Re Interest)
[2025] EWHC 1034 (Pat)

This judgment concerns the question of whether as a matter of principle ancillary interest may be awarded upon sums found due in an account of profits for patent infringement.

The defendants had each been held liable for patent infringement: [2020] EWHC 1968 (Pat) & [2022] EWCA Civ 20. Leech J heard the ensuing account of profits [2025] EWHC 375 (Pat) and determined the relevant sums due for each defendant (see [1]-[4] of [2025] EWHC 1034 (Pat)). The question then arose as to Lufthansa’s entitlement to interest upon those sums.

Leech J held that the court has the power to award the payment of interest on sums found due following an account of profits for patent infringement, both pursuant to the court’s inherent equitable jurisdiction (see [6]-[12]) and (obiter) pursuant to s.35A Senior Courts Act 1981 (see [13]-[21]).

In addition to that question of principle, the Judge determined disputes relating to the amount of interest: namely discretion to award interest [22]-[25], delay [26]-[30], rate [31]-[35], tax upon interest [36]-[38], and the time from which interest should be calculated [39].

Further, against a background of multi-jurisdictional litigation between the parties in respect of products which in the ordinary course of trade pass through several jurisdictions, the issue arose as to how to address the risk of ‘double recovery’ of profits by the patentee. On the facts, the UK Patents Court was the first court to reach a decision on recoverable profits. The Judge elected not to render the account on a provisional basis with liberty to apply, preferring instead to leave the matter of double recovery for the overseas courts to address in their own decisions in due course (see [44]-[56] & [58]).

Lufthansa Technik AG v Astronics Advanced Electronic Systems & others [2025] EWHC 375 (Pat)

This is the judgment in an account of profits following the liability trial ([2020] EWHC 1968 (Pat)) concerning infringement of Lufthansa’s patent for an aircraft passenger in-seat power supply system. Astronics manufactured such systems, Safran installed them into airline seats, and Panasonic supplied in-flight entertainment systems incorporating power supplies.

Leech J heard the trial over four weeks in October 2024.

Accounts of profits are rare in patent infringement disputes, and the main issue addressed by the Court was the correct legal approach to causation in an account of profits.

The judge first conducted a ‘differential profits’ analysis comparing the profits the Defendants actually made in the real world with those which the Defendants could hypothetically have made in a counterfactual world. The Defendants were permitted to propose hypothetical non-infringing activity in which they could have engaged (a departure from the rule to the contrary in *United Horse Shoe* (1888) 13 App Cas 40). The judge then followed the differential profits analysis with an apportionment exercise based upon the royalty provisions in a licence agreement between Lufthansa and a third party.

The Judge also considered a wide range of other legal and factual issues, including issues of estoppel and abuse with regards to patent claim construction, secondary liability under s.60(2) Patents Act 1977, and the German law on interpretation of IP licence agreements. Further, the decision covers the analysis and application of various accounting principles.

BioNTech and Pfizer v CureVac [2024] EWHC 2538 (Pat)

CureVac, a German developer of mRNA vaccines, asserted that BioNTech/Pfizer's Comirnaty COVID-19 vaccine infringed 2014 patents directed to a 'split poly(A) tail' i.e. a 3' sequence of repeated adenosines split by a linker. CureVac argued that the patents plausibly disclosed improved protein expression resulting from the split poly(A) tail across the scope of the claims. BioNTech/Pfizer sought revocation of the patents on the grounds that they did not plausibly disclose this effect and it could not be obtained in fact, and on the further grounds that they lacked inventive step over an earlier CureVac patent (Thess) and added matter. Meade J heard the trial between 10 and 24 July 2024. He found that the patents did not plausibly disclose the claimed effect, this could not be obtained in fact and that the patents were also invalid for obviousness over Thess.

Moderna, Inc. v Pfizer Ltd & or [2024] EWHC 1695 (Pat)

This trial concerned two patents owned by Moderna, EP949 and EP565. Both patents were asserted against Pfizer/BioNTech's SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. This trial focused on the issue of revocation of the two patents – infringement was not disputed.

EP949 claims mRNA in which one of the usual nucleosides (uridine) is replaced with N1-methyl-pseudouridine ("m1Ψ"). The prior art concerned a patent application and an academic article. EP565 relates to a betacoronavirus mRNA vaccine formulated in a lipid nanoparticle, and the use of such an mRNA vaccine in a method of preventing and/or treating betacoronavirus disease. The Judgment focused on the "functional features" of claims 1 and 10 of EP565, which required that the formulated mRNA is a "vaccine", meaning that it is able to generate an antigen-specific immune response.

The trial was heard by Meade J. The Judge upheld the validity of EP949 and revoked EP565 on the basis that it is obvious over the prior art and invalid for added matter.

The Judgment contains a useful consideration of various legal principles on the topics of the skilled team, added matter, novelty and obviousness and the test for individualised disclosure and selection from lists. The following findings are of particular interest:

- The Judge expressed his obiter view that the EPO's alternative test of "serious contemplation" for added matter should in principle render the same results as the "golden standard" test, but is best avoided.
- The Court confirmed that it is not legitimate to say that there is a relevant pointer to one disclosure on a list merely because the CGK says that particular choice is desirable.
- Whilst the Judge accepted the proposition in T1581/12 that a full length sequence implicitly discloses all fragments, this does not mean that disclosure of use of a modified nucleotide necessarily involves disclosure of all percentage requirements of the nucleotide.
- There is no precise numerical limit to prior art lists – each case turns on its facts. Meade J found that the presence of m1Ψ in the middle of a 96-item list without any (sufficiently strong) pointers to individualise it did not amount to sufficient disclosure.
- The Court emphasised the need for the skilled team to have had a practical interest in the application of the invention, and warned against assessing the mindset at the priority date in 2015 in relation to SARS-Cov with hindsight following the 2020 pandemic.
- The Judge rejected points that only amounted to criticism of EP565 for not meeting the highest standards of experimental science, which is not required of a patent specification.
- Paragraphs [677]-[682] list several errors that can affect an added matter analysis.

The Judgment also contains useful practical indications on:

- how best to conduct a hearing on two separate patents in the same trial, placing particular emphasis on the cooperation between the parties' legal teams and the Court; and
- the benefits of allowing multiple experts who represent the notional skilled team to interact with each other or, at the very least, to read each other's reports.

Lastly, the Judgment contains an interesting assessment of the different evidence and arguments which led to different outcomes having been reached in the Patents Court and in the Court of Appeal.

Sandoz and Teva v BMS and Pfizer [2022] EWHC 1831 (Pat)

Apixaban, trade name ELIQUIS, is a successful drug for treating thromboembolic disorders. This trial concerned four patents relating to formulations of apixaban (the “Patents”), all from the same family having priority dates of 25 February 2010. Sandoz/Teva argued that the Patents are obvious over a review article by Carreiro and Ansell, “Apixaban, an oral direct Factor Xa inhibitor: awaiting the verdict”, published in November 2008 in Expert Opinion on Investigational Drugs, (“Carreiro”). The other prior art citations pleaded by Sandoz/Teva were not considered at trial.

Meade J heard the trial in person between 28 April and 13 June 2022. The Judge decided that that the Patents are invalid for obviousness over Carreiro in light of the common general knowledge of the skilled person.

Neurim v Mylan [2022] EWCA Civ 699

In these proceedings the Claimants allege infringement by Mylan of European Patent (UK) No. 3 103 443 (“EP443”). EP443 is a second medical use patent which (as unconditionally proposed to be amended) claims the use of a prolonged release formulation of melatonin in a 2 mg dose for improving the restorative quality of sleep in a patient aged 55 years or older suffering from primary insomnia characterised by non-restorative sleep (“NRS”).

In previous proceedings brought by the Claimants against Mylan for infringement of EP702, Marcus Smith J dismissed a number of challenges to the validity of EP702 advanced by Mylan for the reasons given in his judgment dated 4 December 2020, [2020] EWHC 3270 (Pat). Shortly afterwards, however, EP702 was revoked as a result of Neurim’s withdrawal of an appeal against an order for revocation by the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office at the conclusion of a hearing before the Board of Appeal. EP443 is a divisional of European Patent (UK) No. 1 441 702. Marcus Smith J rejected Mylan’s challenge to the validity of EP443 for the reasons given in the December Judgment as supplemented in a judgment dated 8 March 2022, [2022] EWHC 519 (Pat).

Mylan appealed Marcus Smith J’s decision that EP443 plausibly disclosed the claimed effect notwithstanding Mylan’s “lay patient argument”, namely that the data disclosed in EP443, being patients’ responses to two questions taken from the Leeds Sleep Evaluation Questionnaire, would not be considered by the skilled person to be specific to NRS.

The appeal was heard by Newey, Arnold and Birss LLJ on 19 May 2022 and was dismissed.

Neurim v Mylan [2022] EWHC 109 (Pat)

In these proceedings, Neurim alleges that Mylan infringe European Patent (UK) 3,103,443 (the Divisional). In previous proceedings, started in 2020 (the 2020 Action), Neurim sued Mylan for infringement of European Patent (UK) 1,441,702 (the Parent of the Divisional). The Patents concern melatonin for use in treating a primary insomnia characterised by non-restorative sleep (NRS). In his judgment in the 2020 Action (the Judgment), Marcus Smith J held that the Parent was valid and infringed. On 18 December 2020, Neurim withdrew its appeal to the Technical Board of Appeal (TBA of the EPO) from the Opposition Division’s decision that the Parent was invalid. So, the Parent was revoked ab initio. However, Neurim had the Divisional in prosecution, and obtained its grant on 30 June 2021, whereupon it began these proceedings. Neurim applied to amend the claims of the Divisional into a form identical for practical purposes to the claims of the Parent. Neurim alleged that issue estoppel arising from the Judgment prevented Mylan from challenging the validity of the Divisional. Mylan said that Neurim’s conduct in amending the Divisional was an abuse of process, and it said that Neurim’s conduct in seeking to shut out its challenge to the validity of the Divisional was an abuse of a dominant position under s. 18 of the Competition Act 1998.

The preliminary issues were therefore:

- i) Whether Mylan was issue estopped from challenging the validity of the Divisional in the light of the 2020 action.
- ii) Whether Neurim’s conduct in amending the Divisional was an abuse.
- iii) Whether Neurim’s conduct amounts to an abuse of a dominant position (on the assumption of dominance and market definition).

Meade J heard the trial in person between 15-17 December 2021 and 19 January 2022. The

Judge agreed with Mylan that there was no issue estoppel and directed that submissions be made to Marcus Smith J in relation to the validity of the Divisional Patent. He held that there was no abuse and the competition issue did not need to be determined, given his decision on issue estoppel.

Lufthansa Technik AG v Astronics Advanced Electronic Systems & others [2022] EWCA Civ 20

The appeal concerned Lufthansa's patent for an aircraft passenger in-seat power supply system. The three defendants Astronics, Panasonic and Safran, were responsible for manufacturing such systems, supplying them, and installing them into seats.

At trial, Morgan J had held the patent valid and infringed by all defendants ([2020] EWHC 1968 (Pat)). As well as conventional validity issues, the judgment applied the *Rotocrop v Genbourne* principle by which a supplier of a kit of parts for assembly may be held jointly liable for infringement with the assembling consignee.

The issues on appeal ([2022] EWCA Civ 20) concerned validity, and in particular the use of reference numerals in claim construction. The judgment provides an illustration of the principle that such use is permissible where it is for the purposes of orientation, or to "help you get the map the right way up".

In an earlier interim decision regarding withdrawal of admissions ([2020] EWHC 83 (Pat)), the Court discussed the relevant prejudice that should be taken into account.

Illumina Cambridge Ltd v Latvia MGI Tech SIA & Ors [2021] EWHC 57 (Pat)

This was a patent action concerning DNA sequencing technology.

Illumina was the proprietor of five patents which it alleged were infringed by MGI's systems. Three of the patents related to a reversible chain terminator in sequencing by synthesis; one to the use of ascorbic acid in a fluorescent imaging buffer and the other to a conjugate molecule consisting of a nucleotide, cleavable linker and fluorescent dye compound.

The Judge held that all but one of the patents were valid and that the patents were also infringed.

The case is notable for the discussions of insufficiency, following *Regeneron v Kymab* [2020] UKSC 27, and the novel (but unsuccessful) collocation attack against the conjugated molecule.

Edwards Lifesciences Corporation & Anor v Meril GmbH & Anor [2020] EWHC 2562 (Pat)

This was the first of three technical trials in a patent action concerning transcatheter heart valves, artificial heart valves that can be implanted into a patient without the need for surgery, and their delivery systems.

The trial concerned two of Edwards' patents: EP(UK) 1,267,753 entitled "Minimally-invasive heart valve" (the "753 Patent") and EP(UK) 3,494,929 entitled "Low profile delivery system for transcatheter heart valve" (the "929 Patent").

Edwards alleged that Meril's "Myval" transcatheter heart valve and "Navigator" delivery system infringed the 753 and 929 Patents respectively. Meril denied infringement, counterclaimed for revocation of both Patents on numerous grounds and sought declarations of non-infringement in relation to two alternative designs of the Navigator delivery system, only one of which was in issue at trial.

The trial occurred as a 'hybrid' hearing with the Judge and some counsel, solicitors and witnesses in court and others attending via a secure videolink. The judgment contains a short discussion on the conduct of the hybrid trial.

Birss J held that claim 1 of the 753 Patent was infringed by the Myval but was invalid for obviousness (the other grounds relied on for invalidity were rejected) and held that the 929 Patent was partially valid and infringed by both the Navigator and the alternative design.

Lufthansa Technik AG v Astronics Advanced Electronic Systems & others [2020] EWHC 1968 (Pat)

Lufthansa was the owner of a patent for an aircraft passenger in-seat power supply system. Astronics manufactured such systems, Safran installed them into airline seats, and Panasonic supplied in-flight entertainment systems incorporating power supplies. Following a remote trial conducted over 6 days via Zoom in late June 2020, Morgan J held the patent valid and infringed by all defendants.

Akebia Therapeutics Inc v Fibrogen, Inc & Astellas [2020] EWHC 866 (Pat)

A multi-patent action concerning the use of an enzyme inhibitor to treat anaemia and related conditions. The patents in issue fell into two families – Family A & Family B – and included claims to classes of compounds and to single compounds.

Anan Kasei Co. Ltd & Anor v Molycorp Chemicals & Oxides (Europe) Ltd [2018] EWHC 843 (Pat)

This was a claim for infringement of a patent concerned with a method for producing ceric oxide (also known as ceria). Ceria is used in catalytic applications, particularly as a co-catalyst for purifying vehicle exhaust gas.

Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd & Anor v ResMed Ltd & Anor [2017] EWHC 2748 (Ch)

This was a claim for a declaration of invalidity and/or non-infringement of three patents, each of which was concerned with features of masks to be used with continuous pressure airway pumps for the treatment of sleep apnea. Shortly before trial the patentee consented to revocation of two of the patents. The trial of the third patent involved consideration of construction and the doctrine of equivalence in the light of the recent Actavis judgment in the Supreme Court.

Edwards Lifesciences LLC v Boston Scientific Scimed Inc, [2017] EWHC 405 (Pat); [2017] EWHC 755 (Pat)

This was a patent action about transcatheter heart valves i.e. artificial heart valves that can be implanted in patients without the need for surgery. It concerned two of Boston's patents for "repositionable heart valves"

Richter Gedeon Vegyeszeti Gyar RT v Generics (UK) Ltd (t/a Mylan) [2016] EWCA Civ 410

The patent in suit was for a dosing regimen for use in emergency contraception, comprising 1.5 mg levonorgestrel taken as a single dose. The prior art disclosed the interim results of a clinical trial in which such a regimen was used but mistakenly referred to the dose as 1.5 g (not mg). Sales J held that it would have been immediately apparent to the skilled person that there was a mistake and it would have been obvious to consult the author of the prior art or one of the presenters of the interim data to find out the correct dose.

Generics (UK) Ltd (trading as Mylan) v ViiV Healthcare Ltd

Mylan sought revocation of the claims of EP (UK) 0 817 637 contended by ViiV to support SPC/GB05/027 in order to clear the path for a generic product containing the anti-HIV drugs lamivudine and abacavir in combination. The Patent is entitled "Synergistic Combinations of Zidovudine, 1592U89 and 3TC". Those three drugs (also known as AZT, abacavir and lamivudine, respectively) were known in the art to have efficacy against HIV.

Generics (UK) Limited t/a Mylan v Warner-Lambert Company LLC [2015] EWHC 2548 (Pat)

Warner-Lambert's patent was a second medical use patent, which covered the use of pregabalin for the treatment of pain. Pregabalin was known as a treatment for epilepsy and generalised anxiety disorder

Idenix Pharmaceuticals Inc v Gilead Sciences Inc [2014] EWHC 3916 (Pat)
 Patent infringement proceedings brought by Idenix in relation to “Sovaldi”, a drug for treating Hepatitis C virus. Patents Court. Appeal pending.

Smith & Nephew v ConvaTec Technologies [2015] EWCA Civ 607; [2013] EWHC 3955 (Pat)
 Patent relating to the manufacture of silverised wound dressings. Construction of numerical ranges. Springboard relief to relating to use of marketing authorisation obtained by infringement. Patents Court and Court of Appeal.

Generics (UK) Ltd (t/a Mylan) v Richter Gedeon Vegyeszeti Gyar RT [2014] 1666 (Pat)
 Patent infringement and invalidity, dosing regimen for use in emergency contraception. Patents Court.

Eugen Seitz v KHS Corpoplast GmbH [2014] EWHC 14 (Ch)
 Revocation and declaration of non-infringement in relation to a patent for valves used in rotary stretch blow moulding machines.

ConvaTec Technologies Inc [2013] Technical Board of Appeal and [2012] Opposition Division. Patent for silverised wound dressings.

Generics v Yeda & Teva [2013] EWCA Civ 925; [2012] EWHC 1848 (Pat)
 Patent for copolymer-1 used for treating multiple sclerosis. Validity and infringement. Patents Court and Court of Appeal.

Teva UK Ltd v AstraZeneca AB [2013] EWCA Civ 454; [2012] EWHC 655 (Pat)
 Patent for a sustained release formulation of quetiapine used in the treatment of schizophrenia. Revocation. Patents Court and Court of Appeal.

International Stem Cell Corp v Comptroller General of Patents [2013] EWHC 807 (Ch)
 Exclusion of patentability of two patent applications relating to human stem cells. Appeal to the Patents Court. Referred to CJEU.

Glenmark Generics (Europe) Limited v. Wellcome Foundation Ltd [2013] EWHC 148 (Pat)
 Expedited trial for revocation of a drug combination patent (atovaquone and proguanil sold as the antimalarial Malarone).

Smith & Nephew v ConvaTec [2012] EWCA Civ 1638; [2012] EWHC 1602 (Pat)
 Patent for making silverised wound dressings. Added matter and obviousness. Patents Court and Court of Appeal

BMW v Round and Metal [2012] EWHC 2099 (Pat)
 Community designs for alloy wheels, scope of Article 110(1) of the Community Designs Regulation.

Norbrook v Bayer [2012] Enlarged Board of Appeal and [2011] Technical Board of Appeal
 patent for imidacloprid, opposition, petition for review pursuant to Art.112a EPC

ConvaTec v Smith & Nephew [2012] EWCA Civ 520 and [2011] EWHC 2039
 Court of Appeal and first instance, patent for wound dressings, validity and infringement.

Pro-Tec v Specialised Covers [2011] EWPCC 023
 Design right in caravan covers.

Cephalon v Orchid [2011] EWHC 1591
 Patents for formulations for modafinil (used to treat sleep disorders). Infringement and validity.

Actavis v Novartis [2010] EWCA Civ 82; [2009] EWHC 41
 Court of Appeal and first instance, sustained release formulation of fluvastatin, novelty and obviousness.

Blinx v Blinkbox [2010]
 Trade mark infringement, interim injunction.

Edwards v Cook – [2010] EWCA Civ 718; [2009] FSR 27
 Court of Appeal and first instance, patent for artificial heart valves, novelty, obviousness, loss of priority.

CoreValve v Edwards [2010] EWCA Civ 704; [2010] F.S.R. 34; [2009] FSR 8
 Court of Appeal and first instance, patent for artificial heart valves, novelty, obviousness, insufficiency, infringement, experimental use defence.

HTC Corp v Yozmot 33 Ltd [2010] EWHC 786 (Pat)
 Patent for telephone identification calling apparatus and procedures, validity and infringement.

Mars Inc [2009] Opposition Division, EPO
 Patent for cocoa extracts containing procyanidins.

Leo v Sandoz [2009] EWCA Civ 1188;
 Court of Appeal and first instance, patent for vitamin D analogue, novelty, obviousness.

Laboratorios Almirall v Boehringer [2009] EWHC 102 (Pat)
 Patents for combinations of anticholinergic drugs and beta agonists, novelty, obviousness, insufficiency, method of treatment.

Dyson Technologies v Samsung [2009] FSR 15
 Patents for cyclonic vacuum cleaners, novelty, obviousness, amendment, added matter.

Napp v Ratiopharm [2009] RPC 18; [2009] RPC 11
 Court of Appeal and first instance, patents for sustained release formulations of oxycodone, obviousness, added matter, infringement.

Oxonica v Neuftec [2009] EWCA Civ 668; [2008] EWHC 2127 (Pat)
 Court of Appeal and first instance, construction of a patent and know how licence.

Actavis v Janssen [2008] FSR 35
 Patent for nebivolol, novelty, obviousness, anticipation by prior disclosure.

LB Europe v Smurfit Bag in Box [2008] EWHC 510 (Pat)
 Inquiry as to damages for patent infringement.

Actavis v Merck [2008] 1 All ER 196; [2007] EWHC 1311 (Pat)
 Court of Appeal and first instance – pharmaceutical patent, method of medical treatment, novelty and obviousness.

European Central Bank v Document Security Systems Inc [2008] EWCA Civ 192
 Court of Appeal – patent for preventing manufacture of counterfeit currency, added matter.

Hughes v Paxman [2007] RPC 2
 Court of Appeal, jurisdiction of comptroller under section 37 of the Patents Act to order the grant of a licence against the wishes of a co-proprietor.

Cantor Gaming Ltd v GameAccount [2008] FSR 4
 Copyright in computer software, whether injunctive relief appropriate.

LB Europe v Smurfit Bag in Box [2007] EWHC 510 (Pat)
Patent for wine taps, validity and declaration of non-infringement.

Vetco Gray v FMC Technologies Inc [2007] EWHC 540 (Pat)
Patent for oil well heads, proceedings in Scotland and England, forum non conveniens.

Memberships

IPBA
ChBA