

found only in the prior art portions of the claims, and if these known features did not help to solve the problem of the combined whole, this might also indicate a lack of unity.

In W 38/90 the sole common link between the subject-matter of claims 1, 2 and 4 was that the respective features all contributed to the realisation of the same device – a viewing assembly for a door. The board observed that this common pre-characterising feature was confined to indicating the designation of the invention, as part of the prior art; it was not, however, a specific feature interacting with the remaining characterising features and thereby contributing to the various inventions and their effects. Therefore, this sole link had to be rejected as irrelevant as regards any possible contribution to inventiveness. As already concluded, in the absence of any kind of common relevant feature, no unity "a priori" could be recognised.

In W 32/92 (OJ 1994, 239) the board held that there was no unity of invention where the subject-matters of independent claims, including their effects, had no common inventive feature in those parts of the claims differing from the closest prior art.

In T 861/92 the apparatus claimed was specifically adapted for carrying out only one step of the claimed process. The board came to the conclusion that the subject-matter of the claims satisfied the requirements of Art. 82 EPC 1973 as there was a technical relationship between both inventions.

In W 9/03 the board held that a common problem could establish the unity of different inventions only under certain conditions, for example in the case of a problem invention. According to the applicant, the common problem was considered that of providing a more secure, faster and easier connection setup. The board started from the assumption that the person skilled in the relevant art would normally consider this problem. The common problem was therefore so broadly formulated that it was "itself already known or could be recognised as generally desirable or obvious" (see W 6/90, OJ 1991, 438); as a result, unity could not thereby be established. See also T 2482/12.

## **5.2. Special technical features and inventive character of the single general concept**

R. 13.2 PCT defines the method for determining whether the unity requirement is satisfied in respect of a group of inventions claimed in an international application: "Where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application, the requirement of unity of invention referred to in R. 13.1 PCT shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art" (cf. R. 44(1) EPC).

According to the case law, once such a single, i.e. common, concept was established, it was necessary to consider whether or not the same could contribute to the inventiveness of the various subject-matters claimed in the case. Nothing indicated that this concept was known or belonged to the general knowledge of the man skilled in the art. Since the search