

in the application, and had therefore to be considered as abandoned, the board noted *inter alia* that in the frequent case of an *a posteriori* objection of non-unity, even if justified, the claims could usefully serve as a basis for later limiting the claimed subject-matter to a more specifically defined but now unitary and searched invention. Whilst the extent to which this was possible depended on the circumstances of the individual case, it remained the position that the payment of claims fees for claims exceeding the number of ten could have a useful purpose on its own independently of the question whether all the claims concerned unitary subject-matter.