

In T.1506/13 the board, referring to T.948/02, summarised that a deletion of genes from a **list of specific genes** was allowable if it fulfils **two conditions**: First, the deletion must not result in singling out any hitherto not specifically mentioned individual compound or group of compounds, but maintains the remaining subject-matter as a generic group of compounds differing from the original group only by its smaller size. Second, the deletion does not lead to a particular combination of a specific meaning which was not disclosed originally, i.e. it does not generate another invention, or in other words it merely restricts the required protection but does not provide any technical contribution to the originally disclosed subject-matter.

In T.98/09, which concerned the "singling out" of combinations of active ingredients not originally disclosed from lists, the board held that, contrary to the appellant's view, a deletion from a list could also constitute an inadmissible extension if the singling out of one individual ingredient led to a selection of combinations which, even if conceivably covered by the application as filed, had not been specifically disclosed. It was the boards' settled case law that such a selection is to be regarded as an inadmissible extension and so as an infringement of Art. 123(2) EPC (see e.g. T.727/00 and T.686/99). The case at issue concerned two lists (six elements and 47 elements). The applicant sought to individualise one of the lists to one element. The board held that this selection was contrary to Art. 123(2) EPC. For a similar case, in which the board found that the deletion of elements of two lists led to an unallowable selection, see T.1808/08.

In T.10/97 not all the compounds listed in the original claim were included in amended claim 1. However, since the claimed group of compounds was obtained not by restricting an originally disclosed generic definition of a substituent in a generic formula to a specific one selected from worked examples, but by **deleting some members from a list** of individualised equally useful compounds in order to improve the chances of patentability over the available prior art, the board found that such deletions must be considered admissible in accordance with the case law of the boards of appeal (see T.393/91). For the remaining compounds, no particular technical effect was either disclosed or alleged.

In T.783/09 the board referred to T.10/97. All forty-four combinations resulting from the combination of the elements of the two lists (one list with two elements, the other list with 22 elements) were directly and unambiguously disclosed. However, a further issue was whether or not the claiming of only three of the forty-four combinations disclosed extended the content of the application as filed in an unallowable way. The forty-four combinations were referred to as "very preferred embodiments"; by this statement the skilled person was taught that each of the forty-four combinations had the same quality, i.e. they were all very preferred combinations in the context of the invention. Nothing else was derivable from the remainder of the application, i.e. a particular quality, for example a particular technical effect, was attributed neither to the three combinations of claim 1 nor to the remaining forty-one. Hence, the group of claim 1 was to be considered as the result of the **deletion of forty-one elements from a list of forty-four qualitatively equal elements** (see T.10/97). In summary, the subject-matter of claim 1 complied with the requirements of Art. 123(2) EPC.