



BL O/068/06
15th March 2006

PATENTS ACT 1977

PARTIES ARM Limited, Christopher Neal Hinds and
Eric Bernard Schorn

ISSUE Whether a certificate should be issued in
accordance with section 13(3) to the effect
that Eric Bernard Schorn should not have
been mentioned as a joint inventor in
granted patent number GB 2396929

HEARING OFFICER S M Williams

DECISION

- 1 Patents Form 2/77 names two inventors, Christopher Neal Hinds and Eric Bernard Schorn.
- 2 ARM Limited, the patent proprietor, has made an application under section 13(3) of the Act to the effect that Eric Bernard Schorn should not have been mentioned as an inventor.
- 3 Eric Bernard Schorn has confirmed in writing that he should not have been mentioned as an inventor. Christopher Neal Hinds has also confirmed in writing that he consents to the removal of Eric Bernard Schorn as an inventor. I therefore conclude that all the relevant parties agree that Eric Bernard Schorn should not have been mentioned as a joint inventor.
- 4 Accordingly I find that Eric Bernard Schorn should not have been mentioned as a joint inventor in the granted patent. This decision, issued in accordance with section 13(3), serves as a certificate to this effect. I also direct that an addendum slip be prepared stating that Eric Bernard Schorn should not have been mentioned as a joint inventor.

S M WILLIAMS

B3 Head of Litigation Section, acting for the Comptroller