



PATENTS ACT 1977

APPLICANT	Corey Kaizen Reux-Savonte
ISSUE	Whether patent application GB 2210879.9 complies with Section 1(2) and 76(2)
HEARING OFFICER	Nikki Dowell

DECISION

Background

- 1 This decision relates to the issue of whether the application, GB2210879.9 meets the requirements of sections 1(2) and 76(2) of the Patents Act 1977 (“the Act”).
- 2 Throughout the examination process, the examiner has maintained that the application is excluded from patentability under section 1(2)(c) of the Act. Following amendment, the examiner has also maintained that the amended claims include added matter under section 76(2) of the Act. In their letter of 24th March 2025, the applicant filed further amendments and statements disagreeing with the examiner’s objections and requested that the application be passed to a Hearing Officer for a decision on the papers if the examiner didn’t agree.
- 3 The examiner maintained their objections and therefore the application was forwarded to me for a decision. The applicant did not request to attend a hearing therefore I have based my decision on the papers on file including the claims filed on 24th March 2025 and the corresponding specification. The examiner’s objections are set out in the report dated 2nd May 2025 and the applicant’s most recent statements disagreeing with those are in the letter dated 20th May 2025. No further amendments or auxiliary requests have been filed since the examiner’s last report.
- 4 I note that the questions as to whether the application relates to excluded matter and includes added matter are the only issues to be decided. No search has been performed. Consequently, if I find in favour of the applicant I will need to remit the application to the examiner for further processing.
- 5 I confirm in reaching my decision that I have considered all the correspondence on file. The specification including the claims, the objections raised by the examiner and the applicant’s observations can be viewed at the IPO’s online file inspection service:

<https://www.search-for-intellectual-property.service.gov.uk/>

Subject matter

- 6 The application generally relates to distributed ledger networks. Original claim 1 was directed to a distributed ledger network which involved nodes validating transactions using account balance information, a system assigning a witness node a reference value, and the sender and recipient in a transaction sending information to be cross-referenced against the distributed ledger to verify and complete the transaction. Original claim 9 was to a method for currency acquisition on a distributed ledger network with users contributing data, nodes processing and verifying the data, peers casting votes on the data with the user receiving a reward when approved.
- 7 The applicant describes the amendments to the claims as “rephrased” and “generalised” from the features originally claimed which changes the “focus” whilst keeping “core features”. Although the scope of the independent claims has changed considerably, the underlying concept and embodiments, have not.

The law

- 8 The relevant law is defined in sections 1(2) and 76(2) of the Act can be viewed online at the IPO’s website:
- The Act: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-patent-act-1977>
- 9 The Manual of Patent Practice explains the IPO’s practice under the Act and makes helpful references to relevant case law. The Manual can be viewed online at the IPO’s website: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/manual-of-patent-practice-mopp>
- 10 Paragraphs 1.15 and 1.33-1.44.5, relating to business methods and computer programmes, and paragraphs 76.04-76.21 relating to added matter are helpful.
- 11 There is no dispute concerning the relevant law and its application to the facts of this case.

Argument and analysis

- 12 I have carefully considered the applicant’s statements set out in the correspondence on file, and the relevant law and practice. I agree with the examiner’s analysis of the issues as set out in the examination report dated 2nd May 2025 and find that the application fails to meet the requirements of sections 1(2) and 76(2) of the Act.

Conclusion

- 13 This application is refused under section 18(3) of the Act.

Appeal

- 14 Any appeal must be lodged within 28 days after the date of this decision.

Nikki Dowell

Patent Examination Group Head