
NEWSLETTER

IP NEWS FROM GERMANY AND EUROPE

FEBRUARY 2014

NEWS ABOUT US

Seminar on European IP law in September 2013

From September 5 to 14, 2013, Kador & Partner hosted a seminar on European intellectual property matters at our premises in Munich.

We were happy to welcome participants from all over the world as well as prominent guest speakers who, together with our attorneys, gave the presentations at the seminar.

The topics covered included the basics of the European patent system, and current practice of the European Patent Office along with the latest case law of the Boards of Appeal concerning:



Utz at our Seminar



Seminar participants

- the assessment of novelty and inventive step (Arts. 54 and 56 EPC, respectively),
- sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 83 EPC),
- clarity (Art. 84 EPC), and
- amendments (Art. 123(2) EPC).

Furthermore, presentations were given on:

- best practice in opposition and appeal proceedings,
- patent filing strategies, infringement and litigation under European and German law, and
- the planned new unitary European patent system.

The participants also attended an opposition hearing at the EPO here in Munich. Thus, they could directly see how the subjects treated in the lectures are handled in practice.

We are proud that amongst our guest speakers there were **Mr. Robert Young**, former chairman of EPO Board of Appeal 3.3.3 and member of the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the EPO, **Dr. Daniele Semino**, deputy chairman of EPO Board of Appeal 3.3.7, **Dr. Ludwig von Zumbusch**, litigation specialist at Preu Bohling & Partner, and **Dr. Jörg Dietz**, former IP litigation director of Novartis International AG.



Our Seminar group at Hofbräuhaus

Besides the lectures, a range of social activities took place such as a sightseeing tour of Munich, followed by a beer drinking event at the Hofbräuhaus, a trip to Neuschwanstein Castle, an evening at a variety theater, a tour of a small Munich craft brewery and a trip to the picturesque town of Salzburg.

We would again like to greatly thank all our participants and guest speakers who helped to make this seminar an interesting, enjoyable and successful event!

We also would like to announce that the seminar will be held again this year **from October 10 to 18, 2014**, here in Munich, and we are happy that several prominent guest speakers have already agreed to contribute, amongst them Mr. Robert Young, former member of the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

We will soon provide more details of this year's seminar on our webpage at **www.kadorpartner.com**.

We look forward to receiving your applications and to seeing you in October here in Munich!

Kador & Partner Turns Forty!

We are very proud to announce that this year we will celebrate our fortieth anniversary!

Our firm was founded in 1974 as a firm of patent attorneys and was reconstituted in 1983 as a firm incorporating patent attorneys and attorneys at law under the name of Kador & Partner.

On the occasion of our fortieth anniversary, we will have a celebration on July 11, 2014, at our premises in Munich.

Our Seminar in South Africa

Three of our attorneys (Dr. Utz Kador, Dr. Bernhard Pillep and Dr. Claus Schindele) travelled to Johannesburg from November 10 to 13, 2013 to give a condensed version of our seminar following an invitation by leading South African chemical company Sasol.

The seminar was attended by more than 30 people, both from Sasol and from South African IP firms. The main topics presented during these days were the assessment of novelty and inventive step by the European Patent Office and its Boards of Appeal, as well as the requirements of sufficient disclosure, clarity of the claims and added matter. Furthermore, an overview was given of German infringement proceedings and the planned new Community patent system.

We were impressed by the participants' high standard of knowledge of the European patent

system, which gave rise to lively discussions. Also, we very much appreciated the outstanding hospitality of our South African hosts, whom we must once again thank.

Excursion to Sarntal

On the last weekend of September 2013 we had our annual office trip. This time we went to South Tyrol, to a valley called Sarntal. The valley of Sarntal lies north of Bozen and is well-known for its beautiful landscape, its hiking trails and its mountain pine products.

On the first day we went on a hike to the “little stone men” on the Auenjoch. Legend has it that these stone men were built in medieval times and the summit was a meeting place for witches.

In fact, rock engravings and flint tools found there indicate Stone Age and medieval activity. Once we reached our destination we were rewarded with a spectacular view of the surrounding mountain ranges and, of course, the numerous little men of stone.



The "little stone men" on top of Auenjoch mountain

On the second day we made an excursion to Bozen where we visited the Messner Mountain Museum. In this museum the world-famous mountaineer Reinhold Messner, who was the first man to reach the top of Mount Everest without supplemental oxygen, conveys his knowledge and experience and the stories that derive from man's encounter with the mountains.



Our team hiking

EUROPEAN PATENT LAW

New Rules on European Divisional Applications

On October 16, 2013, the Administrative Council of the European Patent Office (EPO) adopted an amendment of the provisions of the European Patent Convention (EPC) dealing with the requirements for the filing of European divisional applications (Rules 36, 38, and 135 EPC)¹.

The decision will enter into force on April 1, 2014, applying to divisional applications filed on or after that date.

Currently, Rule 36(1) EPC, in force since April 1, 2010, prescribes a 24-month time limit for the filing of European divisional applications, starting from the date of issuance of either the first Examination report of the earliest application or the first objection of lack of unity under Article 82 EPC.

As of April 01, 2014, the system for filing divisional applications will essentially be the same as it was before April 1, 2010, i.e. new Rule 36(1) EPC stipulates that divisional applications may be filed as long as the earlier (parent) application is still pending.

This applies to all applications pending on or after April 1, 2014, including those for which the 24-month limit according to old Rule 36 EPC already expired before April 1, 2014.

In order to prevent a misuse of divisional applications by filing long sequences of divisional applications (which was originally the reason behind the amendments to Rule 36 in April 2010), new paragraph 4 of Rule 38 EPC introduces an additional fee as part of the filing fee for a divisional application filed in respect of any earlier application which is itself a

divisional application (divisional of the second generation).

This means that the filing of divisional applications in respect of earlier divisional applications will be subject to an additional fee. The respective fee will increase progressively for each subsequent generation of a divisional application up to a maximum fee yet to be determined.

Our comment:

It is high time to abandon the unfortunate amendment to Rule 36 EPC introducing a 24-month time limit for filing European divisional applications in 2010. This regulation was heavily criticized even before it entered into force, and this criticism continued throughout its existence.

The old Rule 36 EPC triggered a lot of confusion regarding the nature of the communication commencing the time limit, and the monitoring of such deadlines has accordingly required a lot of effort.

One of the reasons for amending Rule 36 EPC in 2010 was to prevent applicants from filing series of divisional applications. This purpose is now served through Rule 38(4) EPC, which introduces an ever increasing fee for divisionals derived from previous divisional applications.

With regard to these definitely positive changes, applicants should note the following from a practical point of view.

If the filing of a divisional application is currently being considered, the respective earlier application should be kept pending until April 1, 2014 if the 24-month time limit has already expired or will expire before April 1, 2014. This applies particularly to earlier applications that are already in the formal granting phase, i.e. for which a communication according to Rule 71(3) EPC has been issued.

¹ See Official Journal EPO 11/2013 accessible at <http://www.epo.org/law-practice/legal-texts/official-journal/2013/11.html>

Amendment of Rule 164 EPC (Unity of Invention and Further Searches)

From November 1, 2014, amended Rule 164 will apply, enabling applicants to request further searches where a lack of unity objection is raised for a European application derived from a PCT filing ("Euro-PCT" application).

In contrast to the current situation where according to existing Rule 164 in cases of lack of unity only one invention/group of inventions of a Euro-PCT application is searched/examined, it will then be possible to have all inventions/groups of inventions present in one application searched, subject to the payment of additional search fees.

The EPO will give notice to the applicant to pay such fees within a two-month time limit.

Furthermore, applicants will be able to contest lack of unity objections raised e.g. in the search report during the examination procedure.

If the Examining Division agrees that the lack of unity objection was not justified, any further search fees paid will be refunded on request, as specified in new Rule 164(5) EPC.

Our comment:

Through this amendment of Rule 164 EPC the applicant of a Euro-PCT application will be able to gain a comprehensive overview of the prior art for all claimed inventions contained in his application at an early stage of the application procedure. He will then have the possibility to decide which invention to pursue in a parent application or in one or several divisional applications.

For this reason, new Rule 164 EPC is certainly to be welcomed as an improvement for applicants, and it also overcomes the disparity between applications directly filed at the EPO, for which it was already possible to obtain further searches in cases where the EPO found a lack of unity, and PCT applications entering the

European regional phase, where this was not possible up to now.

Accession of Saudi Arabia and Iran to the PCT

Saudi Arabia has acceded to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) as of August 3, 2013, and the Islamic Republic of Iran (IR) has acceded effective as of October 4, 2013.

Thus, applicants interested in filing applications claiming the priority of a previous application in a Paris Union Memberstate may now use the well-known PCT procedures instead of having to file parallel national applications in those states.

Moldova

Recently, the European Patent Office and the Moldovan State Agency on Intellectual Property signed a validation agreement which will allow European patents to take legal effect in the Republic of Moldova (see e.g. <http://www.epo.org/news-issues/news/2013/20131021.html>).

Under the agreement, applicants will be able to validate their European patent applications and granted European patents in Moldova, even though it is not a contracting state to the European Patent Convention.

For the agreement to come into force, it will have to be approved and the implementing legislation in Moldova will have to be passed by the Republic of Moldova.

Germany Leading in Number of Professional Representatives

As recently communicated by the Legal Division of the European Patent Office, the number of professional representatives in Germany is 3918, followed by 2071 in Great Britain and 1016 in France.

This number of professional representatives in Germany shows that a disproportionately high number of applicants are choosing German patent attorneys to represent their cases at the European Patent Office, which is due, in our view, to their thorough technical training (all German patent attorneys must have a full Masters degree in science or engineering, and at least one year of practical experience or a PhD degree) and legal training, as well as the high quality of their work.

New Cases G 1/13 and G 2/13 pending at the Enlarged Board of Appeal

Case **G 1/13** pending at the Enlarged Board of Appeal (EBA) deals with questions concerning the party status of a company which had been dissolved during a pending opposition and appeal procedure, but restored before the final decision in the appeal was taken.

The facts underlying this case were that a British limited company filed an opposition against a European Patent in 2004, apparently acting as a straw man for the “real” opponent.

While the use of a straw man is admissible according to case law of the EBA, in the present case the company used as a straw man dissolved in 2005 soon after filing the opposition.

The fact that the opposing company dissolved in 2005 was never brought to the knowledge of the EPO by its representative, but only by the patent proprietor in 2012, who discovered the dissolution by chance.

The representative then had the company restored (which was possible under UK company law) before the Board of Appeal issued its final decision on the case.

The Board of Appeal, with the intermediate decision T 22/09, therefore referred the following questions to the Enlarged Board of Appeal:

“1. *Where an opposition is filed by a company which is dissolved before the Opposition Division issues a decision maintaining the*

opposed patent in amended form, but that company is subsequently restored to the register of companies under a provision of the national law governing the company, by virtue of which the company is deemed to have continued in existence as if it had not been dissolved, must the European Patent Office recognize the retroactive effect of that provision of national law and allow the opposition proceedings to be continued by the restored company?

2. *Where an appeal is filed in the name of the dissolved company against the decision maintaining the patent in amended form, and the restoration of the company to the register of companies, with retroactive effect as described in question 1, takes place after the filing of the appeal and after the expiry of the time limit for filing the appeal under Article 108 EPC, must the Board of Appeal treat the appeal as admissible?*
3. *If either of questions 1 and 2 is answered in the negative, does that mean that the decision of the Opposition Division maintaining the opposed patent in amended form automatically ceases to have effect, with the result that the patent is to be maintained as granted?”*

Kador & Partner is involved in the case as a representative of the patent proprietor. We strongly advocate that, on the basis of the present case law, at least the appeal should be dismissed as inadmissible in spite of the restoration of the British limited company.

As the proceedings before the Board and Enlarged Board of Appeal are public, our detailed arguments in favor of such a decision can be found in the European Patent Register concerning case G 1/13².

In any case, a decision in favor of the admissibility of the appeal would have several severe negative consequences, one being that even if a company is dissolved and struck off of the

2 See: <https://register.epo.org/application?number=EP99906328&lng=en&tab=main>

register and this fact is known to the Board of Appeal (which was not the case in the present case), then the Board will have to continue with the proceedings despite the uncertainty of whether or not the party will restore the company.

In **G 2/13** concerning a biochemical case, the Technical Board of Appeal with intermediate decision T 83/05 referred the following questions to the Enlarged Board of Appeal:

“1. *Can the exclusion of essentially biological processes for the production of plants in Article 53(b) EPC have a negative effect on the allowability of a product claim directed to plants or plant material such as plant parts?*”

In particular:

a) *Is a product-by-process claim directed to plants or plant parts allowable if its process features define an essentially biological process for the production of plants?*

b) *Is a claim directed to plants or plant material other than a plant variety allowable even if the only method available at the filing date for generating the claimed subject-matter is an essentially biological process for the production of plants disclosed in the patent application?*

1. *Is it of relevance in the context of questions 1 and 2 that the protection conferred by the product claim encompasses the generation of the claimed product by means of an essentially biological process for the production of plants excluded as such under Article 53(b) EPC?*

2. *If a claim directed to plants or plant material other than a plant variety is considered not allowable because the plant product claim encompasses the generation of the claimed product by means of a process excluded from patentability under Article 53(b) EPC, is it possible to renounce on the protection for such generation by “disclaiming” the excluded process?”*

The Enlarged Board has decided to consider the case, which in the meantime has also been termed “Broccoli II”, in consolidated proceedings together with case G 2/12 (“Tomatoes II”).

EUROPEAN TRADE MARK LAW

■ ECJ on Genuine Use

The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has clarified in two preliminary rulings that a trade mark may be seen as genuinely used even if it is used only as a component of a composite sign – which as such may also be registered as a trade mark – or in combination with another mark, as long as the component mark still indicates the origin of the product.

The background to the first ruling (ECJ, 18 Apr. 2013, C-12/12 – Colloseum Holding AG v Levi Strauss & Co) was a dispute in Germany between Levi Strauss and Colloseum Holding AG over the use by the latter of red tags sewn into the rear pockets of trousers.

Levi Strauss is the proprietor of several trade marks for articles of clothing, in particular the Community word mark “LEVI’S”, the German word/design mark:



and the Community position mark:



which was registered because it had acquired distinctiveness through use.

The ECJ declared that a mark (“red tag” position mark) that has become distinctive as a result of the use of another composite mark of which it constitutes one of the elements (“red tag” plus word element “LEVI’S”) may be genuinely used where it is used only through that other

composite mark, or where it is used only in conjunction with another mark, and the combination of those two marks is, furthermore, itself registered as a mark. However, for the mark to be considered genuinely used it “*must continue to be perceived as indicative of the origin of the product at issue*”.

To the ECJ this answer follows from its conclusions in its “Nestlé” preliminary ruling (ECJ, 7 July 2005, C-353/03) in which it stated that a sign (in that case “Have a break”) may acquire distinctiveness through use as part of a registered trade mark (the slogan “Have a break ... Have a Kit-Kat”) or in conjunction with a registered trade mark. In both cases it is sufficient that, in consequence of such use, the relevant class of persons actually perceive the product or service, designated exclusively by the mark applied for, as originating from a given undertaking.

In the second preliminary ruling (ECJ, 18 July 2013, C-252/12 – Specsavers), the ECJ declared that

“The condition of ‘genuine use’ may be fulfilled where a Community figurative mark is used only in conjunction with a Community word mark which is superimposed over it, and the combination of those two marks is, furthermore, itself registered as a Community trademark, to the extent that the differences between the form in which that trade mark is used and that in which it was registered do not change the distinctive character of that trade mark as registered.”

The background to this second preliminary ruling (ECJ, 18 July 2013, C-252/12 – Specsavers) was an infringement action filed in the UK by the Specsavers group, which owns the Community word mark “Specsavers” and various Community word/design marks:



as well as the figurative Community mark:



The action was filed against a competitor who used the following logos in an advertising campaign:



The ECJ stated that use of the wordless logo mark in the form of the word/design marks is use in a form different from that under which that trade mark was registered, as it is not a mere juxtaposition, since certain parts of the wordless logo mark are hidden by the word sign.

The Court further considered that this form of use falls within the scope of Art. 15(1) a) of the Regulation on the Community Trade Mark, which allows use of the Community trade mark in a form differing in elements which do not alter the distinctive character of the mark in the form in which it was registered. After repeating the same line of reasoning as in the “Levi’s” case, the ECJ concluded that use of the wordless logo mark with the superimposed word sign may be considered to be a genuine use of the wordless logo mark to the extent that that mark as it was registered “*always refers in that form to the goods of the Specsavers group covered by the registration, which is to be determined by the referring court*”, that is to say, to the extent that the wordless logo mark keeps its distinctive character within the composite sign.

In line with its previous case law (see ECJ, 25 Oct. 2012, C-553/11 – Proti), the Court also declared that it is not a hindrance that the word

mark “Specsavers” and the composite word/design marks are also registered trade marks.

In the “Proti” decision, the Court clarified that a mark (in that case “PROTI”) can be genuinely used if it is used in a form that does not alter its distinctive character (“PROTIPLUS” and “ProtiPower”), even if this used form is also registered as a trademark. This decision ended the confusion caused in Germany by the ECJ’s previous “Bainbridge” decision (13 Sept. 2007, C-234/06) which had been interpreted by some (including the second instance court in the “Proti” case) as precluding the possibility to rely on the use of a mark in an altered form if this form is also registered as a trade mark.

In the “Specsavers” decision the ECJ also declared that if a CTM (in this case the Specsavers logo mark) is not registered in color, but the proprietor has used it extensively in a particular color or combination of colors (in this case: green), with the result that it has become associated in the mind of a significant portion of the public with that color or combination of colors, the color or colors used by an alleged infringer are relevant in the global assessment of the likelihood of confusion or unfair advantage.

Our comment:

Departing from its reasoning in the “Nestlé” preliminary ruling, in which it had allowed the possibility that a sign may acquire distinctive character through its use as part of or together with another mark, the ECJ declared in its “Levi’s” and “Specsavers” preliminary rulings that a mark may be genuinely used even if it is used only as part of or together with another mark, on the condition that it keeps its distinctive character and is still recognized by consumers as an indication of origin from a particular undertaking.

If this is the case, the Court considers that such forms of use are covered by Art. 15 (1) a) of the Regulation on the Community Trade Mark, which allows use of a mark in a form which only differs from the registered form in elements which do not alter the distinctive character of the mark.

Therefore, according to the Court the distinctive character of the mark is not altered as long as it is still recognized by the relevant public within the composite sign and still perceived as an indication of origin from a particular undertaking, even if it is used together with other distinctive elements as part of a composite sign.

These rulings allow trade mark owners to hold separate word and device marks and, in practice, to use them combined as composite mark (which may also be registered), without having to fear that the separate word and device marks might be considered not genuinely used.

This enables them to rely on the word or the device mark instead of the actually used composite mark in infringement or opposition proceedings against marks with similar word or graphic elements, thus increasing their chances of success due to a higher overall similarity between the conflicting signs, always on the condition that the separate word or device mark does not lose its distinctive character within the composite sign.

The “Specsavers” decision has also made clear that if a sign is registered in black and white but is extensively used in a particular color and is associated in the mind of a significant portion of the public with that color, this color has to be taken into account when assessing the likelihood of confusion between conflicting signs and whether a possible infringer is taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the sign.

GERMAN IP LAW

Amendments to German Patent Act

On October 24, 2013 an amendment to the German Patent Act was proclaimed which will bring about the following changes:

- The time limit for filing of German translations of English or French patent applications will be extended to 12 months

- The search report will contain a preliminary opinion on patentability
- Oral hearings in opposition cases will be public, and
- The opposition period will be extended from three months to nine months.

These changes will take effect as of April 1, 2014.

Amendments to German Design Act

As of Jan. 1, 2014, the German term “Geschmacksmuster”, a quite outdated term for “design”, has been replaced by the word “Design” in the German Design Act. Thus, legal terminology has finally been brought in line with general linguistic usage.

Furthermore, the Design Act now includes a nullification procedure for registered designs, which, like the nullification procedure for utility models, has to be initiated at the German Patent and Trade Mark Office. Such a nullification action may be based on relative grounds such as the existence of prior IP rights, in particular prior designs.

Decision of German Federal Supreme Court on Co-Inventorship

In the recent decision “Flexibles Verpackungsbehältnis” (flexible packaging container)³, the German Federal Supreme Court has given its opinion on the degree of contribution necessary for an acknowledgement of (co-)inventorship.

The case concerned a patent for flexible polymeric packaging container for free-flowing materials, in particular, building materials. In the original report on the invention, three inventors had been named. At the time the invention was made, all three inventors were working for the same company.

One of the inventors, after having left the company, filed a law suit against his previous employer, who allegedly had never validly claimed the invention. In Germany, such a formal claiming of an invention by the employer was necessary at the time for transferring the right to the invention from the employed inventors to the employing company. This has now changed due to an amendment to the German Employee Invention Act on September 30, 2009.

If such a claim was not made in the formally correct way, then the invention and the right to patent the invention remained with the employed inventors.

In the present case, the inventor was successful with his complaint at the first instance (“Landgericht” or Regional Court), but at the second instance (“Oberlandesgericht” or Higher Regional Court) his complaint was dismissed for the reason that, allegedly, the claimant’s contribution to the invention was not in itself inventive and in any case did not “relate to the crucial point” of the invention, so that a co-inventorship had to be denied.

The German Federal Supreme Court has now clarified that this understanding of the Higher Regional Court, and especially its reasoning, is not in compliance with the case law of the Supreme Court. Rather, it was expressed in the decision that the contribution necessary for acknowledging a (co-)inventorship does not have to be in itself inventive and does not have to comply with the requirements of a patentable invention on its own.

Acknowledgment as a co-inventor can, therefore, not be denied on the grounds that the contribution did not “relate to the crucial point” of the invention. Rather, the only contributions that may be considered insufficient for an acknowledgment of (co-)inventorship are ones that had no influence on the overall success of the invention and were therefore non-essential for the solution, or that were made merely on the instructions of an inventor or a third person.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court expressed that it is not the subject-matter of the claims alone

³ BGH, decision of June 18, 2013 – X ZR 103/11

that must be considered for an assessment of the question of co-inventorship, but rather the complete invention as described in the patent, and its genesis.

In the present case, the claimant's contribution to the invention was the development of excess pressure vents comprising a seam weakened by a separation medium so that it opens only in the event of a corresponding pressure build-up. Although such intentionally weakened seams were in principle known in the art, this was seen by the Supreme Court as a non-negligible contribution to the invention.

The Federal Supreme Court, accordingly, remitted the case back to the Higher Regional Court with the order to re-open the case and assess the contribution of the claimant anew using the principles as pointed out above, which the Supreme Court cast into the following two head notes:

"1. The issue of (co-)inventorship involves – apart from the evaluation of the subject-matter of the invention as to patentability – the question of who is entitled to a right to the subject-matter. The contribution necessary for awarding the status as a (co-)inventor does not need to be inventive and fulfill all requirements for a patentable invention on its own. Co-inventor status cannot be denied on the ground that the contribution made did not affect the crux of the invention. In fact, only those contributions are insufficient for an acknowledgment of (co-)inventorship that did not (at all) affect the overall success and for that reason are insignificant for the solution, or that were made on the instructions of an inventor or a third party only.

2. Therefore, it is important that not only the subject-matter of the patent claims is taken into account for the assessment of a co-entitling involvement, but rather the invention as described in the patent, and its creation, and it has to be examined which effort the individual contributed to the invention in its entirety. The wording of the patent claims is only relevant when assessing the question of which inventive contribution was made by whom insofar as those claims can indicate that a part of the invention that is presented in the description of the invention is not any subject-matter for which the grant of the patent awards protection."

Our comment:

The Federal Supreme Court has given new guidance for assessing the question of how high the quality of a contribution to an invention must be in order that co-inventorship can be acknowledged.

This kind of problem often occurs in research departments of companies, where developments and inventions are usually made by a cooperating team of persons. Then the question arises of whose contribution is to be seen as constituting a co-inventorship and whose is not.

The Supreme Court has made it quite clear that only either a very minor contribution or work done exclusively on another person's instructions may be seen as not contributing to an invention. Thus, in practice, a (co-)inventorship should rather be acknowledged from the very start, in cases of doubt, in order to avoid unnecessary conflicts or disputes.



KADOR & PARTNER

80496 München
Corneliusstraße 15
Phone: +49 89 2015252
Fax: +49 89 2015242
+49 89 2014454
mail@kadorpartner.com

6020 Innsbruck
Bienerstrasse 2A
Phone: +43 512 58 33 12
mail@kadorpartner.at

London SWIV 1QL
99 Warwick Way
Phone: +44 20 78348589
Fax: +44 20 76300286
mail@kadorpartner.com

03001 Alicante
Castaños 10 - Atico 3
Phone: +34 965 215758
Fax: +34 965 215758
mail@kadorpartner.com

www.kadorpartner.de

Building Bridges