



Case Number: D 0002/94


D E C I S I O N
of the Disciplinary Board of Appeal
of 3 March 1995

Appellant: N.N.

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examination Board for the
European Qualifying Examination dated 7 October
1993.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: P. Gori
Members: W. Moser
J.-C. Saisset
C. Onn
A. Armengaud



Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The Appellant sat for the European Qualifying Examination held from 31 March to 2 April 1993 and received the following marks for his four papers:
- Paper A: 3 (good)
Paper B: 3 (good)
Paper C: 4 (pass)
Paper D: 6 (very inadequate)
- II. On 7 December 1993, the Appellant filed an appeal against the decision dated 7 October 1993 of the European Patent Office's Examination Board for the European Qualifying Examination that he had failed the examination. The appeal fee was paid on the same day. However, no Statement setting out the grounds of appeal (Article 27[2] REE) has been filed by the Appellant.
- III. In a communication dated 29 July 1994, the Board informed the Appellant that the appeal would have to be rejected as inadmissible, unless an application for re-establishment of rights in accordance with the prescriptions of Article 24(2) of the Regulation on discipline for professional representatives (RDR) in conjunction with Article 27(4) REE was filed by the Appellant.
- IV. The Appellant did not answer the communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit under Article 27(2) REE, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 22[2] RDR in conjunction with Article 27[4] REE).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

M. Beer

P. Gori