

Internal distribution code:

- (A) Publication in OJ
(B) To Chairmen and Members
(C) To Chairmen
(D) No distribution

D E C I S I O N
of 26 July 2006

Case Number: T 0594/06 - 3.2.07

Application Number: 03728989.9

Publication Number: 1506062

IPC: B05D 5/10

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Improved high speed embossing and adhesive printing process

Applicant:

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108, 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0594/06 - 3.2.07

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.07
of 26 July 2006

Appellant: THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
One Procter & Gamble Plaza
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (US)

Representative: Borbach, Markus
Procter & Gamble Service GmbH
Sulzbacher Strasse 40-50
D-65823 Schwalbach am Taunus (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 29 September 2005
refusing European application No. 03728989.9
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: C. Holtz
Members: P. O'Reilly
H. Hahn

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 29 September 2005 refusing the European Patent application No. 03 728 989.9.
The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 09 December 2005 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 02 May 2006 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible.
The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.
Attention was also drawn to Article 122 EPC.

III. No answer has been given to the registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The notice of appeal filed on 9 December 2005 contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.
2. As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 65(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

G. Nachtigall

C. Holtz