

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 25 May 2007**

Case Number: T 1079/06 - 3.3.10

Application Number: 99967195.1

Publication Number: 1137446

IPC: A61L 15/32

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Collagen Hemostatic Foam

Applicant:
C.R. BARD, INC.

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1079/06 - 3.3.10

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.10
of 25 May 2007

Appellant:

C.R. BARD, INC.
730 Central Avenue
Murray Hill
New Jersey 07974 (US)

Representative:

HOFFMANN EITLÉ
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte
Arabellastrasse 4
D-81925 München (DE)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 26 January 2006
refusing European application No. 99967195.1
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: R. Freimuth
Members: J. Mercey
P. Schmitz

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. In its decision issued in writing on 26 January 2006 the Examining Division refused the European patent application No. 99 967 195.1.

- II. The Applicant (Appellant) filed a notice of appeal on 27 March 2006 against the decision of the Examining Division and paid the appeal fee on the same day. No statement of grounds was filed within the prescribed period in accordance with Article 108 EPC.

- III. By a communication dated 4 December 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 it was to be expected that the appeal be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

- IV. No reply from the Appellant was received within this time-limit.

Reasons for the Decision

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:

C. Moser

R. Freimuth