

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 17 January 2008**

Case Number: T 1602/07 - 3.3.01

Application Number: 03744465.0

Publication Number: 1487830

IPC: C07D 417/12

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Novel crystalline form of
5-(4-((3-methyl-4-oxo-3,4-dihydroquinazolin-2-yl)methoxy)benzyl)thiazolidine-2,4-dione potassium salt

Applicant:

Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

Thiazolidine dione/DR. REDDY

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC.R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

EPC Art. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1602/07 - 3.3.01

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.01
of 17 January 2008

Appellant:

Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd.
7-1-27 Ameerpet
Hyderabad 500 016
Andhra Pradesh (IN)

Representative:

Bates, Philip Ian
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL (GB)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 27 March 2007
refusing European application No. 03744465.0
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: P. Ranguis
Members: C. M. Radke
D. S. Rogers

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the Applicant on 27 March 2007, refusing the European Patent Application No. 03744465.0.

The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal by a letter received on 21 May 2007 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No Statement of Grounds was filed. The Notice of Appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 28 September 2007, sent by registered post, the Registrar of the Board informed the Appellant that no Statement of Grounds has been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellant was informed about the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC 1973 and was invited to file observations within two months.

III. No answer has been given within the given time limit to the Registry's communication.

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 101(1) EPC (formerly Rule 65(1) EPC 1973)).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

N. Maslin

P. Ranguis