

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 7 May 2008**

Case Number: T 1690/07 - 3.5.04

Application Number: 03798251.9

Publication Number: 1550316

IPC: H04N 9/31

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Scrolling color projection system with lamp synchronization

Applicant:

Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1690/07 - 3.5.04

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.04
of 7 May 2008

Appellant: Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V.
Groenewoudseweg 1
NL-5621 BA Eindhoven (NL)

Representative: Van den Hooven, Jan
Philips
Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 220
NL-5600 AE Eindhoven (NL)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 30 March 2007
refusing European application No. 03798251.9
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: F. Edlinger
Members: M. Paci
B. Müller

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division dated 30 March 2007 refusing the European Patent application No. 03 798 251.9.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal received on 1 June 2007 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was received.
- III. In a communication dated 5 November 2007 sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds of appeal had been received and that the appeal would be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed within two months.
- IV. No observations were filed.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Article 108 EPC requires that a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed within four months of notification of the decision. Pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC the appeal shall be rejected as inadmissible if it does not comply with Article 108 EPC.
2. In the present case no document was filed by the appellant which could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal. Consequently the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

D. Sauter

F. Edlinger