# PATENTAMTS

## OFFICE

BESCHWERDEKAMMERN BOARDS OF APPEAL OF CHAMBRES DE RECOURS DES EUROPÄISCHEN THE EUROPEAN PATENT DE L'OFFICE EUROPEEN DES BREVETS

#### Internal distribution code:

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

### Datasheet for the decision of 15 May 2009

T 0123/09 - 3.4.01 Case Number:

Application Number: 02729014.7

Publication Number: 1386174

IPC: G01R 33/28

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Remotely powered MR injector

Applicant:

LIEBEL-FLARSHEIM COMPANY

Opponent:

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108 EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

Keyword:

"Admissibility of appeal - no"

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



Europäisches Patentamt European Patent Office

Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Case Number: T 0123/09 - 3.4.01

DECISION
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.01
of 15 May 2009

Appellant: LIEBEL-FLARSHEIM COMPANY

2111 E. Galbraith Road

Cincinnati

Ohio 45237 (US)

Representative: Chettle, Adrian John

Withers & Rogers LLP

Goldings House 2 Hays Lane

London SE1 2HW (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the

European Patent Office posted 20 June 2008

refusing European patent application

No. 02729014.7 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: B. Schachenmann

Members: P. Fontenay

H. Wolfrum

- 1 - T 0123/09

#### Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division dated 20 June 2008 refusing European patent application No. 02 729 014.7.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal received on20 August 2008 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC.
- IV. In a communication dated 16 February 2009 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 it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed within two months.
- V. The appellant filed no observations in response to the communication.

#### Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement of grounds of appeal has been filed and as the notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal according to Article 108 EPC, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC).

### Order

### For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

R. Schumacher

B. Schachenmann