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 10 March 2010

T 2320/09 - 3.3.02 Case Number:

Application Number: 00940733.9

Publication Number: 1267864

A61K 31/335 IPC:

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

A synergistic anti-malarial formulation

Applicant:

COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC & INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108 EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



Europäisches Patentamt

European Patent Office

Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Case Number: T 2320/09 - 3.3.02

DECISION
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.02
of 10 March 2010

Appellant: COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC & (Applicant) INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Rafi Marg

New Delhi 110001 (IN)

Representative: Schwarz, Albin

Schwarz & Partner Patentanwälte

Wipplingerstraße 30 A-1010 Wien (AT)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the

European Patent Office posted 26 May 2009

refusing European patent application

No. 00940733.9 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: U. Oswald

Members: M. C. Ortega Plaza

T. Karamanli

- 1 - T 2320/09

### Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the examining division posted on 26 May 2009, refusing European patent application No. 00940733.9.

The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal received on 27 July 2009 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No statement of grounds was filed.

- II. In a communication dated 10 December 2009, sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the registrar of the board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.
- III. No reply was filed to said communication.

#### 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:

N. Maslin

U. Oswald