BESCHWERDEKAMMERN	BOARDS OF APPEAL OF	CHAMBRES DE RECOURS
DES EUROPÄISCHEN	THE EUROPEAN PATENT	DE L'OFFICE EUROPEEN
PATENTAMTS	OFFICE	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 24 January 2011

Case Number:	T 2018/10 - 3.4.03			
Application Number:	02768252.5			
Publication Number:	1425783			
IPC:	H01L 21/027			
Language of the proceedings:	EN			

Title of invention:

Homogenization of a spatially coherent radiation beam and printing and inspection, respectively, of a pattern on a workpiece

Applicant: Micronic Mydata AB

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions: EPC Art. 108 EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

```
Keyword:
"Inadmissible appeal - 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 2018/10 - 3.4.03

DECISION of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.03 of 24 January 2011

Appellant:

Micronic Mydata AB Box 3141 SE-183 03 Täby (SE)

Representative:

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted 16 April 2010 refusing European application No. 02768252.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

_

Composition of the Board:

Chairman:	G.	Eliasson		
Members:	v.	L.	P.	Frank
	т.	Karamanli		

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. This is an appeal against the refusal of European patent application No. 02768252 posted 16 April 2010.

> A notice of appeal on behalf of the applicant appellant was filed on 16 June 2010. The appeal fee was paid on the same day. No separate statement of grounds of appeal was filed.

- II. By a communication dated 5 October 2010 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the appellant was informed that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that, therefore, it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.
- III. No answer has been given to the communication within the time limit. No request for re-establishment of rights was filed.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the 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, third sentence, 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

S. Sánchez Chiquero

G. Eliasson