

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 21 March 2012**

Case Number: T 1566/11 - 3.2.03

Application Number: 98301769.0

Publication Number: 0942255

IPC: F41H 5/04

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Composite armor panel

Patentee:
MOFET ETZION

Opponents:
Plasan-Sasa - Limited Partnership of Kibbutz Sasa
Rafael-Armament Development Authority Ltd.

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 1566/11 - 3.2.03

DECISION
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.03
of 21 March 2012

Appellant: Plasan-Sasa - Limited Partnership of Kibbutz
(Opponent 1) Sasa
M.P. Marom
Hagalil 13870 (IL)

Representative: Stellbrink, Axel
Vossius & Partner
Siebertstrasse 4
D-81675 München (DE)

Respondent: MOFET ETZION
(Patent Proprietor) Kibbutz Kfar Etzhion
Mobile Post North Yehuda 90200 (IL)

Representative: Hartley, Andrew Philip
Mathisen & Macara LLP
120 Bridge Road
Chertsey
Surrey KT16 8LA (GB)

Party as of right: Rafael-Armament Development Authority Ltd.
(Opponent 2) P.O. Box 2250
31021 Haifa (IL)

Representative: Stellbrink, Axel
Vossius & Partner
Siebertstrasse 4
D-81675 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted 15 April 2011
rejecting the opposition filed against European
patent No. 0942255 pursuant to Article 101(2)
EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: U. Krause
Members: G. Ashley
I. Beckedorf

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant (opponent 01) appealed against the decision of the Opposition Division dated 15 April 2011 rejecting the opposition filed against European Patent No. 0 942 255.

- II. The notice of appeal was received on 24 June 2011 and the appeal fee was paid on the same day. However, no statement of grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit for doing so, nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as such statement.

- III. In a communication dated 10 October 2011 sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that, as a consequence, it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was also given a time limit of two months for filing observations starting from the date of notification of said communication.

- IV. The communication was received on 13 October 2011. No observations were filed within the given time limit.

Reasons for the Decision

1. According to Article 108 EPC, a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed within four months of notification of the decision.

2. If the appeal does not comply with Article 108 EPC, the appeal must be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC). In the present case, no statement of grounds has been filed and consequently the appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

D. Hampe

U. Krause