

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 13 January 2020**

Case Number: T 1612/19 - 3.3.05

Application Number: 11743330.0

Publication Number: 2576848

IPC: C21D1/25, C21D8/02, C21D8/04

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
METHOD FOR PRODUCING A HOT-ROLLED STEEL PRODUCT, AND A HOT-ROLLED STEEL

Patent Proprietor:
Rautaruukki Oyj

Opponent:
ArcelorMittal

Headword:

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

Keyword:
Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Boards of Appeal of the
European Patent Office
Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8
85540 Haar
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0
Fax +49 (0)89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 1612/19 - 3.3.05

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.05
of 13 January 2020

Appellant: ArcelorMittal
(Opponent) 24-26, Boulevard d'Avranches
1160 Luxembourg (LU)

Representative: Plaisant, Sophie Marie
ArcelorMittal France
Research & Development
Intellectual Property
6, rue André Campra
Immeuble Le Cézanne
93200 Saint-Denis (FR)

Respondent: Rautaruukki Oyj
(Patent Proprietor) Panuntie 11
00620 Helsinki (FI)

Representative: Valea AB
Box 7086
103 87 Stockholm (SE)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 1 April 2019
rejecting the opposition filed against European
patent No. 2576848 pursuant to Article 101(2)
EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman E. Bendl
Members: G. Glod
O. Loizou

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The opponent (hereinafter "the appellant") filed on 3 June 2019 an appeal against the opposition division's decision taken on 21 February 2019, posted on 1 April 2019, rejecting the opposition against the European patent EP-B-2 576 848. The appeal fee was paid on the same day.

- II. By communication dated 18 September 2019, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received by the appellant, the registry of the board informed the appellant that it appeared from the file that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed, and that it was therefore 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 of notification of the communication. Within this period of time the appellant filed no observations.

Reasons for the Decision

1. No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC. Since the notice of appeal of 3 June 2019 does not contain any reasoning within the meaning of Rule 99(2) EPC or anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal pursuant to Article 108 EPC, a statement of grounds is missing so that the appeal is 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:



C. Vodz

E. Bendl

Decision electronically authenticated