

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 19 January 2026**

Case Number: T 1315/25 - 3.3.08

Application Number: 23207780.0

Publication Number: 4328324

IPC: C12Q1/6883

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
METHODS OF DIAGNOSING EPILEPSY

Applicant:
Dignity Health

Headword:
Diagnosing epilepsy/DIGNITY HEALTH

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

Case Number: T 1315/25 - 3.3.08

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.08
of 19 January 2026

Appellant: Dignity Health
(Appellant) 185 Berry Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94107 (US)

Representative: Hutter, Anton
Venner Shipley LLP
5 Stirling House
Stirling Road
The Surrey Research Park
Guildford GU2 7RF (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 26 June 2025
granting European patent No. 4328324 pursuant to
Article 97(1) EPC**

Composition of the Board:

Chairwoman T. Sommerfeld
Members: B. Claes
O. Loizou

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 19 August 2025 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- II. No statement of grounds was filed by the appellant. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.
- III. By communication of 12 November 2025, 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 informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.
- IV. No reply was received.

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. In addition neither the notice of appeal nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC.
2. Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairwoman:



C. Rodríguez Rodríguez

T. Sommerfeld

Decision electronically authenticated