

A		B		C	X
---	--	---	--	---	---

File Number: T 70/92 - 3.4.1

Application No.: 85 905 978.4

Publication No.: 0 201 585

Title of invention: Semiconductors having shallow, hyperabrupt doped regions,
and process for preparation thereof using ion implanted
impurities

Classification: H01L 21/265

D E C I S I O N
of 12 January 1993

Applicant: Hughes Aircraft Company

Opponent: 01) TEMIC TELEFUNKEN microelectronic GmbH
02) N.V. Philips' Gloeilampenfabrieken

Headword:

EPC Article 108, Rule 65(1)

Keyword: "Missing Statement of Grounds"



Case Number : T 70/92 - 3.4.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.1
of 12 January 1993

Appellant :
(Proprietor of the patent)

Hughes Aircraft Company
7200 Hughes Terrace
PO BOX 45066
Los Angeles
CA 90045-0066 (US)

Representative :

Colgan, Stephen James
CARPMAELS & RANSFORD
43 Bloomsbury Square
London WC1A 2RA (GB)

Respondent :
(Opponent 01)

TEMIC TELEFUNKEN microelectronic GmbH
Theresienstrasse 2
Postfach 35 35
W - 7100 Heilbronn (DE)

Representative :

Maute, Hans-Jürgen, Dipl.-Ing.
TELEFUNKEN electronic GmbH
Theresienstrasse 2
W - 7100 Heilbronn (DE)

Respondent :
(Opponent 02)

N.V. Philips' Gloeilampenfabrieken
Groenewoudseweg 1
NL - 5621 BA Eindhoven (NL)

Representative :

Houbiers, Ernest Emile Marie Gerlach
INTERNATIONAAL OCTROOIBUREAU B.V.
Prof. Holstlaan 6
NL - 5656 AA Eindhoven (NL)

Decision under appeal :

Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office dated 25 November 1991
revoking European patent No. 0 201 585 pursuant
to Article 102(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board :

Chairman : G.D. Paterson
Members : H.J. Reich
R.K. Shukla

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office delivered orally on 23 October 1991, with written reasons posted on 25 November 1991, revoking European patent No. 0 201 585. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 25 November 1991. The Appellant filed a notice of appeal by fax received on 23 January 1992 and paid the fee for appeal on 24 January 1992. No Statement of Grounds was received. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

- II. By a communication dated 6 July 1992 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellant that no Statement of Grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

- III. No answer has been given to the Registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 65(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons, it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

M. Beer

G.D. Paterson