

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

File No.: T 0645/93 - 3.5.1
Application No.: 86 107 063.9
Publication No.: 0 202 687
Classification: H04B 3/28
Title of invention: Noise-free terminal station compatible with existing
master stations.

D E C I S I O N
of 15 November 1993

Applicant: NEC Corporation
Proprietor of the patent: -
Opponent: -

Headword:

EPC: Art. 108, Rule 65(1)

Keyword: "Missing Statement of Grounds"

Headnote
Catchwords



Case Number: T 0645/93 - 3.5.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.1
of 15 November 1993

Appellant:

NEC Corporation
7-1, Shiba 5-chome
Minato-ku
Tokyo 108-01 (JP)

Representative:

Vossius & Partner
Postfach 86 07 67
D - 81634 München

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the European
Patent Office dated 29 January 1993 refusing
European patent application No. 86 107 063.9
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: P.K.J. van den Berg
Members: A.S. Clelland
E.M.C. Holtz

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office 29 January 1993 refusing the European patent application No. 86 107 063.9. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 29 January 1993. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 8 April 1993 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No Statement of Grounds was filed. 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 16 August 1993 and sent by registered post, 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. The Appellant filed no observations in response to said 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. Kiehl

P.K.J. van den Berg