

Internal distribution code:

(A) ☐ Publication in OJ
(B) ☐ To Chairmen and Members
(C) ☒ To Chairmen

D E C I S I O N
of 29 March 1994

Case Number: T 1015/93 - 3.3.3

Application Number: 88300239.6

Publication Number: 0276923

IPC: C08K 13/02

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Polyolefin composition

Applicant:
Tonen Chemical Corporation

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal norms:
EPC Art. 108
EPCR. 65(1)

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1015/93 - 3.3.3

DECISION
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.3
of 29 March 1994

Appellant:

Tonen Chemical Corporation
1-1, Tsukiji 4-Chome
Chuo-Ku
Tokyo (JP)

Representative:

Dew, Melvyn John
Exxon Chemical Limited
Exxon Chemical Technology Centre
P.O. Box 1
Abingdon
Oxfordshire, OX13 6BB (GB)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office dated 21 June 1993 refusing
European patent application No. 88 300 239.6
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: F. Antony
Members: H.H.R. Fessel
W.M. Schar

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division 013 of the European Patent Office dated 21 June 1993 refusing the European patent application No. 88 300 239.6. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on the same day. The Appellant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 6 August 1993 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. 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 12 January 1994 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:


E. Görgmaier

The Chairman:


F. Antony