

Internal distribution code:

- (A) [] Publication in OJ
(B) [] To Chairmen and Members
(C) [X] To Chairmen

D E C I S I O N
of 16 June 1995

Case Number: T 0217/95 - 3.3.3

Application Number: 90917463.3

Publication Number: 0502903

IPC: C08F 2/16

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Internal resin-tackified acrylic polymers containing
crosslinkable comonomers

Applicant:

EXXON CHEMICAL PATENTS INC.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0217/95 - 3.3.3

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.3
of 16 June 1995

Appellant: EXXON CHEMICAL PATENTS INC.
1900 East Linden Avenue
Linden
New Jersey 07036-0710 (US)

Representative: Veldhuizen, Albert Dirk Willem
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 20 September 1994 refusing
European patent application No. 90 917 463.3
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: C. R. J. Gérardin
Members: R. J. Young
J. A. Stephens-Ofner

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 20 September 1994, refusing the European patent application No. 90 917 463.3. The written reasons for the decision were dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the Applicant on 20 September 1994. The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal by a letter received on 18 November 1994 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 31 March 1995, 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. 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:



P. Martorana

The Chairman:



C. Gérardin