

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 6 June 1997

Case Number: T 0214/97 - 3.5.1

Application Number: 91104245.5

Publication Number: 0448046

IPC: H04L 12/18

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
An ATM cell broadcasting system

Applicant:
FUJITSU LIMITED

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 0214/97 - 3.5.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.1
of 6 June 1997

Appellant: FUJITSU LIMITED
1050, Kamikodanaka
Nakahara-ku
Kawasaki-shi
Kanagawa 211 (JP)

Representative: Lehn, Werner, Dipl.-Ing.
Hoffmann, Eitle & Partner
Patentanwälte
Postfach 81 04 20
81904 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 9 August 1996
refusing European patent application
No. 91 104 245.5 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

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

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 9 August 1996, refusing the European patent application No. 91 104 245.5. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 9 August 1996. The Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal by a letter received on 9 October 1996 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 13 March 1997 and sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellant that no Statement of Grounds has 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