

Internal distribution code:

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

D E C I S I O N
of 1st June 1999

Case Number: T0020/99 - 3.3.2

Application Number: 93917738.2

Publication Number: 0655909

IPC: A61K 7/50

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Detergent composition

Patentee:
UNILEVER PLC, et al.

Opponent:
Goldwell GmbH
L'OREAL

Headword:
-

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

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 0020/99 - 3.3.2

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.2
of 1st June 1999

Appellant: UNILEVER PLC
(Proprietor of the patent) Unilever House
Blackfriars
London EC4P 4BQ (GB)

Representative: Elliott, Peter William
Unilever plc
Patent Division
Colworth House
Sharnbrook
Bedford MK44 1LQ (GB)

Respondent(s): Goldwell GmbH
(Opponent 01) Zerninstr. 10-18
D-64280 Darmstadt (DE)

(Opponent 02): L'OREAL
14, rue Royale
F - 75008 Paris (FR)

Representative: Dossmann, Gérard
Bureau D.A. Casalonga-Josse
Morassistr. 8
D-80469 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted 23 october 1998
revoking European patent No. 0 655 909 pursuant
to Article 102(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: P. A. M. Lançon

Members: J. Riolo
R. Teschemacher

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 23 October 1998, revoking the European patent No. 0 655 909 pursuant to Article 102(1) EPC.

The Appellants (Patent Proprietors) filed a notice of appeal on 23 December 1998 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 11 March 1999 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 received within the given time limit 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:

P. Martorana

P. A. M. Lançon