BESCHWERDEKAMMERN DES EUROPÄISCHEN PATENTAMTS

BOARDS OF APPEAL OF THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

CHAMBRES DE RECOURS DE L'OFFICE EUROPEEN DES BREVETS

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 17 August 1999

Case Number: T 0508/99 - 3.2.2

Application Number: 93902461.8

Publication Number: 0624074

IPC: A61B 5/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Electrode

Applicant:
The Victoria University of Manchester

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

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

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-

Europäisches Patentamt | European Patent Office | Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern | Boards of Appeal | Chambres de recours

Case Number: T 0508/99 - 3.2.2

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.2
of 17 August 1999

Appellant: The Victoria University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL (GB)

Representative: Tunnicliffe, Peter Barry
Chester Court
Church Close
Broadway
Worcestershire WR12 7AH (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted 4 December 1998 refusing European patent application No. 93 902 461.8 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: W. D. Weiß
Members: M. G. Noel
R. T. Menapace

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 4 December 1998 refusing the European patent application No. 93 902 461.8. The Appellant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 4 February 1999 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 14 May 1999 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. 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: The Chairman:

P. Martorana W. D. Weiß