Datasheet for the decision
of 11 July 2013

Case Number: T 2515/12  -  3.5.04
Application Number: 06727065.2
Publication Number: 1880386
IPC: G11B33/04

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR DISPLAYING AN ITEM

Applicant:
Memory Box UK Limited

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

Keyword:

Decisions cited:

Catchword:
DECISION of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.04 of 11 July 2013

Appellant: Memory Box UK Limited
(Aplicant)
Unit 10, 13 Broadway Market
London
E8 4PH (GB)

Representative: ip21 Ltd
Central Formalities Department
Lakeside 300
Old Chapel Way
Broadland Business Park
Norwich
Norfolk NR7 0WG (GB)
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division posted on 29 June 2012.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 29 August 2012 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 14 January 2013, received by the appellant, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that it appeared from the file that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed (date of receipt: 21 January 2013), and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.

IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC. In addition, neither the notice of appeal nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC. Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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