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Appellant:  
GARDENA Manufacturing GmbH  
Hans-Lorenser-Str. 40  
D-89079 Ulm (DE)

(Opponent)

Representative:  
Schröer, Gernot H.  
Meissner Bolte Patentanwälte  
Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB  
Bankgasse 3  
90402 Nürnberg (DE)

Respondent:  
Chen, Ho-Chin  
No. 11-2, Lane 188,  
Gungye Road,  
Lung Ching Shiang  
Taichung Hsien (TW)

(Patent Proprietor)

Representative:  
Viering, Jentschura & Partner mbB  
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte  
Grillparzerstraße 14  
81675 München (DE)

Decision under appeal:  
Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 19 March 2013 rejecting the opposition filed against European patent No. 1884292 pursuant to Article 101(2) EPC.
Composition of the Board:

Chairman: H. Meinders
Members:  
          K. Poalas
          E. Kossonakou
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant (opponent) lodged an appeal against the decision of the Opposition Division rejecting the opposition filed against the European patent 1 884 292.

II. In a communication of the Board dated 26 April 2016 the parties were informed that from the Register it was known that the European patent had lapsed for all the designated Contracting States and that the appeal proceedings could be only continued at the request of the opponent, provided that within two months from notification of that communication a corresponding request was filed.

III. The respondent (patent proprietor) with its submission dated 9 June 2016 confirmed that the patent had lapsed with effect for all designated Contracting States.

IV. The appellant has not responded to the communication of the Board.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Pursuant to Rule 84(1) EPC in conjunction with Rule 100(1) EPC, proceedings are not continued after the European patent has lapsed, unless there is a request to this effect by the opponent filed within two months from notification by the European Patent Office of the lapse (see e.g. T 329/88; T 289/06; T 978/07; T 949/09; T 178/12; all not published in OJ EPO).

2. Since no such request was filed by the appellant, the proceedings are terminated.
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal proceedings are terminated.
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