Datasheet for the decision
of 7 November 2014

Case Number: T 0932/14 - 3.3.10
Application Number: 01272430.8
Publication Number: 1345637
IPC: A61L27/06
Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
SURFACE MODIFICATION OF IMPLANTS FOR HEALING IN BONE AND SOFT TISSUE

Patent Proprietor:
TioTec AB

Opponent:
Dentsply IH AB

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:
Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds

Decisions cited:
Catchword:
Case Number: T 0932/14 - 3.3.10

DECISION
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.10
of 7 November 2014

Appellant: Dentsply IH AB
(Opponent)
Aminogatan 1
431 21 Malmö (SE)

Representative: Zakrisson, Ulrika
Awapatent AB
P.O. Box 45086
104 30 Stockholm (SE)

Respondent: TioTec AB
(Patent Proprietor)
Box 45
540 16 Timmersdala (SE)

Representative: Romare, Laila Anette
Zacco Sweden AB
Torggatan 8
Box 142
401 22 Göteborg (SE)


Composition of the Board:
Chairman: P. Gryczka
Members: J. Mercey
F. Blumer
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Opposition Division of 25 November 2013, posted on 28 February 2014.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 23 April 2014 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 7 August 2014, 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, 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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