## Europäisches Patentamt Beschwerdekammern

## European Patent Office Boards of Appeal

Office européen des brevets Chambres de recours

Veröffentlichung im Amtsblatt X兆/Nein Publication in the Official Journa(X野s/No Publication au Journal Official X炎光/Non

Aktenzeichen / Case Number / No du recours : D 02/83

Anmeldenummer / Filing No / N<sup>o</sup> de la demande :

Publikations-Nr. / Publication No / NO de la publication :

Bezeichnung der Erfindung:

Title of invention:
Titre de l'invention:

### **ENTSCHEIDUNG / DECISION**

vom/of/du 20 December 1983

Appellant:

Stichwort / Headword / Référence: Art.6 Regulation of the establishment of an

institute of professional representatives

before the EPO (REI)

Art.4(2) Regulation on discipline for professional representatives (RDR)

EPÜ/EPC/CBE

Subscriptions for EPI - no justification for application of Art.4(2) RDR

Leitsatz / Headnote / Sommaire

# Europäisches Patentamt

Beschwerdekammer in Disziplinarangelegenheiten

# European Patent Office

Disciplinary Board of Appeal

# Office européen des brevets

Chambre de recours statuant en matière disciplinaire



Case No. D 02/83

### **DECISION**

dated 20 December 1983

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Disciplinary Board of the European Patent Office dated 31 January 1983 (Case No. 9/82)

# Composition of the Board:

L. Gotti Porcinari, Chairman

O. Bossung Member

P. Ford Member

E. Bokelmann Member

H. Brühwiler Member

### SUMMARY OF FACTS AND SUBMISSIONS

The appellant was entered in the list of professional representatives before the European Patent Office. By letter of 13 December 1979 to the Institute of Professional Representatives, he expressed the wish to resign from the Institute. Deletion of his name from the list of professional representatives, in response to this letter, did not however occur until 1983.

The Institute subscriptions for 1978 and 1979 were paid at the end of 1979 by the firm employing the appellant at the time. Sent reminders in error, he did not clarify the position. Letters from the Disciplinary Board were not received or went unanswered. The outcome was that a fine of DM 800 was imposed on him by Disciplinary Board Decision of 31 January 1983 under Article 4(1) of the Regulation on discipline.

On 12 March 1983, the appellant appealed against this Decision. He apologised and explained what had happened, which further investigation has substantiated. The appellant requests that the contested Decision be set aside

2

### REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The appeal is admissible and substantiated. The facts of the case are not such as to justify application of Article 4(2) of the Regulation on discipline, as it is proved that he resigned from the Institute and the subscription had been paid.

It is therefore

decided that:

The Decision under appeal is set aside.