

Internal distribution code:

- (A) [] Publication in OJ
(B) [] To Chairmen and Members
(C) [] To Chairmen
(D) [X] No distribution

D E C I S I O N
of 18 September 2001

Case Number: T 0606/01 - 3.5.1

Application Number: 97916514.9

Publication Number: 0891581

IPC: G06G 5/06

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Fifo Memory System

Applicant:
LSI Logic Corporation

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statements of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0606/01 - 3.5.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.1
of 18 September 2001

Appellant: LSI Logic Corporation
2001 Danfield Court
Fort Collins
CO 80525-2998 (US)

Representative: W.P. THOMPSON & CO.
Celcon House
289-293 High Holborn
London WC1V 7HU (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 3 January 2001
refusing European application No. 97 916 514.9
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. V. Steinbrener
Members: H. Preglau
A. S. Clelland

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 3 January 2001 refusing the European patent application No. 97 916 514.9. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 3 January 2001. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 12 March 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No statement of grounds was filed.
- II. By a communication dated 18 June 2001 and sent by registered post, 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. The appellant filed no observations in response to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit provided by Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 78(3) EPC), the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 65(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

M. Kiehl

S. V. Steinbrener