

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 6 March 2002

Case Number: T 1084/01 - 3.4.2
Application Number: 94106399.2
Publication Number: 0622655
IPC: G02F 1/1333, G02F 1/1335,
G02F 1/1343, G02F 1/136,
G09G 3/36, H04N 9/31

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Display device, method of driving the same and projection-type display apparatus using the same

Applicant:

MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1084/01 - 3.4.2

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.2
of 6 March 2002

Appellant: MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD
1006, Oaza-Kadoma
Kadoma-shi
Osaka 571-8501 (JP)

Representative: Eisenführ, Speiser & Partner
Martinistrasse 24
D-28195 Bremen (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 5 April 2001
refusing European patent application
No. 94 106 399.2 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: E. Turrini
Members: M. P. Stock
V. Di Cerbo

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office date 5 April 2001, refusing the European patent application patent No 94 106 399.2.

The Appellant filed a notice of appeal on 8 June 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No Statement of Grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

- II. By a communication dated 12 October 2001, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, 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 observation within two months.

- III. No answer has been given within the given time limit to the Registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written Statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 65(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registry:

The Chirman:

P. Martorana

E. Turrini