

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 8 February 2002

Case Number: T 1201/01 - 3.3.7

Application Number: 94902790.8

Publication Number: 0737098

IPC: B01J 20/32

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Adsorption material and method

Applicant:
Cultor Ltd.

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1201/01 - 3.3.7

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.7
of 8 February 2002

Appellant: Cultor Ltd.
Kyllikinportti 2
FI-00240 Helsinki (FI)

Representative: Puranen, Maija-Liisa
Kolster Oy Ab
Iso Roobertinkatu 23
P.O. Box 148
FI-00121 Helsinki (FI)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 31 May 2001
refusing European patent application
No. 94 902 790.8 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: R. E. Teschemacher
Members: G. Santavicca
B. L. ter Laan

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 31 May 2001 refusing European patent application No. 94 902 790.8 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

The applicant (appellant) filed a notice of appeal on 16 July 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 16 November 2001, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible.

The appellant was informed about the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC and was invited to file observations within two months.

- III. No answer has been received 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 Registrar:

The Chairman:

C. Eickhoff

R. Teschemacher