

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 August 2002

Case Number: T 0294/02 - 3.5.1

Application Number: 95115267.7

Publication Number: 0704805

IPC: G06F 12/10

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Address translation device

Applicant:
KABUSHIKI KAISHA TOSHIBA

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0294/02 - 3.5.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.1
of 6 August 2002

Appellant: KABUSHIKI KAISHA TOSHIBA
72, Horikawa-cho
Saiwai-ku
Kawasaki-shi
Kanagawa-ken 210-8572 (JP)

Representative: Lehn, Werner, Dipl. Ing.
Hoffmann, Eitle
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte
Arabellastrasse 4
D-81925 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 3 April 2001
refusing European patent application
No. 95 115 267.7 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. V. Steinbrener
Members: R. R. K. Zimmermann
S. C. Perryman

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 3 April 2001 refusing the European patent application No. 95 115 267.7. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 3 April 2001. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 13 June 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No statement of grounds was filed.
- II. By a communication dated 16 April 2002 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.
- IV. By letter dated 19 July 2002, the appellant withdrew the auxiliary request for oral proceedings.

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(2) 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:

G. Magouliotis

S. Steinbrener