

**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 21 March 2003**

**Case Number:** T 0932/02 - 3.3.6

**Application Number:** 93870145.5

**Publication Number:** 0634481

**IPC:** C11D 3/39

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**  
Detergent compositions

**Patentee:**  
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

**Opponent:**  
Unilever PLC

**Headword:**  
-

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

**Keyword:**  
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

**Decisions cited:**  
-

**Catchword:**  
-



Case Number: T 0932/02 - 3.3.6

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.6  
of 21 March 2003

**Appellant:** Unilever PLC  
(Opponent) Unilever House, Blackfriars  
London EC4P 4BQ (GB)

**Representative:** Fransella, Mary Evelyn  
Unilever PLC  
Patent Division  
Colworth House  
Sharnbrook  
Bedford MK44 1LQ (GB)

**Respondent:** THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
(Proprietor of the patent) One Procter & Gamble Plaza  
Cincinnati,  
Ohio 45202 (US)

**Representative:** Samuels, Lucy Alice  
Gill Jennings & Every  
Broadgate House  
7 Eldon Street  
London EC2M 7LH (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Opposition Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 1 July 2002  
rejecting the opposition filed against European  
patent No. 0 634 481 pursuant to Article 102(2)  
EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** P. Krasa  
**Members:** G. N. C. Rathes  
C. Holtz

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 28 August 2002 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day, contesting the decision of the opposition division of the European patent Office posted 1 July 2002, rejecting the opposition against European patent No. 0 634 481 pursuant to Article 102(2) EPC.

No statement of grounds was filed.

The notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

By a communication dated 12 December 2002 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 observations within two months and attention was drawn to the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC.

No answer was filed within the given time limit to this communication.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed and as the notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal according to Article 108 EPC, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction

within Rule 65(1) EPC).

**Order**

**For these reasons it is decided that:**

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

G. Rauh

P. Krasa