

BESCHWERDEKAMMERN
DES EUROPÄISCHEN
PATENTAMTS

BOARDS OF APPEAL OF
THE EUROPEAN PATENT
OFFICE

CHAMBRES DE RECOURS
DE L'OFFICE EUROPEEN
DES BREVETS

Internal distribution code:

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

D E C I S I O N
of 4 October 2004

Case Number: T 0685/04 - 3.3.1

Application Number: 97938489.8

Publication Number: 0927154

IPC: C07C 231/02

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Polyester Oligomer Acrylates

Applicant:
HENKEL CORPORATION

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

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

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 0685/04 - 3.3.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.1
of 4 October 2004

Appellant:

HENKEL CORPORATION
The Triad
Suite 200
2200 Renaissance Boulevard
Gulph Mills
Pennsylvania 19406 (US)

Representative:

Weber, Thomas, Dr.Dipl.-Chem.
Patentanwälte
von Kreisler-Selting-Werner
Postfach 10 22 41
D-50462 Köln (DE)

Decision under appeal:

**Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 1 December 2003
refusing European application No. 97938489.8
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. J. Nuss
Members: J. M. Jonk
J. H. Van Moer

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 1 December 2003 refusing the European patent application No. 97938489.8. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 1 December 2003. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 30 January 2004, and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. 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 29 June 2004 and sent by registered post, 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 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, 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:

N. Maslin

A. Nuss