

**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 18 July 2005

**Case Number:** T 0051/05 - 3.4.2

**Application Number:** 99308296.5

**Publication Number:** 0997769

**IPC:** G02F 1/1362

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Active matrix liquid crystal display device

**Applicant:**

SONY CORPORATION

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing statement of grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 0051/05 - 3.4.2

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.2  
of 18 July 2005

**Appellant:** SONY CORPORATION  
7-35, Kitashinagawa 6-chome  
Shinagawa-ku  
Tokyo (JP)

**Representative:** Nicholls, Michael John  
J.A. KEMP & CO.  
14, South Square  
Gray's Inn  
London WC1R 5JJ (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 23 July 2004  
refusing European application No. 99308296.5  
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. G. Klein  
**Members:** F. J. Narganes-Quijano  
M. J. Vogel

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

- I. The appeal is against the decision of the examining division dated 23 July 2004 refusing European patent application No. 99308296.5.

The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 27 September 2004 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

No statement of grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit prescribed by Article 108 EPC.

- II. By a communication dated 4 February 2005 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no written statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that the appeal was expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months and attention was drawn to Article 122 EPC.

No answer to the Registry's communication has been received within the prescribed time limit.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

Whilst the notice of appeal was filed within the time limit set out in Article 108 EPC and the appeal fee was also paid within that time limit, no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit prescribed by Article 108 EPC. In addition, the notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds within the

meaning of Article 108 EPC. For these reasons 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:

M. Dainese

A. G. Klein