

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 22 November 2006**

Case Number: T 0330/06 - 3.2.07

Application Number: 99967311.4

Publication Number: 1140672

IPC: B65G 17/08

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Fiber filled chain link for a modular conveyer chain

Patentee:

REXNORD CORPORATION

Opponent:

REGINA SUD S.p.A.

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0330/06 - 3.2.07

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.07
of 22 November 2006

Appellant:
(Patent Proprietor)

REXNORD CORPORATION
4701 West Greenfield Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53214 (US)

Representative:

Ledeboer, Bernard Christiaan
Vereenigde
Postbus 87930
NL-2508 DH Den Haag (NL)

Respondent:
(Opponent)

REGINA SUD S.p.A.
SS 156 dei Monti Lepini
Km 50 Traversa via dei Lavoratori 23
I-04010 Borgo San Michele (LT) (IT)

Representative:

Faraggiana, Vittorio
Ingg. Guzzi & Ravizza S.r.l.
Via Vincenzo Monti 8
I-20123 Milano (IT)

Decision under appeal:

Interlocutory decision of the Opposition
Division of the European Patent Office posted
19 December 2005 concerning maintenance of
European patent No. 1140672 in amended form.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: H. Meinders
Members: H. Hahn
E. Lachacinski
K. Poalas
C. Holtz

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 19 December 2005 concerning maintenance of European Patent No. 1 140 672 in amended form.

The appellant (patent proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 28 February 2006 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

- II. By a communication dated 12 June 2006 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 invited to file observations within two months. Attention was also drawn to Article 122 EPC.

- III. No answer has been given to the registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The notice of appeal filed on 28 February 2006 contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.
2. As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 65(1) EPC in conjunction with Article 108 EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

G. Nachtigall

H. Meinders