

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 15 December 2006**

Case Number: T0689/06 - 3.2.05

Application Number: 00203217.5

Publication Number: 1084978

IPC: B65H 39/042

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Setting a system for assembling mail items

Patentee:

Neopost Industrie B.V.

Opponent:

PFE International Limited

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T0689/06 - 3.2.05

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.05
of 15 December 2006

Appellant:
(Opponent) PFE International Limited
Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate
Oakwood Hill
Loughton/Essex IG10 3TZ (GB)

Representative: Freeman, Jacqueline Carol
W.P. THOMPSON & CO.
55 Drury Lane
London WC2B 5SQ (GB)

Respondent: Neopost Industrie B.V.
(Patent Proprietor) De Tijen 3
NL-9201 BX Drachten (NL)

Representative: Prins, Adrianus Willem
Vereenigde
P.O.Box 87930
NL-2508 DH Den Haag (NL)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted 31 January 2006
rejecting the opposition filed against European
patent No. 1084978 pursuant to Article 102(2)
EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: W. Moser
Members: P. Michel
H. Schram

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 31 January 2006, rejecting the opposition pursuant to Article 102(2) EPC.

The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 30 March 2006 and paid the appeal fee at the same time. However, no statement of the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit pursuant to Article 108 EPC, third sentence.

II. By a communication sent by registered letter with advice of delivery dated 29 June 2006, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds of the appeal 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. Furthermore, the appellant's attention was drawn to Article 122 EPC (re-establishment of rights) and Rule 84a EPC.

III. No answer to the Registry's communication has been received.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, and the notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC. Consequently, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Rule 65(1) EPC in conjunction with Article 108 EPC, third sentence.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

D. Meyfarth

W. Moser