

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 13 March 2007**

Case Number: T 1363/06 - 3.5.01

Application Number: 02776089.1

Publication Number: 1436758

IPC: G06F 19/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Patient Directed Therapy Management

Applicant:
MEDTRONIC, INC.

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

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

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1363/06 - 3.5.01

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 13 March 2007

Appellant: MEDTRONIC, INC.
710 Medtronic Parkway
Minneapolis
Minnesota 55432-5604 (US)

Representative: Hughes, Andrea Michelle
Frank B. Dehn & Co.
St Bride's House
10 Salisbury Square
London EC4Y 8JD (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 27 March 2006
refusing European application No. 02776089.1
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. Steinbrener
Members: R. R. K. Zimmermann
A. Pignatelli

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 27 March 2006 refusing European patent application No. 02 776 089.1.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 6 June 2006 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

A written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was not filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. Nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as such statement.

II. In a communication dated 19 September 2006, the Board informed the appellant that no statement setting out the grounds of appeal had been received and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed 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 was filed within the time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC, the appeal is inadmissible pursuant to Rule 65(1) EPC.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

R. Schumacher

S. Steinbrener