

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 31 May 2007**

Case Number: T 1499/06 - 3.2.07

Application Number: 00918764.2

Publication Number: 1161383

IPC: B65D 65/46

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

A process for producing a water soluble package

Patentee:

UNILEVER PLC, et al

Opponent:

The Procter & Gamble Company

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1499/06 - 3.2.07

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.07
of 31 May 2007

Appellants:
(Patent Proprietors)

UNILEVER PLC
Unilever House,
Blackfriars
London EC4P 4BQ (GB)

UNILEVER N.V.
Weena 455
NL-3013 AL Rotterdam (NL)

Representative:

Hardy, Susan Margaret
Unilever PLC
Unilever Patent Group
Colworth House
Sharnbrook
Bedford MK44 1LQ (GB)

Respondent:
(Opponent)

The Procter & Gamble Company
One Procter & Gamble Plaza
Cincinnati, OHIO 45202 (US)

Representative:

Mather, Peter Geoffrey
Procter & Gamble
European Technical Center N.V.
Temselaan 100
BE-1853 Strombeek-Bever (BE)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted 19 July 2006
revoking European patent No. 1161383 pursuant
to Article 102(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: H. Meinders
Members: K. Poalas
C. Holtz

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 19 July 2006 revoking the European patent No. 1 161 383 pursuant to Article 102(1),(3) EPC.

The appellants (patent proprietors) filed a notice of appeal on 22 September 2006 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed.

- II. By a communication dated 14 December 2006 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the registry of the Board informed the appellants that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellants were 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 22 September 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