

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 13 April 2010**

Case Number: T 2250/09 - 3.3.07

Application Number: 05251480.9

Publication Number: 1584373

IPC: B01J 29/08

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Zeolite Y alkylation catalysts

Applicants:
Chevron Oronite Company LLC, et al

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):
-

Keyword:
"Missing Statement of Grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 2250/09 - 3.3.07

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.07
of 13 April 2010

Appellants:

Chevron Oronite Company LLC
6001 Bollinger Canyon Road
Bldg. T 3rd Floor
San Ramon
CA 94583-2324 (US)

and

Chevron Oronite S.A.
79 Rue Anatole France
FR-72309 Levallois Perret Cedex (FR)

Representative:

Nash, David Allan
Haseltine Lake LLP
Redcliff Quay
120 Redcliff Street
Bristol BS1 6HU (GB)

Decision under appeal:

**Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 12 June 2009
refusing European patent application
No. 05251480.9 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. Perryman
Members: B. ter Laan
F. Rousseau

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 12 June 2009.

The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 12 June 2009. The applicants filed a notice of appeal by Fax received on 21 July 2009 and paid the fee for appeal on 5 August 2009. No Statement of Grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

- II. By a communication dated 1 December 2009 and sent by registered post, 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.

- III. The Appellants filed no observations in response to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

S. Fabiani

S. Perryman