

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 22 December 2010**

Case Number: T 1894/10 - 3.2.06

Application Number: 04017657.0

Publication Number: 1504838

IPC: B23F 21/10

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Resharpenable pinion type cutter with arbitrary tooth shape

Applicant:

HARMONIC DRIVE SYSTEMS INC.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 101

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Inadmissibility of the appeal - missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1894/10 - 3.2.06

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.06
of 22 December 2010

Appellant:

HARMONIC DRIVE SYSTEMS INC.
25-3, Minamiohi 6-chome
Shinagawa-ku
Tokyo 140-0013 (JP)

Representative:

Klunker . Schmitt-Nilson . Hirsch
Patentanwälte
Destouchesstrasse 68
D-80796 München (DE)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 6 April 2010
refusing European patent application
No. 04017657.0 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: P. Alting van Geusau
Members: G. de Crignis
W. Sekretaruk

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. This matter concerns the appeal against the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 6 April 2010 refusing European patent application No. 04017657.0.

- II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 16 June 2010 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. 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, third sentence, and Rule 101(1) EPC.

- III. By a communication dated 20 September 2010, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received on 21 September 2010, 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.

- IV. No response was made to the Registry's 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, third sentence, 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

M. Patin

P. Alting van Geusau