

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 20 May 2011**

**Case Number:** T 2313/10 - 3.4.02

**Application Number:** 07005724.5

**Publication Number:** 1843194

**IPC:** G02F 1/1343

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Liquid crystal display device, semiconductor device, and  
electronic appliance

**Applicant:**

SEMICONDUCTOR ENERGY LABORATORY CO., LTD

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing Statement of Grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 2313/10 - 3.4.02

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.02  
of 20 May 2011

**Appellant:** SEMICONDUCTOR ENERGY LABORATORY CO., LTD.  
398 Hase  
Atsugi-shi, Kanagawa-ken 243-0036 (JP)

**Representative:** Grünecker, Kinkeldey  
Stockmair & Schwanhäusser  
Anwaltssozietät  
Leopoldstraße 4  
D-80802 München (DE)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 4 June 2010  
refusing European patent application  
No. 07005724.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. G. Klein  
**Members:** M. Stock  
B. Müller

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 4 June 2010 refusing European patent application No. 07 005 724.5.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 10 August 2010 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. The notice of appeal contains a request for oral proceedings.

A written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was not filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC.

II. In a communication dated 3 December 2010, 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. In a letter dated 5 May 2011 the appellant withdrew the request for oral proceedings.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. Nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as such statement pursuant to Article 108 and

Rule 99(2) EPC. Thus, the appeal is inadmissible pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC.

**Order**

**For these reasons it is decided that:**

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

M. Kiehl

A. G. Klein