

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 2 January 2012**

**Case Number:** T 1474/11 - 3.4.02  
**Application Number:** 06075345.6  
**Publication Number:** 1691181  
**IPC:** G01J 5/34, G01J 5/20,  
G01J 5/10, G01J 5/02  
**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Apparatus and method for providing thermal conductance in thermally responsive photonic imaging devices

**Applicant:**

Delphi Technologies, Inc.

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing Statement of Grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 1474/11 - 3.4.02

**DECISION**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.02  
of 2 January 2012

**Appellant:**  
(Applicant)

Delphi Technologies, Inc.  
PO Box 5052  
Troy, MI 48007 (US)

**Representative:**

Denton, Michael John  
Delphi France SAS  
64 Avenue de la Plaine de France  
ZAC Paris Nord II  
B.P. 65059, Tremblay en France  
FR-95972 Roissy Charles de Gaulle Cedex (FR)

**Decision under appeal:**

Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 18 January 2011  
refusing European patent application  
No. 06075345.6 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. G. Klein  
**Members:** F. Maaswinkel  
B. Müller

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 18 January 2011 refusing European patent application No. 06075345.6.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 2 March 2011 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.

II. In a communication dated 11 July 2011, 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**

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