

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 10 February 2015**

Case Number: T 1590/11 - 3.4.03

Application Number: 01309923.9

Publication Number: 1293955

IPC: G09F9/33, G09G3/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Display apparatus

Patent Proprietor:

G-LEC Vision GmbH

Opponent:

bocom Energiespar-Technologien GmbH

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC R. 84(1), 100(1)

Keyword:

Lapse of patent in all designated states - termination of
appeal proceedings

Decisions cited:

T 0708/01

Catchword:



**Beschwerdekammern
Boards of Appeal
Chambres de recours**

European Patent Office
D-80298 MUNICH
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0) 89 2399-0
Fax +49 (0) 89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 1590/11 - 3.4.03

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.03
of 10 February 2015

Appellant: G-LEC Vision GmbH
(Patent Proprietor) Im Stockmädle 15
76307 Karlsbad (DE)

Appellant: bocom Energiespar-Technologien GmbH
(Opponent) Wankelstrasse 13
D-41352 Korschenbroich (DE)

Representative: Albrecht, Ralf
Paul & Albrecht
Patentanwaltssozietät
Hellersbergstrasse 18
41460 Neuss (DE)

Decision under appeal: Interlocutory decision of the Opposition
Division of the European Patent Office posted on
5 May 2011 concerning maintenance of the
European Patent No. 1293955 in amended form.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman G. Eliasson
Members: V. Frank
T. Bokor

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeals by the patent proprietor and the opponent are directed against the interlocutory decision of the opposition division to maintain the European patent No. 1 293 955 in amended form.

- II. In a communication from the registrar of the board dated 21 November 2014 the parties were informed that the European patent had lapsed for all designated states and that the appeal proceedings could be continued at the request of the opponent provided that within two months from the notification of this communication a request to this effect was filed. It was also noted that, as the patent proprietor is also appellant in the present case, he is also entitled to request continuation (following decision T708/01 of 17 March 2005).

- III. Neither the opponent nor the patent proprietor requested continuation of the proceedings.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Pursuant to Rule 84(1) EPC in conjunction with Rule 100(1) EPC, proceedings will only be continued after the European patent has lapsed for non-payment of the renewal fees if there is a request to this effect by the opponent filed within two months as from the notification by the European Patent Office of the lapse.
In this case, the patent proprietor, also appellant, was also entitled to request continuation.

2. As in the present case the appellants did not request the continuation of the proceedings, these are to be terminated.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal proceedings are terminated.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



S. Sánchez Chiquero

G. Eliasson

Decision electronically authenticated