

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 17 April 2012**

Case Number: T 2258/11 - 3.4.02

Application Number: 06844875.2

Publication Number: 1987392

IPC: G02F 3/00, G02B 6/122

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
All-optical logic gates using nonlinear elements

Applicant:
Coveytech, LLC

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 2258/11 - 3.4.02

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.02
of 17 April 2012

Appellant: Coveytech, LLC
(Applicant) 1920 Golf Club Way
Braselton GA 30516 (US)

Representative: Herbjørnsen, Rut
Albihns.Zacco
Valhallavägen 117
Box 5581
SE-114 85 Stockholm (SE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 6 May 2011
refusing European patent application
No. 06844875.2 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. G. Klein
Members: M. Rayner
B. Müller

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 6 May 2011 refusing European patent application No. 06 844 875.2.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 15 July 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 31 October 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