

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 June 2015**

Case Number: T 2217/13 - 3.2.04

Application Number: 07750700.2

Publication Number: 1988811

IPC: A47L25/08, A47L13/16

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

WEAR INDICATOR FOR A FLOCKED SCOURING MATERIAL

Patent Proprietor:

3M Innovative Properties Company

Opponent:

Carl Freudenberg KG

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:

Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds

Decisions cited:

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 2217/13 - 3.2.04

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.04
of 10 June 2015

Appellant: Carl Freudenberg KG
(Opponent) 69469 Weinheim (DE)

Respondent: 3M Innovative Properties Company
(Patent Proprietor) 3M Center
P.O.Box 33427
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427 (US)

Representative: Vossius & Partner
Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte mbB
Siebertstrasse 3
81675 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 15 October 2013
rejecting the opposition filed against European
patent No. 1988811 pursuant to Article 101(2)
EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman A. de Vries
Members: J. Wright
T. Bokor

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Opposition Division of 12 September 2013, posted on 15 October 2013.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 23 October 2013 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. By communication of 20 March 2015, received by the appellant, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that it appeared from the file that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed, and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.
- IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC. In addition, neither the notice of appeal nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC.

Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



G. Magouliotis

A. de Vries

Decision electronically authenticated