

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 4 December 2014**

**Case Number:** T 1321/14 - 3.4.01

**Application Number:** 09731065.0

**Publication Number:** 2274636

**IPC:** G01R33/565

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

RF PULSE DISTORTION CORRECTION IN MRI

**Applicant:**

Regents of the University of Minnesota

**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 1321/14 - 3.4.01

**D E C I S I O N**  
**of Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.01**  
**of 4 December 2014**

**Appellant:** Regents of the University of Minnesota  
(Applicant) 1000 Westgate Drive, Suite 160  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55114-8658 (US)

**Representative:** Prock, Thomas  
Marks & Clerk LLP  
90 Long Acre  
London WC2E 9RA (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted on 10 December  
2013 refusing European patent application No.  
09731065.0 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman** G. Assi  
**Members:** P. Fontenay  
J. Geschwind

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

- I. The appeal lies from the decision of the examining division to refuse the European patent application No. 09 731 065.0. The decision was notified by registered letter with advice of delivery dated 10 December 2013.
- II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal against said decision by a letter received on 12 February 2014 and paid the prescribed appeal fee on the same day.
- III. No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. Nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as constituting such a statement.
- IV. In a communication dated 20 June 2014 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Board informed the appellant that no written statement of grounds had been received and that the appeal should be expected to be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108 EPC, third sentence, 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 which reached the addressee on 25 June 2014.
- V. 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:



R. Schumacher

G. Assi

Decision electronically authenticated