

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 29 April 2015**

Case Number: T 0050/15 - 3.2.06

Application Number: 12162682.4

Publication Number: 2484622

IPC: B66B7/06, D07B1/16, D07B5/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Elevator load bearing member having a jacket with at least one
traction-enhancing exterior surface

Applicant:
Otis Elevator Company

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 0050/15 - 3.2.06

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.06
of 29 April 2015

Appellant: Otis Elevator Company
(Applicant) 10 Farm Springs Road
Farmington, CT 06032-2568 (US)

Representative: Ramsay, Laura Anne
Dehns
St Bride's House
10 Salisbury Square
London EC4Y 8JD (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 30 July 2014 refusing European patent application No. 12162682.4 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman M. Harrison
Members: T. Rosenblatt
M.-B. Tardo-Dino

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division posted on 30 July 2014 refusing European patent application No. 12 162 682.4.
- II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 9 October 2014 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. By communication of 15 January 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:



N. Schneider

M. Harrison

Decision electronically authenticated