

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 14 October 2015**

Case Number: T 0812/15 - 3.5.03

Application Number: 99310611.1

Publication Number: 1017253

IPC: H04R25/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Blind source separation for hearing aids

Patent Proprietors:

Sivantos GmbH
Siemens Corporation

Opponents:

Oticon A/S / GN Resound A/S / Widex A/S

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 99(2), 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 0812/15 - 3.5.03

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03
of 14 October 2015

Appellants: Sivantos GmbH
(Patent Proprietors) Henri-Dunant-Straße 100
91058 Erlangen (DE)

Siemens Corporation
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830 (US)

Representative: FDST Patentanwälte
Nordostpark 16
90411 Nürnberg (DE)

Respondents: Oticon A/S
(Opponents) Kongebakken 9
2765 Smørum (DK)

GN ReSound A/S
Lautrupbjerg 7
2750 Ballerup (DK)

Widex A/S
Nymoellevej 6
3540 Lyngby (DK)

Representative: Eisenführ Speiser
Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbH
Anna-Louisa-Karsch-Strasse 2
10178 Berlin (DE)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 18 February
2015 revoking European patent No. 1017253
pursuant to Article 101(3) (b) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman	F. van der Voort
Members:	K. Schenkel
	O. Loizou

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the opposition division dated 18 February 2015 according to which European patent No. 1017253 was revoked.
- II. The appellants (patent proprietors) filed a notice of appeal on 20 April 2015 and paid the appeal fee the same day.
- III. A statement of grounds of appeal had to be filed by 29 June 2015.
- IV. In a communication dated 13 July 2015, received by the appellants on 14 July 2015, the registrar of the board informed the appellants 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 appellants were informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.

- V. No reply to the communication was received.

Reasons for the Decision

1. 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.

2. 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.
3. 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. Rauh

F. van der Voort

Decision electronically authenticated