

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 13 January 2017**

Case Number: T 1745/16 - 3.3.04

Application Number: 11706712.4

Publication Number: 2539367

IPC: C07K16/22

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Anti-angiogenesis therapy for the treatment of ovarian cancer

Applicant:

F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG

Headword:

Anti-Angiogenesis/HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 101(1), 126(2), 131

Keyword:

"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 1745/16 - 3.3.04

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.04
of 13 January 2017

Appellant: F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG
(Applicant) Grenzacherstrasse 124
4070 Basel (CH)

Representative: Brodbeck, Michel
F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG
Patent Department CLP
Grenzacherstrasse 124
4070 Basel (CH)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 5 February 2016 refusing European patent application No. 11706712.4 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairwoman G. Alt
Members: M. Montrone
M. Blasi

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the examining division of 26 November 2015 refusing the European patent application No. 11 706 712.4. The decision was posted on 5 February 2016 and duly received by the applicant (hereinafter "the appellant").
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 14 March 2016 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. The Registry of the board informed the appellant by a communication of 27 July 2016, which it duly received, 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 Rules 126(2) and 131 EPC. In addition, neither the notice of appeal nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal 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 Chairwoman:



N. Schneider

G. Alt

Decision electronically authenticated