BESCHWERDEKAMMERN BOARDS OF APPEAL OF PATENTAMTS

OFFICE

CHAMBRES DE RECOURS DES EUROPÄISCHEN THE EUROPEAN PATENT DE L'OFFICE EUROPÉEN DES BREVETS

Internal distribution code:

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

Datasheet for the decision of 23 April 2019

Case Number: T 1928/16 - 3.5.02

Application Number: 08736348.7

Publication Number: 2041853

IPC: H02J3/14, H02J3/32, H02J3/38

Language of the proceedings: ΕN

Title of invention:

A Load Management Controller for a Household Electrical Installation

Patent Proprietor:

Cooper, Timothy Patrick

Opponents:

SIB Energy Limited Stiebel Eltron GmbH & Co. KG Viessmann Werke GmbH & Co. KG SMA Solar Technology AG

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC R. 84(1)

Keyword:

Lapse of patent in all designated states - continuation of appeal proceedings (no)

Decisions cited:

T 0708/01



Beschwerdekammern Boards of Appeal Chambres de recours

Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8 85540 Haar GERMANY

Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0 Fax +49 (0)89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 1928/16 - 3.5.02

DECISION
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.02
of 23 April 2019

Appellant: Cooper, Timothy Patrick

(Patent Proprietor) Cambridge Mews

Sandycove Avenue East

Dun Laoghaire County Dublin (IE)

Representative: O'Connor, Michael Donal

Cruickshank

8a Sandyford Business Centre

Sandyford Dublin 18 (IE)

Respondent: SIB Energy Limited (Opponent 1) 32 Thorpe Wood

Thorpe Wood Business Park

Peterborough

Cambridgeshire PE3 6SR (GB)

Representative: Forsyth, Helen Jane

Nash Matthews LLP 24 Hills Road

Cambridge CB2 1JP (GB)

Respondent: Stiebel Eltron GmbH & Co. KG

(Opponent 2) Dr.-Stiebel-Str. 37603 Holzminden (DE)

Respondent: Viessmann Werke GmbH & Co. KG

(Opponent 3) Viessmannstrasse 1 35107 Allendorf (DE)

Representative: MERH-IP Matias Erny Reichl Hoffmann

Patentanwälte PartG mbB

Paul-Heyse-Strasse 29 80336 München (DE)

Respondent: SMA Solar Technology AG

Sonnenallee 1

(Opponent 4) 34266 Niestetal (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the

European Patent Office posted on 10 June 2016 revoking European patent No. 2041853 pursuant to

Article 101(3)(b) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman R. Lord Members: G. Flyng

W. Ungler

- 1 - T 1928/16

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The patent proprietor has appealed against the decision of the Opposition Division of 10 June 2016 revoking the European patent No. EP 2 041 853.
- II. The patent has meanwhile lapsed in all designated Contracting States.
- III. By a communication of the Board of 4 February 2019, the attention of the parties was drawn to Rule 84(1) EPC and the appellant (patent proprietor) was invited to inform the Board within two months from notification of the communication whether it was requested that the appeal proceedings be continued. The parties were advised that if no request for continuation of the appeal proceedings was received, the Board intended to terminate the appeal proceedings.
- IV. Within the time period set in the above communication no reply was filed.

Reasons for the Decision

- 1. If a European patent has lapsed in all designated Contracting States, opposition proceedings may be continued at the request of the opponent, Rule 84(1) EPC. It follows from Rule 100(1) EPC that this also applies in appeal proceedings following opposition proceedings.
- 2. However, if, as in the present case, the patent proprietor is the appellant, it would be inappropriate to allow the opponent to determine whether or not the appeal proceedings are to be continued. For this

- 2 - T 1928/16

reason, Rule 84(1) EPC has to be applied in such cases so that the patent proprietor can request that the appeal proceedings be continued (see decision T0708/01, not published in OJ EPO, and Case Law of the Boards of Appeal, eighth edition, IV.C.4.1.2.b - Request for continuation of the proceedings made by the patent proprietor).

- 3. The patent proprietor has been invited to file such a request for continuation, but has not done so.
- 4. The appeal proceedings are consequently terminated by this decision of the Board.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal proceedings are terminated.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



U. Bultmann

R. Lord

Decision electronically authenticated