

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 9 September 2019**

Case Number: T 1519/19 - 3.4.01

Application Number: 08806253.4

Publication Number: 2198314

IPC: G01R29/02, G01R13/02

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

PULSE ANALYZER

Applicant:

Mitsubishi Electric Information Technology Centre
Europe B.V.
Mitsubishi Electric Corporation

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101, 99(2)

Keyword:

Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds



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 1519/19 - 3.4.01

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.01
of 9 September 2019

Appellant: Mitsubishi Electric Information Technology
(Applicant 1) Centre
Europe B.V.
20 Frederick Sanger Road
The Surrey Research Park
Guildford
Surrey GU2 7YD (GB)

Appellant: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation
(Applicant 2) 7-3, Marunouchi 2-chome
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8310 (JP)

Representative: Whitlock, Holly Elizabeth Ann
Maucher Jenkins
26 Caxton Street
London SW1H 0RJ (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 6 December 2018
refusing European patent application No.
08806253.4 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman P. Scriven
Members: T. Zinke
R. Winkelhofer

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. On 15 February 2019, the Applicants filed a notice of appeal against the decision to refuse the patent application, which was notified on 16 December 2018. The appeal fee was paid the same day.
- II. No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed.
- III. By communication of 29 May 2019, the appellants' attention was drawn to the missing statement of grounds, and to the legal consequence that the appeal was likely to be rejected as inadmissible. Any observations would have to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.
- IV. No such observations were submitted.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit of Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rules 99 (2) and 126(2) EPC. Therefore, the appeal is 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

P. Scriven

Decision electronically authenticated