

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 18 May 2020**

Case Number: T 2936/19 - 3.2.04

Application Number: 13766682.2

Publication Number: 2852275

IPC: A01G7/04

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

LIGHTING DEVICE CAPABLE OF PROVIDING HORTICULTURE LIGHT AND
METHOD OF ILLUMINATING HORTICULTURE

Patent Proprietor:

Signify Holding B.V.

Opponent:

Valoya Oy

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

Keyword:

Admissibility of appeal - (no) - missing statement of grounds

Decisions cited:

Catchword:



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 2936/19 - 3.2.04

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.2.04
of 18 May 2020

Appellant: Signify Holding B.V.
(Patent Proprietor) High Tech Campus 48
5656 AE Eindhoven (NL)

Representative: Verweij, Petronella Daniëlle
Signify Netherlands B.V.
Intellectual Property
High Tech Campus 7
5656 AE Eindhoven (NL)

Respondent: Valoya Oy
(Opponent) Melkonkatu 26, 2nd floor
00210 Helsinki (FI)

Representative: LEITZINGER OY
Tammasaarekatu 1
00180 Helsinki (FI)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Opposition Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 26 August 2019
revoking European patent No. 2852275 pursuant to
Article 101(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman A. de Vries
Members: J. Wright
W. Van der Eijk

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Opposition Division posted on 26 August 2019.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 4 November 2019 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 20 January 2020, 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:



G. Magouliotis

A. de Vries

Decision electronically authenticated