

Dr. Anoop Varghese Vs. the Controller of Patents, Patent Office, Ipr Building and Another

Dr. Anoop Varghese Vs. the Controller of Patents, Patent Office, Ipr Building and Another

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1117866

Court : Intellectual Property Appellate Board IPAB

Decided On : Jul-14-2009

Judge : Hon'ble Ms. S. Usha, Vice- Chairman & Hon'ble Shri S. Chandrasekaran, Technical Member

Appeal No. : M.P.No.2/2009 in TRA/10/08/PT/CH & TRA/10/08/PT/CH & M.P.No.1/2009 in TRA/9/08/PT/CH & TRA/9/08/PT/CH

Appellant : Dr. Anoop Varghese

Respondent : The Controller of Patents, Patent Office, Ipr Building and Another

Judgement :

HON'BLE MS. S. USHA, VICE-CHAIRMAN:

Both the counsel present. Counsel for applicant represents that he has no instructions from the applicant. As per directions of this Board, Registry had issued notice to the applicant and the same has been served on him. In spite of service, applicant has not appeared before this Board. Hence the rectification application is treated as abandoned as per rule 17(2) of the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (Procedure) Rules, 2003. . As the main rectification application has been dismissed, MP No.2/2009 does not survive.