

considered that the case involved a single event because the two time limits had been missed for the same reason and therefore held that one of the fees had to be reimbursed.

In T 2017/12 (OJ 2014, A76) the appellant had missed the time limits for filing the appeal and the statement of grounds of appeal. It had **paid the fee** for re-establishment of rights **twice**, once for each missed time limit. The board refused the request for refund of one of the fees. In line with decision J 26/95, the board considered that the corresponding time limits expired independently of one another, notwithstanding the fact that they were triggered by the same event. Consequently, two fees for re-establishment were indeed due and hence a refund of one of those fees was not possible.

See also in this chapter III.E.4.5. "Number of re-establishment fees due where more than one time limit is missed".