

Internal distribution code:

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

D E C I S I O N
of 7 November 2002

Case Number: T 0545/02 - 3.5.1

Application Number: 95307806.0

Publication Number: 0712066

IPC: G06F 3/033, G06F 3/023

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Computing interface system

Applicant:
AT&T Corp.

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 65(1)

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 0545/02 - 3.5.1

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.1
of 7 November 2002

Appellant: AT&T Corp.
32 Avenue of the Americas
New York
NY, 10013-2412 (US)

Representative: Buckley, Christopher Simon Thirsk
Lucent Technologies (UK) Ltd
5 Mornington Road
Woodford Green
Essex IG8 0TU (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 22 November 2001
refusing European patent application
No. 95 307 806.0 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. V. Steinbrener
Members: A. S. Clelland
P. Mühlens

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 22 November 2001 refusing the European patent application No. 95 307 806.0. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 22 November 2001. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 14 January 2002 and paid the fee for appeal on 15 January 2002. No statement of grounds was filed.
- II. By a communication dated 18 July 2001 and sent by registered post, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds has been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.
- III. The appellant filed no observations in response to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit provided by Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 78(2) EPC), the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 65(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

M. Kiehl

S. V. Steinbrener