

Internal distribution code:

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

D E C I S I O N
of 16 September 2005

Case Number: T 0300/05 - 3.5.03

Application Number: 02714751.1

Publication Number: 1354424

IPC: H04B 1/707

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Simplified block linear equalizer with block space time
transmit diversity

Applicant:

INTERDIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 0300/05 - 3.5.03

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03
of 16 September 2005

Appellant: INTERDIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
Suite 527, 300 Delaware Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19801 (US)

Representative: Ellner, Lars O.
AWAPATENT AB, Box 45086
SE-10430 Stockholm (SE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the examining division of the
European Patent Office posted 13 September 2004
refusing European application No. 02714751.1
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. S. Clelland
Members: F. van der Voort
R. Moufang

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal lies from the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 13 September 2004 refusing European patent application No. 02 714 751.1. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on the day it was given.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 12 November 2004. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 30 March 2005 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the registry of the board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months and attention was drawn to the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC.

III. No answer has been given to the registry's communication within the time limit.

Reasons for the Decision

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

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

D. Magliano

A. S. Clelland