

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 3 June 2008**

Case Number: T 0568/06 - 3.4.03

Application Number: 02740073.8

Publication Number: 1360676

IPC: G07F 17/24

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Parking Management Systems

Applicant:
Vehiclesense, Inc.

Opponent:
-

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 54, 56

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):
-

Keyword:
"Main request - Novelty (no)"
"1st and 2nd Auxiliary request - Inventive step (no)"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 0568/06 - 3.4.03

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.4.03
of 3 June 2008

Appellant: Vehiclesense, Inc.
625 Massachusetts Avenue
Suite 5
P.O. Box 391389
Cambridge MA 02139 (US)

Representative: Boyce, Conor
F. R. Kelly & Co.
27 Clyde Road
Ballsbridge
Dublin 4 (IE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 28 November 2005
refusing European application No. 02740073.8
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: R. G. O'Connell
Members: V. L. P. Frank
T. Bokor

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. This is an appeal against the refusal of application 02 740 073 for lack of novelty (Article 54 EPC 1973).
- II. On appeal the applicant requested grant of a patent on the basis of a main, 1st or 2nd auxiliary requests. Auxiliarily oral proceedings were requested.
- III. In a reasoned communication annexed to the summons to oral proceedings appointed for 10 June 2008, the board informed the appellant of its provisional opinion that the system of claim 1 of the main request was not new over WO 99 30 290 A and that the system of claim 1 of the 1st or 2nd auxiliary requests did not involve an inventive step considering the same document and common general knowledge in the art.
- IV. By letter dated 26 May 2008 the appellant applicant's representatives informed the board that they would not attend the oral proceedings.
- V. The oral proceedings were consequentially cancelled.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The appeal is admissible.
2. In the communication of the board, the appellant applicant was informed in detail of the reasons for the board's preliminary view that the systems of claim 1 of the main, 1st or 2nd requests were not allowable (Article 54 and 56 EPC 1973).

3. The appellant did not file any substantive response to the communication, but announced that he would not be represented at the oral proceedings. Having reconsidered its own reasoned objections as set out in the said communication and making express reference thereto, the board sees no reason to depart from them. Consequently, the appellant's requests fall to be refused.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is dismissed.

Registrar:

Chair:

S. Sánchez Chiquero

R. G. O'Connell