

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 13 July 2007**

Case Number: T 1843/06 - 3.5.03

Application Number: 99122254.8

Publication Number: 1006706

IPC: H04M 3/56

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Subconference calling in a telephony-over-lan environment

Applicant:

Siemens Communications, Inc.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

Subconference calling/SIEMENS

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-

Case Number: T 1843/06 - 3.5.03

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03
of 13 July 2007

Appellant: Siemens Communications, Inc.
900 Broken Sound Parkway
Boca Raton FL 33287 (US)

Representative: Westphal, Klaus
Patentanwälte
Westphal, Mussnug & Partner
Am Riettor 5
D-78048 Villingen-Schwenningen (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 19 May 2006
refusing European application No. 99122254.8
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. S. Clelland
Members: D. H. Rees
R. Moufang

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal lies from the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office refusing European patent application No. 99122254.8. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on 19 May 2006.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 17 July 2006. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day.

No separate statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 14 December 2006 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 reestablishment 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 and as the notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as statement of grounds pursuant to

Article 108 EPC, 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