

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 3 August 2007**

**Case Number:** T 0116/07 - 3.5.03

**Application Number:** 04250913.3

**Publication Number:** 1460827

**IPC:** H04M 15/00

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Apparatus and method for providing multiple line billing in telecommunications systems

**Applicant:**

Lucent Technolgies, Inc.

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108

EPC R. 65(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing statement of grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 0116/07 - 3.5.03

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03  
of 3 August 2007

**Appellant:** Lucent Technologies, Inc.  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974-0636 (US)

**Representative:** Sarup, David Alexander  
Alcatel-Lucent Telecom Limited  
Unit 18, Core 3,  
Workzone  
Innova Business Park  
Electric Avenue  
Enfield, EN3 7XU (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 23 May 2006  
refusing European application No. 04250913.3  
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. S. Clelland  
**Members:** A. Ritzka  
M.-B. Tardo-Dino

## **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. 04250913.3. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on 23 May 2006.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 19 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 9 February 2007 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 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