

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 23 April 2008**

Case Number: T 1417/07 - 3.5.04

Application Number: 01460075.3

Publication Number: 1316922

IPC: G06T17/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Adaptative method for displaying a graphic scene on a terminal based on wavelets coding

Applicant:

France Telecom

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108, third sentence
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1417/07 - 3.5.04

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.04
of 23 April 2008

Appellant: France Telecom
6, Place d'Alleray
F-75015 Paris (FR)

Representative: Vidon, Patrice
Cabinet Vidon
16 B, rue Jouanet - B.P. 90333
Technopole Atalante
F-35703 Rennes Cedex 7 (FR)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 09 March 2007
refusing European application No. 01460075.3
pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: F. Edlinger
Members: M. Paci
C. Vallet

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division dated 9 March 2007 refusing European patent application No. 01 460 075.3.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal received on 9 May 2007 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. In a communication dated 5 October 2007 sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds had been received and that the appeal would be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed within two months.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Article 108 EPC requires that a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed within four months of notification of the decision. Pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC the appeal shall be rejected as inadmissible if it does not comply with Article 108 EPC.
2. In the present case no document was filed by the appellant which could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal. Consequently the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

D. Sauter

F. Edlinger