

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 1 February 2010**

**Case Number:** T 0724/09 - 3.5.05

**Application Number:** 04761775.8

**Publication Number:** 1660985

**IPC:** G06F 3/14

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Method and data structure for user interface customization

**Applicant:**

Research In Motion Limited

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing statement of grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 0724/09 - 3.5.05

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.05  
of 1 February 2010

**Appellant:** Research In Motion Limited  
295 Phillip Street  
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3W8 (CA)

**Representative:** Patel, Binesh  
Barker Brettell LLP  
10-12 Priests Bridge  
London SW15 5JE (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 26 September 2008  
refusing European patent application  
No. 04761775.8 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** D. H. Rees  
**Members:** M. Höhn  
F. Blumer

## Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office posted 26 September 2008 refusing European patent application No. 04761775.8.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 18 November 2008 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

A written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was not filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. Nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as such statement.

II. In a communication dated 7 April 2009, the Board informed the appellant that no statement setting out the grounds of appeal had been received and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed within two months.

III. The appellant filed no observations in response to said communication.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC, the appeal is inadmissible pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC.

## **Order**

**For these reasons it is decided that:**

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar

The Chairman

K. Götz

D. Rees