

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 17 December 2009**

Case Number: T 1577/09 - 3.5.03

Application Number: 99916368.6

Publication Number: 1068719

IPC: H04M 15/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Automated fraud management in transaction-based networks

Applicant:

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1577/09 - 3.5.03

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03
of 17 December 2009

Appellant: LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill
NJ 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 5 February 2009
refusing European application No. 99916368.6
pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. S. Clelland
Members: B. Noll
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. 99916368.6. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on 5 February 2009.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal by a letter received on 3 April 2009. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day.

No separate statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 3 August 2009 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.

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 101(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