

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 29 January 2010**

Case Number: T 1807/09 - 3.5.05

Application Number: 03790502.3

Publication Number: 1570331

IPC: G06F 1/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Method and system for providing chaining of access rules in a digital rights management system

Applicant:

GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION

Headword:

Digital Rights Management/GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Missing grounds of appeal"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1807/09 - 3.5.05

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.05
of 29 January 2010

Appellant: GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, Pennsylvania 19044 (US)

Representative: McLeish, Nicholas Alistair Maxwell
Boulton Wade Tennant
Verulam Gardens
70 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8BT (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 2 April 2009
refusing European patent application
No. 03790502.3 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: D. H. Rees
Members: P. Cretaine
P. Schmitz

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 2 April 2009 refusing European patent application No. 03790502.3.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 4 June 2009 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 16 September 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 without two months.
- III. The appellant filed no observation in response to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the 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. H. Rees