

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 10 June 2010**

**Case Number:** T 2228/09 - 3.5.01  
**Application Number:** 98906108.0  
**Publication Number:** 0976048  
**IPC:** G06F 12/06, G06F 12/08  
**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Page table walker which positions a sliding field in a virtual address using page size

**Applicant:**

Idea Corporation

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

**Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):**

-

**Keyword:**

"Missing statement of grounds of appeal"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-

**Case Number:** T 2228/09 - 3.5.01

**DECISION  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01  
of 10 June 2010**

**Appellant:** Idea Corporation  
19447 Pruneridge Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014 (US)

**Representative:** Wombwell, Francis  
Potts, Kerr & Co.  
15, Hamilton Square  
Birkenhead  
Merseyside CH41 6BR (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 8 June 2009  
refusing European patent application  
No. 98906108.0 pursuant to Article 97(2)  
EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** S. Wibergh  
**Members:** K. Bumés  
P. Schmitz

### **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 8 June 2009 refusing European patent application No. 98906108.0.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 17 August 2009 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. The notice of appeal contains an auxiliary request for oral proceedings.

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 a statement.

II. In a communication dated 1 December 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. In a letter dated 7 January 2010 the appellant declared that the auxiliary request for oral proceedings had not been intended to apply to the question of inadmissibility of the appeal as a consequence of the fact that a written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed. The appellant filed no further 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

T. Buschek

S. Wibergh