

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 8 June 2010**

**Case Number:** T 2315/09 - 3.5.01

**Application Number:** 98901746.2

**Publication Number:** 1010115

**IPC:** G06F 17/60

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**  
Internet advertising system

**Applicant:**  
BEH Investments LLC

**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 2315/09 - 3.5.01

**DECISION  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01  
of 8 June 2010**

**Appellant:** BEH Investments LLC  
1652 48th Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11204 (US)

**Representative:** Hoarton, Lloyd Douglas Charles  
Forrester & Boehmert  
Pettenkoferstrasse 20-22  
80336 München (DE)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 23 June 2009  
refusing European patent application  
No. 98901746.2 pursuant to Article 97(2)  
EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** S. Wibergh  
**Members:** R. R. K. Zimmermann  
P. Schmitz

**Summary of Facts and Submissions**

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 23 June 2009 refusing European patent application No. 98901746.2.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 21 August 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 a statement.

II. In a communication dated 11 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. 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

T. Buschek

S. Wibergh