

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 14 December 2010**

Case Number: T 1149/10 - 3.5.01

Application Number: 00991702.2

Publication Number: 1242909

IPC: G06F 17/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Method and system for content-based document security, routing,
and action execution

Applicant:

Sequoia Software 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 1149/10 - 3.5.01

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 14 December 2010

Appellant: Sequoia Software Corporation
8890 McGaw Road
Columbia, MD 21045 (US)

Representative: O'Connell, David Christopher
Haseltine Lake LLP
Redcliff Quay
120 Redcliff Street
Bristol BS1 6HU (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 15 December 2009
refusing European patent application
No. 00991702.2 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. Wibergh
Members: K. Bumès
G. Weiss

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 15 December 2009 refusing European patent application No. 00991702.2.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 12 February 2010 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 2 June 2010, 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