

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 15 April 2011**

**Case Number:** T 1838/10 - 3.5.03

**Application Number:** 04750740.5

**Publication Number:** 1621005

**IPC:** H04M 11/00

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Using a mobile station for productivity tracking

**Applicant:**

Nokia Corporation

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

Mobile station for productivity tracking/NOKIA

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

**Keyword:**

"Missing statement of grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 1838/10 - 3.5.03

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.03  
of 15 April 2011

**Appellant:** Nokia Corporation  
Keilalahdentie 4  
FI-02150 Espoo (FI)

**Representative:** Read, Matthew Charles  
Venner Shipley LLP  
20 Little Britain  
London EC1A 7DH (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 25 March 2010  
refusing European patent application  
No. 04750740.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. S. Clelland  
**Members:** A. J. Madenach  
M.-B. Tardo-Dino

## **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. 04 750 740.5. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on 25 March 2010.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 2 June 2010 against the decision of the Examining Division. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day.

No separate statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 6 October 2010 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 reply from the appellant was received within this time-limit.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed within the time limit provided by Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC and 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:

G. Rauh

A. Clelland