

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 30 May 2011**

Case Number: T 2339/10 - 3.5.01

Application Number: 06075422.3

Publication Number: 1667042

IPC: G06F 17/30

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

System and method for synchronizing electronic mail across a network

Applicant:

Visto 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 2339/10 - 3.5.01

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 30 May 2011

Appellant: Visto Corporation
101 Redwood Shores Parkway, Suite 400
Redwood City, CA 94065 (US)

Representative: Spaargaren, Jerome
EIP
Fairfax House
15 Fulwood Place
London WC1V 6HU (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 25 May 2010
refusing European patent application
No. 06075422.3 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. Wibergh
Members: R. R. K. Zimmermann
D. Prietzel-Funk

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 25 May 2010 refusing European patent application No. 06075422.3.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 20 July 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 December 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