

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 29 July 2011**

**Case Number:** T 0773/11 - 3.5.05

**Application Number:** 99308164.5

**Publication Number:** 0994407

**IPC:** G06F 3/023

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**

Computer user interface

**Patentee:**

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.

**Opponent:**

-

**Headword:**

-

**Relevant legal provisions:**

EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 101(1)

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

-

**Keyword:**

"Missing Statement of Grounds"

**Decisions cited:**

-

**Catchword:**

-



Case Number: T 0773/11 - 3.5.05

**D E C I S I O N**  
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.05  
of 29 July 2011

**Appellant:** SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.  
416 Maetan-dong  
Paldal-ku  
Suwon  
Kyunggi-do (KR)

**Representative:** Boakes, Jason Carrington  
Harrison Goddard Foote  
106 Micklegate  
York YO1 6JX (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted 28 October 2010  
refusing European patent application  
No. 99308164.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman:** A. Ritzka  
**Members:** P. Cretaine  
D. Prietzel-Funk

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 28 October 2010 refusing European patent application No. 99308164.5

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 6 January 2011 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 statement.

II. In a communication dated 13 April 2011, 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

K. Götz

A. Ritzka