

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 17 October 2012**

Case Number: T 1242/12 - 3.5.06

Application Number: 07710246.5

Publication Number: 1974253

IPC: G06F 7/499, G06F 7/533

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Pre-saturating fixed-point multiplier

Applicant:
QUALCOMM Incorporated

Headword:
-

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1242/12 - 3.5.06

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.06
of 17 October 2012

Appellant: QUALCOMM Incorporated
(Applicant) 5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121 (US)

Representative: Dunlop, Hugh Christopher
R.G.C. Jenkins & Co.
26 Caxton Street
London SW1H 0RJ (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 19 December 2011
refusing European patent application
No. 07710246.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: D. H. Rees
Members: G. Zucka
C. Heath

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 19 December 2011 refusing European patent application No. 07 710 246.5.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 29 February 2012 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 5 June 2012, 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:

B. Atienza Vivancos

D. H. Rees