

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 12 October 2012**

Case Number: T 1664/12 - 3.5.05

Application Number: 06840627.1

Publication Number: 1993238

IPC: H04L 29/12

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

A device and method and system for acquiring IPV6 address

Applicant:

Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

Opponent:

-

Headword:

IPV6 Address/HUAWEI

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Admissibility of appeal - missing statements of grounds"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1664/12 - 3.5.05

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.05
of 12 October 2012

Appellant:
(Applicant)

Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.
Huawei Administration Building
Bantian
Longgang District, Shenzhen
Guangdong 518129 (CN)

Representative:

Körber, Martin Hans
Mitscherlich & Partner
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte
Postfach 33 06 09
D-80066 München (DE)

Decision under appeal:

Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 7 February 2012
refusing European patent application
No. 06840627.1 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chair: A. Ritzka
Members: P. Corcoran
F. Blumer

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 7 February 2012 refusing European patent application No. 06840627.1

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 22 March 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 27 July 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 Chairwoman:

K. Götz

A. Ritzka