

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 28 August 2013**

Case Number: T 1121/13 - 3.5.06

Application Number: 06826783.0

Publication Number: 1955173

IPC: G06F 13/16, G11C 7/10

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Programmable preamble system and method

Applicant:
ATI Technologies Inc.

Headword:
-

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

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 1121/13 - 3.5.06

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.06
of 28 August 2013

Appellant:
(Applicant)

ATI Technologies Inc.
One Commerce Valley Drive East
Markham,
Ontario L3T 7X6 (CA)

Representative:

Maury, Richard Philip
Marks & Clerk LLP
90 Long Acre
London
WC2E 9RA (GB)

Decision under appeal:

**Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 4 December 2012
refusing European patent application
No. 06826783.0 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: D. H. Rees
Members: A. Teale
C. Heath

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division of 13.11.2012, posted on 4 December 2012.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 6 February 2013 and paid the appeal fee on 7 February 2013.
- III. By communication of 21.05.2013, received by the appellant, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that it appeared from the file that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed, and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.
- IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC. In addition, neither the notice of appeal nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC. Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:

C. Spira

D. H. Rees