

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 21 November 2013**

Case Number: T 1749/13 - 3.5.06

Application Number: 06740050.7

Publication Number: 1866827

IPC: G06F21/00, H04L12/58

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

APPARATUS AND METHODS FOR MANAGING CONTENT EXCHANGE ON A
WIRELESS DEVICE

Applicant:

Qualcomm Incorporated

Headword:

-

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:

Missing statement of grounds

Decisions cited:

Catchword:

-



**Beschwerdekammern
Boards of Appeal
Chambres de recours**

European Patent Office
D-80298 MUNICH
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0) 89 2399-0
Fax +49 (0) 89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 1749/13 - 3.5.06

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.06
of 21 November 2013

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 on 4 March 2013
refusing European patent application No.
06740050.7 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: D. Rees
Members: G. Zucka
M.-B. Tardo-Dino

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division of 20 December 2012, posted on 4 March 2013.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 14 May 2013 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. By communication of 19 August 2013, received by the appellant on 23 August 2013, 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:



L. Fernández Gómez

D. Rees

Decision electronically authenticated