

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 7 March 2014**

Case Number: T 1899/13 - 3.5.01

Application Number: 06718291.5

Publication Number: 1856664

IPC: G06Q40/00

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MANAGING TRADING USING ALERT MESSAGES
FOR OUTLYING TRADING ORDERS

Applicant:

eSpeed, Inc.

Headword:

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Keyword:

Admissibility of appeal - 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 1899/13 - 3.5.01

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 7 March 2014

Appellant: eSpeed, Inc.
(Applicant) 110 East 59th Street
New York, NY 10022 (US)

Representative: Beresford, Keith Denis Lewis
Beresford & Co.
16 High Holborn
London
WC1V 6BX (GB)

Decision under appeal: **Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 22 March 2013 refusing European patent application No. 06718291.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. Wibergh
Members: R. R. K. Zimmermann
D. Prietzel-Funk

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 22 March 2013 refusing European patent application No. 06718291.5.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 3 June 2013 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 a statement.

- II. In a communication dated 12 September 2013, 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:



T. Buschek

S. Wibergh

Decision electronically authenticated