

Internal distribution code:

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

**Datasheet for the decision
of 21 August 2012**

Case Number: T 2633/11 - 3.5.01

Application Number: 03733140.2

Publication Number: 1508865

IPC: G06F 17/60

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Information processing system

Applicant:
Sony Corporation

Headword:
-

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

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):
-

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds of appeal"

Decisions cited:
-

Catchword:
-



Case Number: T 2633/11 - 3.5.01

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 21 August 2012

Appellant: Sony Corporation
(Applicant) 7-35, Kitashinagawa 6-chome
Shinagawa-ku
Tokyo 141-0001 (JP)

Representative: Melzer, Wolfgang
Mitscherlich & Partner
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte
Postfach 33 06 09
80066 München (DE)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted 15 July 2011
refusing European patent application
No. 03733140.2 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 15 July 2011 refusing European patent application No. 03733140.2.

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 8 September 2011 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. The notice of appeal contains an auxiliary request for oral proceedings.

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 30 December 2011, 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. In a letter dated 9 January 2012 the appellant declared that the auxiliary request for oral proceedings had not been intended to apply to the question of inadmissibility of the appeal and that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed since the applicant had decided to abandon the application.

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