

**Internal distribution code:**

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

**Datasheet for the decision  
of 10 September 2024**

**Case Number:** T 0848/24 - 3.5.06

**Application Number:** 18864500.6

**Publication Number:** 3692428

**IPC:** G06K9/00, G05D1/00, G06K9/32,  
G06K9/46, G06T7/11, G06K9/34,  
G06K9/52, G06K9/62, G06T7/194,  
G06T7/254, G08G1/01, G08G1/017

**Language of the proceedings:** EN

**Title of invention:**  
SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR AERIAL VIDEO TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

**Applicant:**  
TuSimple, Inc.

**Headword:**  
Appeal inadmissible/TuSimple, Inc.

**Relevant legal provisions:**  
EPC Art. 108  
EPC R. 99(2), 101(1), 127(2)

**Keyword:**  
Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds

**Decisions cited:**

**Catchword:**



**Beschwerdekammern**  
**Boards of Appeal**  
**Chambres de recours**

Boards of Appeal of the  
European Patent Office  
Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8  
85540 Haar  
GERMANY  
Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0

Case Number: T 0848/24 - 3.5.06

**D E C I S I O N**  
**of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.06**  
**of 10 September 2024**

**Appellant:** TuSimple, Inc.  
(Applicant) 9191 Towne Center Drive  
Suite 600  
San Diego, CA 92122 (US)

**Representative:** Murgitroyd & Company  
165-169 Scotland Street  
Glasgow G5 8PL (GB)

**Decision under appeal:** **Decision of the Examining Division of the  
European Patent Office posted on 18 January 2024  
refusing European patent application No.  
18864500.6 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

**Composition of the Board:**

**Chairman** M. Müller  
**Members:** T. Alecu  
K. Kerber-Zubrzycka

## **Summary of Facts and Submissions**

- I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the examining division posted on 18 January 2024, refusing European patent application No. 18864500.6 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.
- II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 16 February 2024 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.
- III. By communication of 25 June 2024, notified to the appellant via the EPO Mailbox Service on the same day, 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 has been received.

## **Reasons for the Decision**

No written statement of grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 127(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. Stridde

M. Müller

Decision electronically authenticated