Datasheet for the decision
of 18 December 2015

Case Number: T 1770/15 - 3.5.04
Application Number: 10197417.8
Publication Number: 2312835
IPC: H04N21/2747, H04N5/445, G06F3/00, G06F13/00, H04N21/472, H04N21/4335

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Interactive television systems with network-based digital video recording

Applicant:
Rovi Guides, Inc.

Headword:

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

Keyword:
"Missing statement of grounds"

Decisions cited:

Catchword:
Case Number: T 1770/15 - 3.5.04

DECISION
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.04
of 18 December 2015

Appellant: Rovi Guides, Inc.
(Applicant)
2830 De La Cruz Boulevard
Santa Clara, CA 95050 (US)

Representative: Curran, Clair
Ropes & Gray International LLP
5 New Street Square
London EC4A 3BF (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 31 March 2015 refusing European patent application No. 10197417.8 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:
Chairman M. Paci
Members: C. Kunzelmann
B. Müller
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division of 3 February 2015, posted on 31 March 2015.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 27 May 2015 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 14 September 2015, 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 has been 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.
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