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 July 2020

Case Number: T 2987/19 - 3.5.01
Application Number: 11765154.7
Publication Number: 2556439
IPC: G06F15/16, H04N21/2662, H04N21/24, H04N21/2385, H04L29/06, H04L12/825, H04N21/845
Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
MANAGING STREAMING BANDWIDTH FOR MULTIPLE CLIENTS

Applicant:
Vasona Networks

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 99(2), 101(1), 126(2)

Keyword:
Admissibility of appeal - missing statement of grounds
Case Number: T 2987/19 - 3.5.01

DECISION of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.01
of 10 July 2020

Appellant: Vasona Networks
(Applicant)
2900 Lakeside Drive Suite 180
Santa Clara, California 95054 (US)

Representative: WP Thompson
138 Fetter Lane
London EC4A 1BT (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 22 May 2019
refusing European patent application No.
11765154.7 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:
Chairman W. Chandler
Members: A. Wahrenberg
P. Schmitz
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division posted on 22 May 2019, refusing European patent application 11765154.7.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 10 July 2019 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 14 November 2019, 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 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, the notice of appeal does not contain 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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