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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 24 January 2000 maintaining the European patent No. 0 672 670 in amended form. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 24 January 2000. The proprietor filed a notice of appeal by letter dated 31 March 2000, received on 31 March 2000, and paid the fee for appeal on 31 March 2000. No Statement of Grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 26 February 2002 and sent by registered letter, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellant that no Statement of Grounds has been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellant was informed about the possibility of filing a request for reestablishment of rights under Article 122 EPC and was invited to file observations within two months.

III. The Appellant filed no observations in response to the Registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 65(1) EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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