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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 2 June 2000, concerning maintenance of European patent No. 0 496 323 in amended form.

The Appellant (Opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 11 August 2000 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

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 30 January 2001, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, 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 invited to file observations within two months.

III. No answer has been given within the given time limit 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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