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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The Appellants I (Opponents 03), Appellants II (Opponents 04) and Appellants III (Opponents 11) lodged appeals against the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division, dated 16 October 2000, on the amended form in which European Patent No. 0 136 011 can be maintained.

II. Appellants II withdrew their opposition and their appeal on 19 September 2003.

III. Appellants III withdrew their opposition on 26 September 2003.

IV. Appellants I filed a notice of appeal on 28 November 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.

V. By a communication dated 27 April 2001 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the registry of the Board informed the Appellants I that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible.

   The Appellants I were invited to file observations within two months. Attention was also drawn to Article 122 EPC. No answer was given to the registry's communication.
Reasons for the Decision

1. The withdrawal of opposition by Appellants III (opponents 11) is regarded as withdrawal of their appeal (decision of the Enlarged Board of Appeal G 8/93, OJ EPO 1994, 887; point 2 of the Grounds for the Decision).

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

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal of Appellants I is rejected as inadmissible.
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