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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal lies from the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 4 August 2000 refusing the European patent application No. 95 939 135.0. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 23 August 2000. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 9 October 2000 and paid the fee for appeal on 9 October 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 2 February 2001 and sent by registered post, 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. The Appellant filed no observations in response to said 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.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

V. Commare W. D. Weiß