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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 22 December 2000 concerning maintenance of the European patent No. 0 585 747.

The Appellant (opponent) filed a Notice of Appeal on 22 February 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date.

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 16 May 2001, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellant that no Statement of Grounds had 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 to the Registry's communication has been received.

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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