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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office rejecting the opposition against the European patent No. 0 447 319. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 8 February 2001. The Opponent filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 5 April 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 6 December 2001 and sent by registered post, 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. 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 within the time limit provided by Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 78(2) EPC, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 65(1) EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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