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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 26 March 2001 revoking European patent No. 0 697 674 pursuant to Article 102(1) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: S. V. Steinbrener
Members: R. R. K. Zimmermann
E. Lachacinski
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 26 March 2001 revoking the European patent No. 0 697 674. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the applicant on the day it was given. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 31 May 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was received. 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 21 November 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 has been given 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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