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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted 2 November 2001 refusing European patent application No. 93 303 518.0 pursuant to Article 97(1) EPC.
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 2 November 2001 refusing the European patent application No. 93 303 518.0. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 2 November 2001. The applicant filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 17 December 2001 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 18 July 2002 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 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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