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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is from the interlocutory decision of the opposition division dated 10 November 2003 concerning the maintenance in amended form of the European Patent No. 0 600 427 granted in respect of European patent application 93 119 238.9.

II. The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 19 January 2004. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on 19 January 2004. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

III. By a communication dated 26 April 2004, sent by registered post 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's attention was drawn to the provision concerning the late receipt of documents pursuant to Rule 84a EPC and to the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

IV. No answer was received within the given time limit to the Registry's 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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