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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 30 December 2003, maintaining the European patent No. 0 524 501 in amended form.

The Appellant (Opponent) filed a Notice of Appeal on 26 February 2004 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 11 June 2004 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 and attention was drawn to Rule 84a EPC (late receipt of documents) and to Article 122 EPC (re-establishment of rights).

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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