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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 14 November 2003, refusing the European patent application No. 9 992 7143.0.

The Appellant filed a notice of appeal on 14 January 2004 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

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 13 July 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 was expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

III. No answer to the Registry's communication has been received within the two months time limit.

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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