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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office rejecting the opposition against the European patent No. 0 599 207. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery on 6 April 2004. The Opponent filed a notice of appeal by letter received on 28 May 2004 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No Statement of Grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains an auxiliary request for oral proceedings but nothing that could be regarded as a Statement of Grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 23 September 2004 and sent by registered post, 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.

III. The Appellant filed no observations in response to said communication. By letter dated 25 February 2005, the Appellant withdrew the request for oral proceedings.

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). Rule 84a EPC is no longer applicable.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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