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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. Opponent 01 (appellant) filed on 30 June 2004 a notice of appeal against the decision of the opposition division dated 23 April 2004 whereby the oppositions against European Patent No. 0 620 850 with the title "Immunogenic detoxified mutants of cholera toxin and of the toxin LT, their preparation and their use for the preparation of vaccines" were rejected under Article 102(2) EPC. The appeal fee was paid on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed.

II. By a communication dated 14 October 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 therefore the appeal had to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months and attention was drawn to the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC. The appellant did not reply to said communication. Nor was a request for re-establishment of rights filed.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed and as the notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal according to Article 108 EPC, 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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