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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is from the interlocutory decision of the opposition division dated 5 August 2005 concerning the maintenance in amended form of European patent No. 294 397, granted in respect of European patent application No. 87905893.1.

II. The appellant (patent proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 14 October 2005. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day. The notice of appeal contains an auxiliary request for oral proceedings. No separate statement of grounds was filed.

III. By a communication dated 1 February 2006, 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 the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC.

IV. No answer has been given to the registry's communication within the time limit. In a letter dated 16 August 2006 the appellant withdrew its request for oral proceedings.
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 according to Article 108 EPC last sentence 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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