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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office maintaining European patent No. 0 857 453 in amended form. The decision was dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to each party on 1 December 2005.

The Appellant (Opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 10 February 2006 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed.

II. By a communication dated 15 May 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.

III. No answer has been given to the Registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed and the notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant 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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