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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal concerns the interlocutory decision of the opposition division of the European Patent Office posted on 6 March 2006 according to which the European patent No. 0 994 716 in amended form complies with the requirements of the EPC.

II. The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 16 May 2006 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

III. No statement of grounds was filed by the appellant. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

IV. By communication dated 31 August 2006 and 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. Attention was also drawn to Article 122 EPC.

V. The appellant did not file any observation within the time limit of two months and did not submit any further request.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal had been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 65(1) EPC in conjunction with Article 108 EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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