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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 13 June 2006 refusing the European Patent application No. 01 993 527.9.

The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 23 August 2006 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 11 December 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.

Attention was also drawn to Article 122 EPC.

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

Reasons for the Decision

1. The notice of appeal filed on 23 August 2006 contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

2. As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, 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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