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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 13 February 2007 revoking European Patent No. 0629735 pursuant to Article 102(1) EPC.
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. This matter concerns an appeal against the decision of the Opposition Division announced at the oral proceedings held on 29 November 2006 revoking European Patent No. 0 629 735. The written decision was posted on 13 February 2007.

II. The appellant (proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 29 November 2006 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date.

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

III. By a communication dated 13 July 2007, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received on 16 July 2007, 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 Article 122 EPC (re-establishment of rights).

IV. No response was made to the Registry's communication.

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 (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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