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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. This matter concerns an appeal against the decision of the Opposition Division posted on 22 December 2006, revoking the European Patent No. 1 161 928.

II. The Appellant (Proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 28 February 2007 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No statement of grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contained nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

III. In a communication dated 5 June 2007, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery indicating receipt by the Appellant on 12 June 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.

IV. In the same communication, the Board's Registry informed the Appellant of the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC and the Appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

V. No response has been 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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