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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 30 January 2007 revoking European patent No. 0825847 pursuant to Article 102(1) EPC.
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Chairman: S. Perryman
Members: B. ter Laan
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. In its written decision issued 30 January 2007 the Opposition Division revoked the European patent No. 825847.

With facsimile dated 5 April 2007 the Appellants (Patent Proprietors) filed a Notice of Appeal against this decision and paid the appeal fee on the same date. The Appellants requested that the patent be maintained as granted.

No statement of Grounds had arrived during the 4 month filing period envisaged by Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 18 July 2007 and sent by registered letter, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellants that no Statement of Grounds had been filed and that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The Appellants were invited to file observations within two months.

III. No response to said communication was received by the EPO.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, and since the Notice of Appeal does not contain anything 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 101(1) (formerly 65(1)) EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:       The Chairman:

K. Götz               S. Perryman