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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 14 March 2007 revoking the European patent No. 0950508 pursuant to Article 102(1) EPC 1973.

II. The appellant (patent proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 18 May 2007 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date.

No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed. In addition, the notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement within the meaning of Article 108 EPC, third sentence.

III. By a communication sent by registered post with advice of delivery on 3 September 2007 and received by the appellant on 6 September 2007, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement setting out the grounds of appeal 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. The attention of the appellant was also drawn to Rule 84a EPC 1973 and to Article 122 EPC 1973.

IV. No answer has been given 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 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

D. Meyfarth

W. Zellhuber