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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. This matter concerns an appeal against the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division posted on 2 April 2007, concerning the maintenance of European patent No. 0 984 841 in amended form.

II. The appellant (proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 11 June 2007 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 24 September 2007, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received on 25 September 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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