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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of European Patent Office dated 8 June 2007 concerning maintenance of European patent No. 1214483 according to the auxiliary request (Article 102(3) EPC 1973).

The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 17 August 2007 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

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.

II. By a communication dated 22 November 2007 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds has been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

III. The Appellant filed no observations in response to said 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.
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