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Summary of Facts and Submissions

The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 23 November 2007, revoking the European patent No. 861 316 pursuant to Article 101(2) EPC 1973.

The Appellant (Patentee) filed a notice of appeal on 18 January 2008 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. The notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal pursuant to Article 108 EPC. No further submissions were filed by the Appellant.

In a communication dated 28 May 2008 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Board informed the Appellant that no statement setting out the grounds of appeal had been received and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The Appellant was invited to file observations within two months from notification of the communication.

No answer has been given within the given time limit to the Board's communication.
Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed and as the notice of appeal does not contain anything that could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal according to Article 108 EPC, 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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