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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the opposition division dispatched by registered letter with advice of delivery to the opponent 1 on 7 November 2008, concerning maintenance of the European patent No. 1 037 616 in amended form.

The appellant (opponent 1) filed a notice of appeal received on 19 January 2009 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed.

II. In a communication dated 28 April 2009, sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the registrar of the board informed the appellant that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was informed about the possibility of filing a request for re-establishment of rights under Article 122 EPC and was invited to file observations within two months.

III. No reply was filed to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Article 108 EPC requires that a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed within four months of notification of the decision. Pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC the appeal shall be rejected as inadmissible if it does not comply with Article 108 EPC.
2. In the present case no document was filed by the appellant which could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal. Consequently, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

N. Maslin U. Oswald