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C2097.D
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. This matter concerns an appeal against the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division posted on 3 February 2009, concerning the maintenance of European patent No. 0 688 630 in amended form.

II. The appellant (opponent 02) filed a notice of appeal on 6 April 2009 and paid the fee for appeal on the same date. No statement setting out the grounds for that appeal was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC, third sentence, and Rule 101(1) EPC.

III. By a communication dated 17 July 2009, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received on 20 July 2009, 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.

IV. No response to the Registry's communication was received.

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, third sentence, 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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