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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The patentee (appellant) filed on 7 June 2010 a notice of appeal against the decision of the opposition division dated 7 April 2010 whereby the European patent No. 1 012 326 was revoked under Article 101(3)(b) EPC. In its notice of appeal, oral proceedings were also requested (Article 116 EPC). The appeal fee was paid on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit set by Article 108 EPC.

II. By a communication dated 21 September 2010 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the appellant was informed that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that, therefore, it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months but did not reply to said communication, and no request for re-establishment of rights was filed.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, and as the notice of appeal does not contain any statements that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal pursuant to Article 108 EPC, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC). Since the appeal is inadmissible, none of the requests in the notice of appeal, including the request for oral proceedings, can be considered.
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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