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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 3 December 2010 revoking European patent No. 1377164 pursuant to Article 101(3)(b) EPC.
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office dated 3 December 2010 revoking European patent No. 1 377 164 pursuant to Art. 101(2) and 101(3)(b) EPC.

II. The appellant (patent proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 31 January 2011 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

III. No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed by the appellant. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as such a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

IV. By communication dated 20 May 2011, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, 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.

V. The appellant did not file observations in response to the 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, 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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