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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted 28 October 2010 refusing European patent application No. 99308164.5 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: A. Ritzka
Members: P. Cretaine
D. Prietzei-Funk
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appellant contests the decision of the examining division of the European Patent Office dated 28 October 2010 refusing European patent application No. 99308164.5

The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 6 January 2011 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

A written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was not filed within the four-month time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC. Nor did the notice of appeal contain anything that might be considered as such statement.

II. In a communication dated 13 April 2011, 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. The appellant was informed that any observations should be filed within two months.

III. The appellant filed no observations in response to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided for in Article 108 EPC, the appeal is inadmissible pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC.
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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