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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted 27 April 2011 rejecting the opposition filed against European patent No. 1326034 pursuant to Article 101(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:

Chairman: T. Kriner
Members: P. Acton
D. T. Keeling
M. Alvazzi Delfrate
A. Pignatelli
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is from the decision of the opposition division dated 27 April 2011 rejecting the opposition to European patent No. 1 326 034, granted in respect of European patent application No. 02028662.1.

II. The appellant (opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 9 June 2011. The payment of the appeal fee was recorded on the same day. No separate statement of grounds was filed. The notice of appeal did not contain any statement that could be interpreted as a ground for the appeal.

III. By a communication dated 12 January 2012 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.

IV. No answer has been given to the registry's communication.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal must be rejected as inadmissible in accordance with Article 108 EPC, last sentence, in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC.
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

V. Commare T. Kriner