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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 17 March 2011 refusing the European Patent application No. 06 785 593.2.

The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 26 May 2011 and paid the fee for appeal on 27 May 2011.

No statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 28 September 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.

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

Reasons for the Decision

1. The notice of appeal filed on 26 May 2011 contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

2. 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.

The Registrar                                      The Chairman

G. Nachtigall                                      H. Meinders