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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 15 December 2011 concerning the rejection of the opposition filed against European Patent No. 1 375 512 pursuant to Article 101(2) EPC.

II. The opponent (hereinafter "appellant") filed a notice of appeal on 16 February 2012 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 a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

IV. By communication dated 28 June 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.

V. The appellant filed no observations in response to said 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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