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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office dated 24 October 2011 refusing European patent application No. 03764607.2.

II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 23 December 2011 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

III. No statement of grounds 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 10 May 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 (Rule 101(1) EPC in conjunction with Article 108 EPC).
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar: P. Cremona

The Chairman: C. Rennie-Smith

Decision electronically authenticated