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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 9 November 2012 refusing European patent application No. 04783109.4 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:
Chairman: C. Rennie-Smith
Members: M. Montrone
G. Alt
Summary of Facts and Submissions


II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 21 January 2013 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 26 April 2013, 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.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

P. Cremona C. Rennie-Smith
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