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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 28 June 2013 revoking European patent No. 1521664 pursuant to Article 101(3)(b) EPC.
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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 28 June 2013 revoking the European patent No. 1 521 664 pursuant to Article 101(3)(b) EPC.

The appellant (patent proprietor) filed a notice of appeal on 3 September 2013 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed.

II. By a communication dated 3 December 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 its 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 3 September 2013 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.
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