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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division dated 12 August 2013 refusing European patent application No. 00950570.2.

II. The appellant (applicant) filed a notice of appeal on 11 October 2013 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

No statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit prescribed by Article 108 EPC.

III. By communication dated 27 January 2014, received by the appellant, the Registry of the Board informed the appellant that it appeared from the file that the written statement of grounds of appeal had not been filed, and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.

IV. No reply has been received.

Reasons for the Decision

No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC in conjunction with Rule 126(2) EPC. In addition, neither the notice of appeal
nor any other document filed contains anything that could be regarded as a statement of grounds within the meaning of Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC.

Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Rule 101(1) EPC).

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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