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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal lies against a decision of an examining division of the European Patent Office posted on 7 January 2015 whereby the European patent No. 1 320 597 (application No. 01 979 073.2) with the title "Induction of exon skipping in eukaryotic cells" was refused under Article 97(2) EPC.

II. The applicant (appellant) filed a notice of appeal on 4 March 2015 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit set by Article 108 EPC.

III. By communication of 19 July 2017 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the appellant was informed that no written statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that, therefore, it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible pursuant to Article 108, third sentence, and Rule 101(1) EPC. The appellant was invited to file observations within two months.

IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

As 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, and as the notice of appeal does not contain any statements that could be regarded as a statement of grounds of appeal pursuant to Article 108 EPC and Rule 99(2) EPC, 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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