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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Examining Division to refuse European patent application No. 07873538.8 announced in oral proceedings on 17 November 2015, the written reasons of which were posted on 3 December 2015.

II. The then applicant (Voicebox Technologies, Inc.) filed a notice of appeal on 3 February 2016 and paid the appeal fee on the same day. Following a corresponding request, VoiceBox Technologies Corporation was registered as new applicant with effect from 11 March 2016 and thereby acquired appellant status.

III. By communication of 25 May 2016, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery (the receipt of which was confirmed by the appellant on 1 July 2016), 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 was received within the deadline set.

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 pursuant to 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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