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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is directed against the decision of the Opposition Division of 12 April 2018, posted on 15 May 2018.

II. The appellant filed a notice of appeal on 5 July 2018 and paid the appeal fee on the same day.

III. By communication of 29 October 2018, 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. It was also indicated that the Board assumed that the appellant’s request for oral proceedings did not apply to the issue if inadmissibility of the appeal because no grounds of appeal had been filed in due time and that this assumption would not be made if the appellant so stated within the specified period.

IV. No reply was 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 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.

The Registrar: The Chairman:

B. ter Heijden D. Semino
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