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Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 18 June 2018 refusing European patent application No. 13725965.1 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.

Composition of the Board:
Chairman F. van der Voort
Members: J. Eraso Helguera
R. Winkelhofer
Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the examining division of 18 June 2018 refusing European patent application No. 13725965.1.

II. On 16 August 2018, the applicant filed a notice of appeal and paid the appeal fee.

III. By communication of 20 December 2018, sent by registered letter with advice of delivery and received by the applicant (appellant), the registry of the board informed the appellant that apparently no written statement of grounds of appeal had been filed, and that it was therefore to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellant was further informed that any observations had to be filed within two months of notification of the communication.

IV. No reply was received.

Reasons for the Decision

1. No written statement setting out the grounds of appeal was filed within the time limit provided by Article 108, third sentence, EPC. 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.

2. The appeal is therefore 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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