

UPC Court of Appeal, 26 February 2024, AIM Sport v Supponor



## PATENT LAW – PROCEDURAL LAW

Parties requested to comment on non-compliance with [Rule 224.1\(b\) RoP](#),

- [providing that a Statement of Appeal of an order has to be filed within 15 days of service of an order referred to in Rule 220.1\(c\) RoP](#)

- Under “Information about Appeal” the CFI has indicated that the decision could be appealed within two months of the date of notification of the decision, referring to [Article 73\(1\) UPCA](#) and [Rule 220.1\(a\)](#) and [Rule 224.1\(a\) RoP](#) concerning an appeal against a **decision**, such as a decision in an infringement action, while in one of the two actions AIM sought a preliminary injunction **order** pursuant to [Article 62 UPCA](#)

Source: [Unified Patent Court](#)

UPC Court of Appeal,  
26 February 2024

(Kalden)

UPC\_CoA\_500/2023

APL\_596892/202

ORDER

of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court  
issued on 26 February 2024

concerning the (non-)compliance with [R.224.1\(b\)](#)

**KEYWORDS:**

Time period for lodging a Statement of appeal pursuant to [R.220.1\(c\) RoP](#) in conjunction with [Art. 62 UPCA](#)

**APPELLANT/CLAIMANT IN THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE:**

**AIM SPORT DEVELOPMENT AG**, Luzern, Switzerland hereinafter also referred to as: AIM, represented by: Johanna Flythström and Mikael Segercrantz, attorneys-at-law, Roschier, Helsinki, Finland; Ari Laakkonen and Siddharth Kusumakar, attorneys-at-law, Powell Gilbert (Europe), Dublin, Ireland; Ralph Nack and Niclas Gajec, attorneys-at-law, Noerr, Munich, Germany Maximilian von Rospatt, attorney-at-law, rospatt osten pross, Düsseldorf, Germany

**RESPONDENTS/ DEFENDANTS IN THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE**

**SUPPONOR OY**, Espoo ,Finland

**SUPPONOR LIMITED**, Hammersmith Grove, London, United Kingdom

**SUPPONOR SASU**, Sophia-Antipolis, Valbonne, France

**SUPPONOR ITALIA SRL**, Busto Arsizio, VA, Italy

**SUPPONOR ESPAÑA SL**, Barcelona, Spain

hereinafter also jointly referred to as Supponor, represented by: Dr. Henrik Lehment, attorney-at-law, Hogan Lovells International, Düsseldorf, Germany Dr. Matthias Sonntag, attorney-at-law, Gleiss Lutz, Düsseldorf, Germany Panu Siitonen, attorney-at-law, Hannes Schnell Attorneys, Helsinki, Finland

**LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS:** English  
**PATENT AT ISSUE**

[EP 3 295 663](#)

**PANEL**

Second Panel

**DECIDING JUDGES:**

This order has been adopted by Rian Kalden, Presiding judge and judge rapporteur

**IMPUGNED DECISION OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE**

□ [Date: 20 October 2023, ORD 572699/2023 \(in ACT 551054/2023\)](#) concerning, inter alia, a request for a preliminary injunction and evidentiary measures; decided together with the infringement action ACT\_545571/2023)

□ Action number attributed by the Court of First Instance: UPC\_CFI\_214/2023

**SUMMARY OF FACTS**

In ACT\_551054/2023 and ACT\_545571/2023, AIM filed identical Statements of claim. In the impugned decision, the panel of the Court of First Instance of the Local Division Helsinki dismissed the requests in ACT\_551054/2023 as well as the requests (inter alia for a permanent injunction) in ACT\_545571/20230 ), as it was of the opinion that the Unified Patent Court does not have competence over European patent no EP 3 295 663 owing to its opt-out on 12 May 2023.

In its decision of 20 October 2023, the Court of First Instance noted:

*“INFORMATION ABOUT APPEAL*

*The present decision dismissing the actions constitutes a final decision of the Court of First Instance and may be appealed by the unsuccessful party within two months of the date of the notification of the decision (Article 73(1) UPCA, [R.220.1\(a\)](#) and [R.224.1\(a\) RoP](#)).”*

**INDICATION OF PARTIES’REQUESTS**

In this appeal, lodged as APL\_596892/2023, AIM has appealed the decision of the CFI concerning ACT\_551054/2023. AIM has lodged a separate appeal, as APL\_596007/2023, against the decision of the Court of First Instance of 20 October 2023 concerning ACT\_545571/2023. It has filed identical Statements of appeal.

In this appeal (and in the parallel appeal case), AIM requests the Court of Appeal to:

(i) order the reversal of the [decision of the Court of First Instance of 20 October 2023](#) insofar as the Court of First Instance has dismissed the actions CMS no 545571/2023 and CMS no 551054/2023 due to the

claimed lack of competence of the Unified Patent Court over European patent no EP 3 295 663; and, consequently, to

(ii) declare that the withdrawal of opt-out with regard to the EP 3 295 663 on 5 July 2023 is effective and therefore the Unified Patent Court has competence to hear actions CMS no 545571/2023 and CMS no 551054/2023;

(iii) order the remittance of the application for provisional measures on action CMS no 551054/2023 back to the proceedings before the Court of First Instance; and

(iv) order the remittance of the infringement action CMS no 545571/2023 back to the proceedings before the Court of First Instance.

#### POINTS AT ISSUE

Time period for lodging a Statement of appeal pursuant to [R.220.1\(c\) RoP](#)

#### GROUND FOR THE ORDER

1. AIM lodged its Statement of appeal on 20 December 2023, within two months of service of the [CFI decision of 20 October 2023](#).

2. In the ‘Information about Appeal’, the CFI, indicating that the decision could be appealed by the unsuccessful party within two months of the date of notification of the decision, referred to [Article 73\(1\) UPCA](#) and [R.220.1\(a\)](#) and [R.224.1\(a\) RoP](#). These provisions concern an appeal against a decision of the Court of First Instance, such as a decision in an infringement action, like ACT\_545571/2023, lodged by AIM in parallel to ACT\_551054/2023.

3. The measure sought by AIM in its ACT\_596892/2023 was, however, inter alia, a preliminary injunction pursuant to [Art. 62 UPCA](#), which reads: “The Court may, by way of order, grant injunctions against an alleged infringer (...)” (underlining added by CoA). It also sought an order to preserve evidence and to inspect premises pursuant to [Art. 60 UPCA](#).

4. Pursuant to [R.224.1\(b\)](#), the term for lodging an appeal against an order referred to in [Rule 220.1\(c\)](#) – which includes orders referred to in [Art. 60](#) and [Art 62 UPCA](#) – is 15 days of service of an order.

5. Neither the UPCA, nor the Rules of Procedure contain a provision that allows a Court of First Instance to determine a time period for lodging a Statement of appeal in derogation from [R.224](#), in particular [R.224.1\(b\) RoP](#).

6. At the time of lodging the Statement of appeal, the non-compliance with the applicable time period for lodging a Statement of appeal under [R.224.1\(b\)](#) was not noticed by the Registry, when doing the formal checks under [R.229 RoP](#), but has now been noticed by the judge-rapporteur when consulting the case file before the Court of First Instance, in view of the preliminary examination of the Statement of grounds of appeal pursuant to [R.233 RoP](#).

7. The judge-rapporteur requests both AIM and Supponor to comment on the non-compliance with [R.224.1\(b\) RoP](#) by AIM when it lodged its Statement of appeal and the consequences thereof, notably whether or not this should under the circumstances of this case, lead

to inadmissibility of the appeal lodged as [APL\\_596892/2023](#).

#### ORDER

The judge rapporteur invites both parties to comment in writing as set out in paragraph 7 above, with 14 days of service of this order. This order shall not have suspensive effect for lodging a Statement of response by Supponor in accordance with [R.235 RoP](#).

Issued on 26 February 2024

Rian Kalden, Presiding judge and judge-rapporteur

-----