


**UPC Court of Appeal, 30 April 2025, Juul v NJOY***A vaporization device***PATENT LAW – PROCEDURAL LAW**

**Request under [R. 295 RoP](#) – supported by both parties – to stay appeal of revocation action granted because of pending Boards of Appeal proceedings**

- **[in which oral proceedings are on 17 October 2025, while hearing before Court of Appeal would be on 22 September 2025.](#)**

9. In view of this, the decision of the Boards of Appeal can be expected to be issued soon after the possible date for an oral hearing before the Court of Appeal (rapidly). There are no pending infringement proceedings or other circumstances that would balance against a stay. To the contrary, it is Juul Labs – who has a primary interest in a swift decision on appeal – who requested a stay. In addition, NJOY has agreed to the requested stay.

Source: [Unified Patent Court](#)

**UPC Court of Appeal,  
30 April 2025**

(Kalden, Simonsson, Rombach, Samoud, Scilletta)

UPC\_CoA\_5/2025

APL\_289/2025

App\_10961/2025

App\_20180/2025

**ORDER**

**of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court issued on 30 April 2025 regarding request for stay of proceedings ([R. 295 RoP](#))**

**HEADNOTE:**

In an action for revocation, where both parties agreed to a stay, the appeal proceedings have been stayed pending the outcome of parallel opposition proceedings before the EPO Boards of Appeal, where the opposition proceedings could be expected to result in a final decision soon after, in any case rapidly, in relation to the possible date for an oral hearing before the Court of Appeal.

**KEYWORD:**

Stay of proceedings ([R. 295 RoP](#)), parallel opposition proceedings

**APPELLANT (AND DEFENDANT BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)**

**Juul Labs International, Inc.**, San Francisco, USA  
(hereinafter ‘Juul Labs’)

represented by European Patent Attorney Bernhard Thum, Thum & Partner, Munich, Germany, and by representatives from Bardehle Pagenberg, Munich, Germany

**RESPONDENT (AND CLAIMANT BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)**

**NJOY Netherlands B.V.**, Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
(hereinafter ‘NJOY’)

represented by attorney-at-law Dr Henrik Holzapfel, McDermott Will & Emery, Düsseldorf, Germany

**PATENT AT ISSUE**

[EP 3 498 115](#)

**PANEL AND DECIDING JUDGES**

Panel 2

Rian Kalden, presiding judge and legally qualified judge  
Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge and judge-rapporteur

Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge

Wiem Samoud, technically qualified judge

Andrea Scilletta, technically qualified judge

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

[Central Division Paris, 5 November 2024, revocation action ACT\\_571669/2023, UPC\\_CFI\\_309/2023](#)

**LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS**

English

**THE APPLICATION**

1. NJOY brought an action for revocation of the patent at issue against Juul Labs before the Central Division Paris. The Central Division revoked the patent at issue with effect for the territories of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden.

2. Juul Labs has appealed. With reference to parallel opposition appeal proceedings before the EPO Boards of Appeal, Juul Labs has withdrawn a previous application for expedition (App\_10961/2025) and instead applied for a stay of the proceedings. Juul Labs has set forth that the parallel proceedings have been accelerated, with scheduling of the oral proceedings for 17 October 2025.

3. NJOY has agreed to a stay of the proceedings.

**REASONS**

4. Pursuant to [R. 295\(a\) RoP](#), and in accordance with [Art. 33\(10\) UPCA](#), the Court may stay proceedings where it is seized of an action relating to a patent which is also the subject of opposition proceedings or limitation proceedings (including subsequent appeal proceedings) before the European Patent Office or a national authority where a decision in such proceedings may be expected to be given rapidly.

5. The terms “rapid decision” and “rapidly” in these provisions must be interpreted inter alia in the light of the relevant circumstances of the case, such as the stage of the opposition proceedings and the stage of the revocation proceedings ([CoA, order on 28 May 2024, APL\\_3507/2024, UPC\\_CoA\\_22/2024, Carrier vs Bitzer](#)).

6. It can be added that pursuant to [R. 298 RoP](#), second sentence, the Court may of its own motion or at the request of a party stay its proceedings in accordance with

**R. 295(a) RoP** pending the outcome of accelerated proceedings before the European Patent Office.

7. The present appeal concerns an action for revocation. The Statement of grounds of appeal were submitted on 11 March 2025 and the Statement of response would ordinarily be expected on 11 June 2025. Application of the normal two month notice period in **R. 239.2 RoP** for summoning to an oral hearing, and taking into account the troubles with scheduling during judicial vacations, would place the hearing in the Court of Appeal on 22 September 2025, a date that has been discussed with the parties.

8. The Boards of Appeal has accelerated their appeal proceedings in view of the UPC proceedings and summoned to oral proceedings for 17 October 2025. The decision without reasons will be announced at the end of the oral proceedings and the written decision with the reasons will be published some time thereafter.

9. In view of this, the decision of the Boards of Appeal can be expected to be issued soon after the possible date for an oral hearing before the Court of Appeal (rapidly). There are no pending infringement proceedings or other circumstances that would balance against a stay. To the contrary, it is Juul Labs – who has a primary interest in a swift decision on appeal – who requested a stay. In addition, NJOY has agreed to the requested stay.

10. Juul Labs' application to stay the appeal proceedings shall be granted.

#### **ORDER**

A stay of the revocation proceedings before the UPC is ordered until such time as the EPO Boards of Appeal has given a final decision in the opposition proceedings or those proceedings are otherwise concluded. The parties shall inform the Court of Appeal forthwith about the outcome of the parallel proceedings.

This order closes App\_10961/2025 where the application for expedition was withdrawn.

Issued on 30 April 2025

Rian Kalden, presiding judge and legally qualified judge  
Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge and judge-rapporteur

Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge

Wiem Samoud, technically qualified judge

Andrea Scilletta, technically qualified judge

-----