



Appeals No.:  
UPC\_CoA\_922/2025  
UPC\_CoA\_923/2025  
UPC\_CoA\_924/2025  
UPC\_CoA\_925/2025

**Order**  
**of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court**  
**issued on 13 March 2026**

HEADNOTES:

As a rule, the Statement of claim should contain the facts and legal arguments necessary to justify the jurisdiction of the Court.

Where the UPC has jurisdiction on the basis of Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 as the court of the place where the damages occurred or threaten to occur, said article does not provide jurisdiction for infringement in non-member states of the UPC.

KEYWORDS:

International jurisdiction of the UPC: scope of the BSH judgment - conditions for the application of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012 - verification of jurisdiction by the court.

APPELLANTS (DEFENDANTS IN THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

1. **ADOBE INC.**, 345 Park Avenue, CA 95110- 2704, San Jose, United States
2. **ADOBE SYSTEMS SOFTWARE IRELAND LIMITED**, 4-6 Riverwalk, Citywest Business Campus, Saggart, Dublin 24, D24DCW0, Ireland

(hereinafter referred to as "Adobe")

represented by Mr Thomas Cuche, attorney at law at Duclos, Thorne, Mollet-Viéville & Associés, Paris, France, and Mr Andreas Kramer, attorney at law, Powell Gilbert LLP, Düsseldorf, Germany

3. **OPENAI LP**, 3180 18th Street, CA, 94110, San Francisco, United States
4. **OPENAI OPCO LLC**, 1455 3rd Street, CA 94158, San Francisco, United States
5. **OPENAI IRELAND LTD**, 1st Floor, The Liffey Trust Centre, 117-126 Sheriff Street Upper, D01 YC43, Dublin 1, Ireland

(hereinafter referred to as "Open AI")

represented by Mr David Por, attorney at law at Clifford Chance LLP, Paris, France

6. **TRUEPIC INC.**, 402 W. Broadway, Suite 400/PMB#5021, CA 92101, San Diego, United States

(hereinafter referred to as "Truepic")

represented by Mr Benjamin May, attorney at law at, JEANTET Law Firm, Paris, France

**7. JOINT DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION PROJECTS LLC**, 548 Market Street, PMB 57274, CA 94104-5401, San Francisco, United States

**8. COALITION FOR CONTENT PROVENANCE AND AUTHENTICITY**, 3500 South Dupont Highway, Suite AA101, DE 19901, Dover, United States

(hereinafter referred to as "Joint Development Foundation")

represented by Mr Philippe Cepl, attorney at law, DLA Piper, Cologne, Germany

RESPONDENT (CLAIMANT IN THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

**KEEEX SAS**, 5 rue de Lissandre, 13013 Marseille, France

(hereinafter referred to as "Keeex")

represented by Mr Thibaud Lelong, attorney at law at Fidal, Schiltigheim, France

PATENT AT ISSUE

EP 2 949 070

PANEL AND DECIDING JUDGES

Panel 1d

Klaus Grabinski, President of the Court of Appeal

Nathalie Sabotier, legally qualified judge and judge-rapporteur

Bart van den Broek, legally qualified judge

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

French

IMPUGNED ORDER OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

- Order of the Paris Local Division of 27 November 2025
- Number assigned by the Court of First Instance:  
UPC\_CFI\_530/2025

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS AND CLAIMS OF THE PARTIES**

1. On 17 June 2025, Keex brought an infringement action based on patent EP 2 949 070 against Adobe Inc. (1), Adobe Systems Software Ireland Limited (2), OpenAI LP (3), OpenAI OpCo LLC (4), OpenAI Ireland LTD (5), Truepic Inc. (6), Joint Development Foundation Projects LLC (7) and Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (8) before the Paris Local Division of the Unified Patent Court ("UPC").
2. The invention protected by patent EP 2 949 070 relates to a method for externally verifying the integrity and authenticity of digital data blocks.

3. On 22 August, 8 October and 3 November 2025, the defendant companies filed preliminary objections with the Court challenging both the internal and international jurisdiction of the Court.
4. In an order dated 27 November 2025, the Local Division Paris (the judge-rapporteur after consultation with the panel) dismissed the preliminary objections based on the UPCs lack of both internal and international jurisdiction and, in particular, upheld the Court's jurisdiction to hear the facts of the alleged infringements committed in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland.
5. On 11 December 2025, Adobe and Adobe Systems Software Ireland appealed the impugned order (CoA\_923/2025). These companies are requesting the Court of Appeal to:
  - I. set aside the impugned order insofar as it rejected "all the preliminary objections raised by the defendant companies" (point 2°, first and second indents of "on those grounds" on page 7), and
  - II. declare the UPC not competent to
    - a. rule on the alleged infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 and to order any measures in respect of the alleged infringement of the national parts of patent EP 2 949 070 in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland;
    - b. rule on claims for compensation for any damage resulting from acts committed and suffered outside any State in which EP 2 949 070 is or was not in force.
6. Adobe, Adobe Systems Software Ireland also requested an accelerated appeal procedure in accordance with R. 9.3(b) RoP.
7. On 11 December 2025, OpenAI, OpenAI OpCo and OpenAI Ireland lodged an appeal against the impugned order (CoA\_922/2025) and requested the Court of Appeal to:
  - I. Set aside the impugned order insofar as it rejected the preliminary objections of the OpenAI Defendants;
  - II. Declare the preliminary objections admissible;
  - III. Declare the UPC not competent to rule on the alleged infringement by the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070, and to order measures in respect of the alleged infringement of the national parts of patent EP 2 949 070 in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland;
  - IV. Dismiss the action insofar as infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 is invoked and insofar as remedies are sought for the alleged infringement of the national parts of patent EP 2 949 070 in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland.
8. On 19 December 2025, Truepic appealed the impugned order (CoA\_925/2025) and requested the Court of Appeal to:
  - I- Declare the preliminary objection admissible;
  - II- Stay proceedings on the claims relating to the total lack of jurisdiction (internal and international) of the Court, pending the decision of the Paris Local Division on the request for review filed on 12 December 2025 by Defendant 6) on the basis of R. 333 RoP;
  - III- Set aside the impugned order insofar as it upheld the jurisdiction of the Court to rule on the alleged infringement by the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2

949 070, and for ordering measures in respect of the alleged infringement of the national parts of patent EP 2 949 070 in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland;

IV- Declare that the Court has no jurisdiction in these respects and, consequently, dismiss the action insofar as infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 is invoked and since remedies are sought in respect of the alleged infringement of the national parts of patent EP 2 949 070 in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland.

9. Joint Development Foundation Projects and Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity appealed the order on 19 December 2025 (CoA\_924/2025) and requested the Court of Appeal to:
  - I. set aside the impugned order (point 2);
  - II. uphold the preliminary objection raised by defendants 7) and 8) and dismiss the infringement claim insofar as it relates to any alleged infringement of the patent outside the territory of the contracting member states of the UPC in which the patent in question is in force, namely Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland, as well as all other countries in the world except France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden.
10. In its response of 2 January 2026, Keex requests the Court of Appeal to:
  - I. Confirm the impugned order insofar as it rejected the preliminary objections of the defendant companies.
  - II. Dismiss all of the defendant companies' claims.
11. In an order dated 12 December 2025, the judge-rapporteur dismissed the request for expedition of the present appeal proceedings filed by the Adobe companies.
12. By order dated 19 December 2025, the Paris Local Division permitted the withdrawal of the claim against OpenAI LP.
13. By order of 12 January 2026, the Paris Local Division dismissed the application for review filed by Truepic.

### **ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES**

#### *Adobe (1) and Adobe Systems Software Ireland (2)*

14. These companies argue, in substance, that the impugned order, which merely refers to an order issued by the Mannheim Local Division, is not substantiated in fact and in law and does not address any of the arguments raised by the defendant companies. They emphasize that the order referred to in the order of 27 November 2025 concerned a different factual situation, as did the BSH judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). These companies add that the decision of the Court of First Instance is contrary to EU law, in particular the Fiona Shevill and Pez Hejduk judgments of the CJEU, according to which, where the jurisdiction of a court is based on the place where the harmful event occurred in accordance with Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012, that court has jurisdiction only to hear cases involving damage caused within the territory of the Member State to which it belongs, and that jurisdiction cannot be extended to other territories .

15. The Adobe companies further argue that Keex's argument based on Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012 is inadmissible, as it was not included in the Statement of claim, in violation of R. 13.1(i) RoP, nor were the documents purportedly supporting this new argument. In any event, they maintain that this provision cannot justify the international jurisdiction of the UPC.
16. The Adobe companies also conclude that it is impossible for the UPC to apply the provisions of Article 14 of the French Civil Code given the provisions of Article 31 of the UPCA and the fact that the UPC is not a French court.
17. In the alternative, should the Court of Appeal consider confirming the order of the Court of First Instance, the Adobe companies request that a preliminary question be referred to the CJEU.

*OpenAI OpCo (4, formerly OpenAI LP) and OpenAI Ireland (5)*

18. These companies argue that the BSH judgment on which the impugned order is based is irrelevant to the issue in dispute. They point out that none of the defendants has its registered office in the territory over which the UPC has jurisdiction, so that the jurisdiction of the Court can only be based on Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 and that, in this case, the jurisdiction of the UPC is necessarily limited to the territory of the Member States of the UPC.
19. The OpenAI companies add that Article 6 of Regulation 1215/2012 cannot apply to the UPC as a court common to several Member States. It is Article 71b(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 that governs the international jurisdiction of the UPC with regard to defendants not domiciled within the European Union, so that Article 6 is inapplicable here, as is Article 14 of the French Civil Code.
20. The OpenAI companies further argue that claims based on Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012 are inadmissible because they were not presented in the Statement of claim (R. 263 RoP). They add that, in any event, this provision only gives the UPC jurisdiction to remedy damage caused by infringement outside the Union and not to hear alleged acts of infringement committed outside the territory over which the UPC has jurisdiction, in Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Norway, and even less so in Spain, Ireland and Poland, Member States of the European Union to which the provision of Article 71b(3) does not apply. The OpenAI companies specify that Keex has in any event failed to establish that the defendant companies have assets located in an UPC Member State with a sufficient connection to the dispute.

*Truepic (6)*

21. This company seeks to have the impugned order set aside, arguing that this decision is based on erroneous reasoning, as the reference to the BSH judgment is not relevant in the present case. It adds that none of the other arguments put forward by Keex can be applied in the present case.

*Joint Development Foundation Projects (7) and Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (8)*

22. These companies similarly conclude that the impugned order should be overturned, as the grounds for this decision are erroneous, as are the other grounds invoked by Keex to justify its claims concerning Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Norway, Spain, Ireland and Poland.

*Keex*

23. This company first requests the Court of Appeal to dismiss the request to "dismiss the infringement action brought by the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parties" on the grounds that such a request relates to the merits of the case.

24. It adds that the impugned order is sufficiently reasoned in fact and in law and is based on an analysis that complies with European Union law. Keex also invokes the application of Article 14 of the French Civil Code and Article 6(1) of Regulation 1215/2012, as well as Article 71b(3) of that same regulation.

25. In this regard, Keex argues that the latter provision allows the UPC to extend its jurisdiction beyond its territory, in particular to hear cases of infringement committed outside the UPC territory. It points out in this regard that OpenAI OpCo has set up a subsidiary in France, OpenAI France, whose registered office is in Paris. It adds that the same applies to Adobe, which established Adobe Systems France in France, also with its registered office in Paris. Therefore, in its view, the conditions for the application of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012 are met and justify its claims concerning the disputed territories.

26. The hearing was held by videoconference on 2 March 2026.

## **GROUND FOR THE ORDER**

### *APPLICABLE RULES*

#### *Internal jurisdiction*

27. According to Art. 33(1)(a) UPCA infringement actions are brought before the local division located in the jurisdiction of the Contracting Member State where the infringement occurred or is likely to occur.

28. The Court of Appeal already clarified that the "place where the infringement occurred or is likely to occur" referred to in Art. 33(1)(a) UPCA should be interpreted in the same way as the place "where the harmful event occurred or is likely to occur" referred to in Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012, insofar as these provisions have a similar objective, namely to define a ground of jurisdiction based on the connection between the subject matter of the dispute and the court or division concerned ( CoA , Order of 3 September 2024, UPC\_CoA\_188/2024 – Aylo v. Dish, para 26 , see also CoA, Order of 28 November 2025, UPC\_CoA\_317/2025, Barco v. Yealink, para 50 to 52). Where the damage is allegedly caused via a website, these provisions do not require that the website be intended for users located in the territory of the Member States concerned, but simply that it be accessible within the jurisdiction of the court or division seised (CoA, Order of 3 September 2024, UPC\_CoA\_188/2024 - Aylo/Dish, paras. 12 and 21).

### *International jurisdiction*

29. Under Art. 31 UPCA, the international jurisdiction of the Court is established in accordance with Regulation 1215/2012 or, where applicable, on the basis of the Convention on Jurisdiction, Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Lugano Convention).
30. Article 71b(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 provides that where the defendant is not domiciled in a Member State and this Regulation does not otherwise confer jurisdiction on him, Chapter II (jurisdiction) of Regulation 1215/2012 shall apply, where appropriate, regardless of the defendant's domicile.
31. Regulation 1215/2012 therefore applies to defendants domiciled outside the European Union before the common courts. This is not the case in proceedings before the national courts of the Member States which, in accordance with Article 6 of the same Regulation, apply their national provisions of private international law, for example Article 14 of the Civil Code in the case of the French courts.
32. Neither Article 6 of Regulation 1215/2012 nor Article 14 of the French Civil Code are therefore applicable before the UPC (see on this point, recital 6 of Regulation 542/2014 of 15 May 2014 amending Regulation No 1215/2012 as regards the rules applicable to the Unified Patent Court and the Benelux Court of Justice).
33. It should also be noted that, according to Article 4(1) of Regulation 1215/2012, persons domiciled in the territory of a Member State shall, regardless of their nationality, be sued in the courts of that Member State.
34. Article 24(4) of Regulation 1215/2012 further provides that, regardless of the domicile of the parties, the courts of the Member State in whose territory the application for registration or registration has been filed, has been made or is deemed to have been made under a Union instrument, shall have exclusive jurisdiction in matters relating to the registration or validity of patents, irrespective of whether the issue is raised by way of action or defense, the courts of the Member State in whose territory the application for registration or registration was made, was affected or is deemed to have been affected under the terms of a Union instrument or an international convention.
35. In its judgment of 25 February 2025, the CJEU ruled that Article 24(4) of Regulation 1215/2012 must be interpreted as meaning that a court of the Member State of the defendant's domicile, seised under Article 4(1) of that regulation of an action for infringement of a patent granted in another Member State, remains competent to hear that action where, in the course of that action, the defendant contests, by way of defense, the validity of that patent, whereas jurisdiction to rule on that validity lies exclusively with the courts of that other Member State (CJEU, judgment of 25 February 2025, BSH Hausgeräte v Electrolux, C-339-22).
36. Where jurisdiction is established under Article 7(2) of the Regulation, the CJEU has ruled that the court of the place where damages occurred or threaten to occur has jurisdiction only to hear cases concerning damage that has occurred or threaten to occur in the territory of the Member State to which it belongs (CJEU, judgment of 22 January 2015, Pez Hejduk v EnergieAgentur.NRW, C-441/13 on copyright; see also judgment of 7 March 1995, Fiona Shevill, C-68/93 on defamation; see also Article 126(2) of Regulation No 2017/1001 of 14 June 2017 on the European Union trade mark).

37. Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012 provides an additional rule of jurisdiction specifically relating to defendants domiciled outside the European Union. This Article provides that where a common court has jurisdiction over such a defendant in a dispute relating to an infringement of a European patent which has caused damage within the Union, that court may also exercise jurisdiction in respect of damage caused by that infringement outside the Union.
38. This text assumes that the court already has jurisdiction to hear cases of infringement of a European patent within the European Union. The common court could then exercise its "ancillary" jurisdiction over the same (non-EU) defendant and hear cases concerning damage caused by such infringement outside the European Union.
39. This text further provides, as a condition for its application, that the defendant must be the owner of property located in a Member State with which the dispute must have a sufficient connection. Recital 7 of Regulation 542/2014 specifies that "the common court should take into account the value of the property in question, which should not be negligible and should be such that it allows, at least in part, the enforcement of the decision in the Member States that are parties to the instrument establishing the common court."

*Verification of jurisdiction by the judge*

40. The CJEU has developed the principle of the autonomy of the court responsible for ruling on its own jurisdiction. It has thus clarified that, although the court seised is not obliged, in the event of the defendant contesting the claimant's allegations, to take evidence at the stage of determining jurisdiction, the objective of the proper administration of justice, which underpins the application of Regulation 1215/2012, and the respect due to the autonomy of the court in the exercise of its functions, require that the court seised be able to examine its international jurisdiction in the light of all the information available to it, including, where applicable, the objections raised by the defendant (CJEU, judgment of 28 January 2015, Kolassa, C-375/13, paragraph 64, and judgment of 16 June 2016, Universal, C-12/15, paragraph 45).
41. Before the UPC, R. 13(.1(i) RoP requires that the Statement of claim contains an indication of the division before which the case is brought and an explanation of its jurisdiction.
42. In addition, paragraph 7 (last sentence) of the preamble to the RoP specifies that the parties must cooperate with the Court and present their case in full as soon as possible.
43. This procedural framework is intended to ensure, on the one hand, that the defendant is aware of the legal and factual elements on which the claim is based, enabling them to assess the jurisdiction and competence of the Court and to prepare an adequate defense in a context where, in principle, they only have one month to file a preliminary objection concerning the jurisdiction of the Court and, on the other hand, enable the Court to establish and assess jurisdiction and competence based on a preliminary review of the facts and statements included in the Statement of claim..
44. As a result, the claimant must bring forward sufficient facts and submissions to establish internal and international jurisdiction of the Court. In particular, where the claimant requests that the Court

exercise its jurisdiction over the territory of States that are not members of the UPCA, the Statement of claim must contain the facts and legal arguments necessary to justify the jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012.

#### *APPLICATION TO THE PRESENT CASE*

45. The internal jurisdiction of the Paris Local Division to hear the case is justified in this instance by the accessibility in France of content integrity verification software made available free of charge on the Internet by the defendants. The only party that (still) contested the internal jurisdiction in this appeal, Truepic, confirmed at the hearing that it no longer contested the decision on internal jurisdiction on appeal. In this context, it also confirmed that its request for a stay of proceedings had become moot as a result of the decision of 12 January 2026 rejecting the request for review of the impugned order.
46. With regard to international jurisdiction, it should be noted that, in the present case, all of the defendants are based outside the European Union, with the exception of Adobe Systems Software Ireland and Open AI Ireland, which are based in Ireland. That country, which has not ratified the UPC Agreement, cannot be regarded as a Contracting Member State of the UPC (CoA, decision of 19 August 2024, UPC\_CoA 338/2024, Sibio/ Abbot, para 10).
47. None of the defendants contest the jurisdiction of the UPC to hear claims against them relating to acts allegedly committed on the territory of the UPC, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012. Truepic was the only party in this appeal that did contest the decision of the Paris Local Division to accept international jurisdiction with respect to the UPC territory. At the hearing, Truepic confirmed that it no longer contested the international jurisdiction of the UPC with respect to the UPC territory.
48. All defendants contest the jurisdiction of the UPC with respect to the claims of Keex insofar as they relate to acts allegedly committed on the territory of States that are not Contracting Member States of the UPCA.
49. The UPC's jurisdiction to hear such claims was "explained" as follows in Keex's Statement of claim: *"The acts of infringement are taking place in France (...) It should be noted that the damage resulting from the acts of infringement is global and therefore covers all the territories protected by European Patent EP 2 949 070 B1."* In addition, Keex included a list of the designated countries in its Statement of claim. Nothing more was said to substantiate international jurisdiction.
50. In order to retain jurisdiction to hear cases of infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070, the Court of First Instance stated that the decision of the CJEU in the BSH-matter, applies regardless of whether the criterion for jurisdiction is established on the basis of Article 4 or Article 7(2) of Regulation No 1215/2012. It therefore accepted jurisdiction based on Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 with respect to the non-UPC countries.
51. This ground is erroneous and is based on an incorrect interpretation of the applicable law. Indeed, as noted above (para. 37), it follows from the case law of the CJEU that where the court has jurisdiction on the basis of Art. 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 as the court of the place where the

damage occurred or may occur, it has jurisdiction only to hear cases concerning damage occurring in its territory, which is the only link between the court seised and the subject matter of the dispute.

52. In the present case, the defendants argued (and Keex did not contest) that Keex only relied on the assertion that the UPC had jurisdiction based on Article 7(2) Regulation 1215/2012 as the court where the damages had allegedly occurred. Based on the foregoing case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the jurisdiction of the UPC based on Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 is therefore limited to the UPC territory.
53. Furthermore, the Court of Appeal considers that, in the present case, as the defendants rightly point out, the explanation of the international jurisdiction of the UPC contained in the Statement of claim, is insufficient, whether in terms of justifying the provisions applicable to other national parts of the patent (see the aforementioned BSH judgment, para 40), but also the justification of the conditions for the application of the provisions of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012, which require, inter alia, the establishment of the presence of assets of a certain value belonging to the defendant companies within the territory of the UPC.
54. The Court of Appeal notes in this regard that the Statement of claim does not provide any explanation on these two points. This cannot be rectified by Keex's exhibits Nos. 2 and 3 after submission of the Statement of claim, in response to the defendants' preliminary objection, meant to substantiate the existence of assets of a certain value belonging in France to defendants 1 and 4, a condition for the application of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012. This is even assuming that this Article can be interpreted, as Keex does, to mean that the "damage caused by this infringement outside the Union" corresponds to the infringement of other national parts of the patent in these countries. The present order leaves this question open.
55. Finally, the Local Division Paris, which is not a French national court, cannot apply the provisions of Article 14 of the French Civil Code (see paragraphs 31-33 above).
56. The decision of the Court of First Instance insofar as it held that it had jurisdiction to hear the alleged infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 must therefore be set aside. The other claims are dismissed, as the Court cannot rule on claims for which it does not have jurisdiction.

### **ON THESE GROUNDS,**

The Court of Appeal

- I. Finds that the application for a stay of proceedings filed by Truepic has become devoid of purpose as a result of the order of 12 January 2026 of the Local Division Paris,
- II. Sets aside the order of 27 November 2025 insofar as it rejected the preliminary objections raised by the defendant companies concerning the jurisdiction of the court,
- III. Declares that the court does not have jurisdiction to rule on the alleged infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070,
- IV. Dismisses all other claims.

Issued on 13 March 2026.

Klaus Grabinski, President of the Court of Appeal

Nathalie Sabotier, legally qualified judge, Judge-Rapporteur

Bart Van Den Broek, legally qualified judge