



Paris Local Division

UPC_CFI_1963/2025
& UPC_CFI_1247/2026

Procedural Order of the Court of First Instance of the Unified Patent Court, issued on July 18, 2026 (R.9.3 RdP extension of time)

PLAINTIFF

VALEO WIPER SYSTEMS
8 rue Louis Lormand,
78320 La Verrière, France

Represented by Lionel MARTIN
and other
representatives
AUGUST DEBOUZY

DEFENDANTS

1-ROBERT BOSCH DOO Belgrade
90E/IV Omladinskih brigade
11070, Belgrade, Serbia

Represented by Johannes HESELBERGER
and other
representatives of
BARDEHLE PADENBERG

2-ROBERT BOSCH FRANCE S.A.S.
32 avenue Michelet
93400, Saint-Ouen-Sur-Seine, France

3-ROBERT BOSCH GmbH
1 Robert-Bosch-Platz
70839, Gerlingen, Germany

4-ROBERT BOSCH S.A.
1 Henri-Joseph Genesse Street
1070, Anderlecht, Belgium

5-ROBERT BOSCH PRODUKTIE S.A.
Hamelendreef 80
3300, Tienen, Belgium

**6-BOSCH AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS
(CHANGSHA) CO., LTD.**
No. 26, Lixiangzhong Road,
Economic and Technical Development Zone,
Changsha County, Hunan Province
410100, Changsha, China

PATENT IN DISPUTE

<i>Patent No.</i>	<i>Patentee</i>
EP4144599	Valeo Wiper Systems

PRESIDING JUDGE:

Presiding Judge Carine Gillet

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS: French

ORDER

On December 12, 2025, VALEO SYSTEMES D'ESSUYAGE (hereinafter "VALEO") filed a patent infringement action regarding its patent EP 4144599 B1 with the Paris Local Division against six companies belonging to the Bosch Group. On April 13, 2026, the BOSCH companies filed their answer, including a counterclaim seeking invalidation of the patent (UPC_CFI_ 1247/2026). On June 15, 2026, VALEO filed a reply to BOSCH's answer and a reply to the claim for revocation of the patent.

In a motion dated July 16, 2026, the BOSCH companies requested that the reporting judge:

- I. Order that the time limit granted to the Defendants to file their rejoinder to the Plaintiff's reply in the infringement proceedings and their reply to the Plaintiff's defense in the counterclaim for invalidity filed on June 15, 2026, shall not begin to run until upon receipt of an unredacted version thereof.

In support of its motion, BOSCH argues that it has access only to a redacted version of the Plaintiff's previous brief, filed in the CMS on June 15, 2026, and is therefore unable to prepare its defense, as it cannot review an unredacted version of that document and determine the specific allegations against which it must defend itself. As held in such cases, regardless of the nature or content of the redacted portions, it is appropriate to grant it additional time to submit its pleadings.

BOSH also contends that VALEO filed its brief dated June 15, 2026, only in the infringement proceeding (UPC_CFI_1963/2025) and not in the CMS track dedicated to the counterclaim for invalidity (UPC_CFI_1247/2026), even though these are separate proceedings, bearing different case numbers, and one of which may be transferred to another Division of the Unified Patent Court.

On July 16, 2026, after being invited that same day by the reporting judge to submit its written observations by July 23, 2026, VALEO makes the following claims:

As a primary claim

- Dismiss the Defendants' request for an extension of time;

In the alternative

-Order an extension not to exceed three (3) additional days from August 17, 2026, the deadline for the Defendants to file their briefs.

VALEO moves to dismiss the request for an extension of time, arguing that, contrary to BOSCH's allegations, a clear (unedited) version of the brief was filed on June 15, 2026, in the CMS simultaneously with the filing of the redacted version, and that this document was immediately accessible to BOSCH within the previously established confidentiality framework, had the Defendant requested it from the court clerk's office or the plaintiff's representative—which BOSCH manifestly failed to do, through negligence. BOSCH therefore cannot justify an extension of the deadlines, given that it has made no effort since June 15, 2026, to access the document and was able to view it one and a half hours after requesting it on July 16, 2026. VALEO argues that an extension of the deadline would also be contrary to the principle of equity, given the plaintiff's diligence and the deadlines imposed on it.

VALEO adds that the failure to file pleadings in the dedicated proceeding for the counterclaim for invalidity does not constitute any cause for complaint on the part of the defendants, as the redacted portions relate to the issue of prior use and thus to the infringement itself; and finally, the case law cited is unrelated to the present case.

In the alternative, any extension should not exceed three days, which corresponds to the realistic response time for any party to identify a difficulty in accessing a document in the case file.

REASONS FOR THE ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 29(d) of the Rules of Procedure, the defendant is required to file, within two months, a reply to the defense brief in response to the counterclaim for nullity and a rejoinder to the reply to the defense brief.

Pursuant to R.9.3 RdP, the court may, upon a reasoned motion by a party,

- a) Extend, even retroactively, a time limit specified in these Rules or imposed by the court.

In this case, on June 15, 2026, VALEO filed, within the procedural track dedicated to the infringement action, a brief containing both a reply to the defense brief and a defense brief in response to the counterclaim for invalidity. This brief dated June 15, 2026, was filed in the CMS in a version redacted of confidential information, designated as "M" ("mutual," accessible to the parties), and in an unredacted version identified as "HC" ("Highly Confidential," accessible only to the court). The unredacted brief bears the notation "Confidential Version—Order of April 30, 2026" in red letters at the bottom of the page, while the redacted brief bears the notation "Non-Confidential Version—Order of April 30, 2026" in blue letters at the bottom of the page.

Immediately following BOSCH's motion of July 16, 2026, the unredacted version of the document was marked "M" in the CMS by the court clerk, on the instructions of the reporting judge, so that the defendant's representatives and legal team could access it.

It is irrelevant that the disputed brief dated June 15, 2026, was filed solely in the procedural track dedicated to infringement and not simultaneously in the track reserved for the counterclaim for invalidity, since the two proceedings are linked in the CMS, especially since BOSCH itself filed a single brief—serving both as its answer and as its counterclaim for invalidity—on April 13, 2026, in which, moreover, the defendants request that the two actions (for infringement and for invalidity) be heard jointly (page 7/123 of the document), that is, without separating the two cases.

BOSCH does not raise any specific grounds for complaint, and the argument lacks merit.

Furthermore, the confidentiality order issued at BOSCH's request on April 30, 2026 (and amended on May 5, 2026), to which reference is made in VALEO's confidential brief of June 15, 2026, pertains to the confidentiality regime governing three documents originating from BOSCH, designated BP 6, BP 7, and BP 8, and designates the members of VALEO's confidentiality circle (representatives, legal team, and two individuals employed by VALEO), leaving it to BOSCH to determine the conditions for disclosing its own documents with respect to its employees.

The passages underlined in blue in the unredacted brief and not visible in the redacted brief are all excerpts from documents that are clearly identified, either in the text of the brief itself (for example, page 10, §21 "according to document BP 8 provided by BOSCH" or page 15, §26), or by a footnote (for example, page 46, footnotes 25, 26, and 27, or page 47, footnotes 30, 31, and 32) identifying the documents as BP6, BP7, and BP8—that is, the very documents that are the subject of the aforementioned confidentiality order and which all originate from BOSCH.

Thus, contrary to BOSCH's allegations, an unredacted version was indeed filed in the CMS, at the same time as the redacted version. Furthermore, VALEO was not required to file a confidentiality request, since the treatment of the redacted disputed excerpts had already been determined by the confidentiality order issued on April 30 of this year.

For its part, BOSCH was in a position, as soon as the plaintiff's brief was filed on June 15, 2026, to clearly identify the sources of the documents whose content was redacted in the redacted brief and to understand that these were its own documents, the content of which it presumably knows. BOSCH was also, as of June 15, 2026, in a position to request access to the unredacted brief from either the opposing party's representative or the Division's clerk's office, which it refrained from doing, before raising concerns about the accessibility of this document more than a month after the brief was filed. This is all the more so given that the Division's registry had previously, with particular diligence, resolved issues related to difficulties accessing case documents in the same matter, simply upon request.

It follows that BOSCH, having failed to take any steps within a reasonable time—steps for which it alone was responsible—cannot seriously invoke its own negligence to justify the granting of an extension to submit its next briefs.

The motion to extend the deadline must therefore be denied.

FOR THESE REASONS,

The Reporting Judge

-Denies the request for an extension of time filed by BOSCH,

-Holds that the deadlines set forth in R.29(d) RdP, applicable to the defendant, begin to run as of June 15, 2026, the date VALEO's previous pleadings were filed in the CMS.

Dated and issued on July 18, 2026

Carine Gillet, Reporting Judge

Carine Gillet 2026.07.18
10:43:34
+02'00'

This order is subject to review under the conditions set forth in R333 RdP.

DETAILS OF THE ORDER

UPC No.: UPC_CFI_1963/2025

Type of action: Infringement action Related

proceeding No. UPC-CFI_1247/2026

Details of the Order: R.9 Extension of Time Limits

Date of the Order: July 18, 2026