



Call numbers:
UPC-COA-0000922/2025
UPC-COA-0000923/2025
UPC-COA-0000924/2025
UPC-COA-0000925/2025

Order
of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court
made on 13 March 2026

HEADING:

In principle, the statement of claim must contain the legal and factual elements necessary to establish the court's jurisdiction.

Where the court's jurisdiction is based on Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012, as the court of the place where the harmful event occurred or is likely to occur, that provision does not confer jurisdiction to hear cases of infringement committed in a non-member state of the AJUB.

KEYWORDS:

International jurisdiction of the JUB: scope of the so-called 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, a member of the Paris Bar, of Duclos, Thorne, Mollet-Viéville & Partners, Paris, France, and Mr Andreas Kramer, Rechtsanwalt, 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. **OPEN AI IRELAND LTD**, 1st Floor, The Liffey Trust Centre, 117-126 Sheriff Street Upper, D01 YC43, Dublin 1, Ireland

(hereinafter referred to as
'OpenAI')

represented by Mr David Por, a member of the Paris Bar, 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, Member of the Paris Bar, JEANTET Law Firm, Paris, France

7. **JOINT DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION PROJECTS LLC**, 548 Market Street, PO Box 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 the “Joint Development Foundation”)

represented by Mr Philippe Cepl, Rechtsanwalt, DLA PIPER, Cologne, Germany

RESPONDENT (PLAINTIFF 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, Barrister at the Strasbourg Bar, Fidal, Schiltigheim, France

PATENT IN DISPUTE

EP 2 949 070

PANEL AND DECIDING JUDGES

Klaus Grabinski, President of the Court of Appeal

Nathalie Sabotier, legally qualified judge, and Bart van den Broek, legally

qualified judge and judge-rapporteur

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

French

CONTESTED ORDER OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

- Order of the Paris Local Division of 27 November 2025
- Case number assigned by the Court of First Instance:
UPC_CFI_530/2025

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND THE PARTIES’ CLAIMS

1. On 17 June 2025, Keex brought an infringement action based on patent EP2949070 against Adobe Inc. (1), Adobe Systems Software Ireland Limited (2), OpenAI LP (3), OpenAI OpCo LLC (4), Open AI 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.
2. The invention protected by patent EP2949070 relates to a method for externally verifying the integrity and authenticity of blocks of digital data.

3. On 22 August, 8 October and 3 November 2025, these companies filed preliminary objections with the court challenging both the internal and international jurisdiction of the court.
4. By an order of 27 November 2025, the Paris Local Division (the reporting judge after consultation with the panel) dismissed the preliminary objections based on the UPC's lack of both internal and international jurisdiction and, in particular, upheld the court's jurisdiction to hear the alleged acts of infringement committed in Switzerland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Poland.
5. On 11 December 2025, Adobe and Adobe Systems Software Ireland lodged an appeal against the contested order (CoA_923/2025). These companies request that the Court of Appeal:
 - I. set aside the contested order in so far as it dismissed 'all the preliminary objections raised by the defendant companies' (point 2), first and second indents of 'on these grounds' on page 7), and
 - II. consequently, declare that the JUB lacks jurisdiction 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 the claims for compensation for any loss resulting from acts committed and suffered outside any State in which patent EP 2 949 070 is not or was not in force.
6. Adobe and Adobe Systems Software Ireland have also requested an expedited appeal procedure, in accordance with Rule 9(3)(b) of the Rules of Procedure.
7. On 11 December 2025, Open AI, Open AI OpCo and Open AI Ireland lodged an appeal against the contested order (CoA_922/2025) and request the Court of Appeal to:
 - I. Set aside the contested order in so far as it dismissed the preliminary objections of the OpenAI Defendants;
 - II. Declare the preliminary objections admissible;
 - III. Declare the JUB to have no jurisdiction to rule on the alleged infringement of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish national 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 in so far as infringement of the Swiss, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 is alleged and in so far as 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.
8. On 19 December 2025, Truepic lodged an appeal against the contested decision (CoA_925/2025) and requests the Court of Appeal to:
 - I- DECLARE the preliminary objection admissible;
 - II- INTERIM ORDER to be made on the applications concerning the Court's lack of jurisdiction (both domestic and international), pending the decision of the Chamber of the Local Division of

Paris on the application for review lodged on 12 December 2025 by Defendant 6) pursuant to Rule 333 of the Rules of Procedure;

III- SET ASIDE the contested order in so far as it upheld the Court's jurisdiction 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- DECLARE that the Court has no jurisdiction in these respects and, consequently, DISMISS the action in so far as infringement of the Swiss, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070 is alleged and in so far as 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. The companies Joint Development Foundation Projects and Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity lodged an appeal against the contested order on 19 December 2025 (CoA_924/2025), and request the Court of Appeal to:
 - I. set aside the contested order (point 2);
 - II. uphold the preliminary objection raised by defendants 7) and 8) and dismiss the infringement claim in so far as it relates to any alleged infringement of the patent outside the territory of the JUB contracting member states 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 with the exception of France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden.
10. Keex requests the Court of Appeal, in its response of 2 January 2026, to:
 - I. Uphold the contested order in so far as it dismissed the preliminary objections raised by the defendant companies.
 - II. Dismiss all the claims brought by the defendant companies.
11. By an order dated 12 December 2025, the reporting judge dismissed the application for expedited appeal proceedings brought by the Adobe companies.
12. By an order dated 19 December 2025, the Paris Local Division authorised the withdrawal of the claims against OpenAi LP.
13. By an order dated 12 January 2026, the Paris Local Division dismissed the application for review brought by Truepic.

ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

The companies Adobe (1) and Adobe Systems Software Ireland (2)

14. These companies argue, in essence, that the contested order, which merely refers to an order made by the Mannheim Local Division, is not substantiated in fact or in law and does not address any of the grounds raised by the defendant companies. They emphasise that

the order to which the contested order refers 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 CJEU's Fiona Shevill and Pez Hejduk judgments, according to which, where a court's jurisdiction 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 concerning 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 submit that Keex's plea based on Article 71b (3) of Regulation 1215/2012, which was not included in the statement of claim, in breach of Rule 13.1(i) of the Rules of Procedure, nor were the documents purporting to support this new argument. They maintain in any event that this provision cannot justify the international jurisdiction of the JUB.
16. The Adobe companies also argue that the JUB cannot apply the provisions of Article 14 of the French Civil Code, given the provisions of Article 31 of the AJUB and the fact that the JUB is not a French court.
17. In the alternative, should the Court of Appeal consider upholding the order of the court of first instance, the Adobe companies request that a reference for a preliminary ruling be made to the CJEU.

The companies Open AI OpCo (4, formerly Open AI LP) and Open AI Ireland (5)

18. These companies argue that the BSH decision on which the contested order is based is irrelevant to the matter in dispute. They point out that none of the defendants has its registered office within the territory over which the UBC has jurisdiction, so that the court's jurisdiction can only be based on Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012 and that, in this case, the UBC's jurisdiction is necessarily limited to the territory of the Member States party to the UBC Agreement.
19. OpenAI further argues that Article 6 of Regulation 1215/2012 cannot apply to the JUB as a court shared by several Member States. It is Article 71b that governs the international jurisdiction of the JUB in respect of 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 raised in the statement of claim (Rule 263 of the Rules of Procedure). They add that, in any event, this provision confers jurisdiction on the UPC to award damages for infringement occurring outside the Union, and not to hear alleged acts of infringement committed outside the territory over which the UPC has jurisdiction, namely 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 provisions of Article 71b(3) do not apply. The Open AI companies state that KeeX fails in any event to establish that the defendant companies have assets located in a Member State of the AJUB with a sufficient connection to the dispute.

Truepic (6)

21. The company seeks the setting aside of the contested order, arguing that the decision is based on erroneous reasoning, as the reference to the BSH judgment is not relevant to the present case. It adds that none of the other grounds put forward by Keex are applicable in the present case.

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

22. These companies likewise seek the setting aside of the contested order, as the grounds for that decision are erroneous, as are the other grounds relied on by Keex to justify its claims concerning Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Norway, Spain, Ireland and Poland.

Keex

23. This company first asks the Court of Appeal to dismiss the application seeking to ‘dismiss the infringement claims brought by the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parties’, as such an application relates to the merits of the case.
24. It adds that the contested order is sufficiently reasoned in fact and in law and is based on an analysis consistent with European Union law. Keex also invokes the application of Article 14 of the 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 JUB to extend its jurisdiction beyond its territorial jurisdiction, in particular to hear cases of infringement committed outside that territory. It points out in this regard that Open AI OpCo has established a subsidiary in France, Open AI France, whose registered office is in Paris. It adds that the same applies to Adobe, which has established Adobe Systems France in France, whose registered office is likewise in Paris. Therefore, in its view, the conditions for the application of this provision are met and justify its claims regarding the disputed territories.
26. The hearing was held by videoconference on 2 March 2026.

GROUNDINGS FOR THE DECISION

THE APPLICABLE RULES

Internal jurisdiction

27. Under Article 33(1)(a) of the AJUB, infringement proceedings shall be brought before the local division situated within the jurisdiction of the Contracting Member State where the infringement has occurred or is likely to occur.

28. The Court of Appeal has already had occasion to clarify that the ‘place where the infringement has occurred or is likely to occur’ as referred to in Article 33(1)(a) AJUB should be interpreted in the same way as the place “where the tortious act 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 (JUB CdA, Order of 3 September 2024, UPC_CoA_188/2024 – Aylo v. Dish, para 26, see also Order of 28 November 2025, UPC_CoA_317/2025, Barco v. Yealink, para 50 to 52). Where the damage is alleged to have been caused via a website, these provisions do not require that the website be directed at users located within the territory of the Member States concerned, but merely that it be accessible within the jurisdiction of the court or division seised (JUB CdA Order of 3 September 2024, UPC_CoA_188/2024 – Aylo v. Dish, paras 12 and 21).

International jurisdiction

29. Under Article 31 of the AJUB, the Court’s international jurisdiction is established in accordance with Regulation 1215/2012 or, where applicable, on the basis of the Convention on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Lugano Convention).
30. Article 71b(2) of Regulation No 1215/2012 provides that where the defendant is not domiciled in a Member State, and this Regulation does not otherwise confer jurisdiction over him, Chapter II (jurisdiction) applies, where applicable, irrespective of the defendant’s domicile.
31. Regulation 1215/2012 therefore applies outside the European Union before the ordinary courts, which is not the case 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 French courts.
32. Neither Article 6 of Regulation 1215/2012 nor Article 14 of the French Civil Code is therefore intended to apply before the JUB (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 is also noted that, pursuant to Article 4(1) of Regulation 1215/2012, persons domiciled in the territory of a Member State are to be sued, irrespective of their nationality, in the courts of that Member State.
34. Article 24(4) further provides that, irrespective of the domicile of the parties, the courts of the Member State in whose territory the application for registration or the registration has been made, or is deemed to have been made under a Union instrument or an international convention, shall have exclusive jurisdiction in matters relating to the registration or validity of patents, whether the issue is raised by way of an action or a plea in defence, the courts of the Member State in whose territory the application for filing or registration was made, was effected or is deemed to have been effected under an instrument of the Union or an international convention.

35. In its judgment of 25 February 2025, the CJEU ruled that Article 24(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 of 12 December 2012 must be interpreted as meaning that a court of the Member State in which the defendant is domiciled, seised pursuant to Article 4, (1) of that Regulation, of an action for infringement of a patent granted in another Member State, retains jurisdiction to hear that action where, in the course of those proceedings, the defendant raises, as a preliminary objection, the validity of that patent, even though 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 the court has jurisdiction under Article 7(2) of the Regulation, the Court of Justice has held that the court of the place where the damage has occurred or is likely to occur has jurisdiction only to hear cases concerning damage that has occurred within the territory of the Member State to which it belongs (CJEU, judgment of 22 January 2015, Pez Hejduk v EnergieAgentur.NRW, C-441/13, concerning copyright; see also judgment of 7 March 1995, Fiona Shevill, C-68/93, concerning 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, however, provides for an additional rule on jurisdiction where defendants are domiciled outside the European Union. This provision states that where a national court has jurisdiction over such a defendant in a dispute concerning the infringement of a European patent that 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 provision presupposes that the court already has jurisdiction to hear cases of infringement of a European patent within the European Union. The ordinary court could then exercise its 'incidental' jurisdiction over the same (non-EU) defendant and hear cases concerning the damage caused by that infringement outside the European Union.
39. The text further stipulates, as a condition for its application, that the defendant must own property situated in a Member State with which the dispute must have a sufficient connection. Recital 7 of Regulation 542/2014 states that 'the common court should take into account the value of the property in question, which should not be negligible and should be such as to allow, at least in part, for the enforcement of the judgment in the Member States party to the instrument establishing the common court.'

Verification of jurisdiction by the court

40. The CJEU has developed the principle of judicial autonomy in relation to a court's determination of its own jurisdiction. It has thus clarified that, although the court before which the case is brought is not obliged, where the defendant contests the claimant's allegations, to take evidence at the stage of determining jurisdiction, the objective of the proper administration of justice, which underlies the application of the Brussels I Regulation, 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 at its disposal, including, where appropriate, 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 JUB, Rule 13(1)(i) of the Rules of Procedure requires that the statement of claim contain an indication of the division before which the case is brought, as well as an explanation of its jurisdiction.
42. Paragraph 7 (last sentence) of the preamble to the Rules of Procedure specifies that the parties must cooperate with the court and present their case in full as soon as possible.
43. This procedural framework is designed, on the one hand, to ensure that the defendant is aware of the legal and factual grounds on which the claim is based, enabling them to prepare an adequate defence in a context where they generally have only one month to lodge a preliminary objection regarding the court's jurisdiction, and, on the other hand, to enable the court to rule on its jurisdiction on the basis of a preliminary examination of the facts and legal grounds justifying its jurisdiction.
44. It follows that the claimant must set out sufficient evidence to justify the court's domestic and international jurisdiction. In particular, where the claimant requests that the court exercise its jurisdiction in the territory of non-member states of the AJUB, the statement of claim must contain the factual and legal elements necessary to justify the court's jurisdiction in accordance with Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012.

APPLICATION TO THE PRESENT CASE

45. The Paris Local Division's jurisdiction to hear the case is, in this instance, justified by the fact that the content integrity verification software made available free of charge on the internet by the defendants is accessible in France. Truepic further confirmed at the hearing that it did not contest, on appeal, the decision regarding local jurisdiction. It likewise confirmed that its application for a stay of proceedings had become moot as a result of the decision of 12 January 2026 rejecting the application for review of the contested order.
46. With regard to international jurisdiction, it is noted that, in the present case, all the defendants have their registered offices outside the European Union, with the exception of Adobe Systems Software Ireland and Open AI Ireland, which have their registered offices in Ireland. That country, which has not ratified the UPC Agreement, cannot be regarded as a contracting Member State of the UPC Agreement (UPC Board of Appeal, decision of 19 August 2024, UPC_CoA 338/2024, Sibio v Abbot, para 10).
47. None of the defendants contests the UPC's jurisdiction to hear the claims brought against them and relating to the facts allegedly committed within the territory of the UPC, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7(2) of Regulation 1215/2012. Truepic was the only party to this appeal that contested the decision of the Paris Local Division to accept its international jurisdiction with regard to the territory of the JUB. At the hearing, Truepic confirmed that it no longer contested the JUB's decision regarding its international jurisdiction over the acts allegedly committed within the territory of the JUB.

48. The defendant companies, however, contest the claims insofar as they relate to damages allegedly suffered within the territory of States that are not contracting members of the AJUB.
49. The JUB's jurisdiction to hear such claims was thus 'explained' in Keex's statement of claim: *'The acts of infringement take place, in particular, in France. (...) It should be noted that the damage resulting from the acts of infringement is global and therefore covers all territories protected by European Patent EP 2 949 070 B1.'* Furthermore, Keex included a list of the countries designated by the patent. Nothing further is mentioned to establish the JUB's international jurisdiction.
50. In order to establish its jurisdiction to hear cases concerning infringements of the Swiss, Spanish, British, Irish, Norwegian and Polish parts of patent EP 2 949 070, the Paris Local Division stated that the CJEU's 'BSH' judgment, which allows the jurisdiction of a European Union court to be extended to third-country territories, applies regardless of whether the basis for jurisdiction is established under Article 4 or Article 7(2) of Regulation No 1215/2012.
51. These grounds are erroneous and rest 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 a court has jurisdiction as the court of the place where the harmful event occurred or is likely to occur, it has jurisdiction only to hear cases concerning damage caused within its territory, which is the sole link between the court seised and the subject-matter of the dispute.
52. In the present case, the defendant companies also argued (and Keex did not contest) that Keex had relied solely on the assertion that the JUB had jurisdiction under Article 7(2) of Regulation No 1215/2012 as the court of the place where the damage was allegedly suffered. However, on the basis of the aforementioned case law of the CJEU, the jurisdiction of the JUB based on Article 7(2) of Regulation No 1215/2012 is limited to the territory of the JUB.
53. Furthermore, the Court of Appeal considers that, in the present case, as the defendant companies rightly point out, the explanation of the JUB's international jurisdiction set out in the statement of claim is insufficient, both as regards the justification of the provisions applicable to the other national parts of patents (see the BSH judgment cited above, paragraph 40), but also as regards the justification of the conditions for the application of the provisions of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012, which require the establishment of the presence of assets of a certain value belonging to the defendant companies within the territory of the JUB.
54. The Court of Appeal notes in this regard that the statement of claim provides no explanation whatsoever on these two points. This cannot be remedied by exhibits 2 and 3, produced by Keex in response to the defendants' arguments, in order to prove the existence of assets of a certain value belonging to defendants 1 and 4 in France, a condition for the application of Article 71b(3) of Regulation 1215/2012, even assuming that this provision can be interpreted, as Keex does, as meaning that the 'damage caused

by this infringement outside the Union' correspond to the infringement of other national patent rights. This decision leaves that question open.

55. Finally, the Paris Local Division, which is not a French national court, cannot apply the provisions of Article 14 of the French Civil Code (see paragraph 33 above).

56. The decision of the court of first instance, in so far as it held that it had jurisdiction to hear the case concerning 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 over which it has no jurisdiction.

FOR THESE REASONS,

The Court of Appeal,

- I. Finds that the application for a stay of proceedings submitted by Truepic has become devoid of purpose by virtue of the order of 12 January 2026 of the Paris Local Division,
- II. Sets aside the order of 27 November 2025 in so far as it dismissed the preliminary objections raised by the defendant companies concerning the jurisdiction of the court,
- III. Holds 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.

Delivered in Luxembourg, 13 March 2026.

**KLAUS
MARTIN
Grabinski**

Digitally signed by
KLAUS STEFAN MARTIN
Grabinski
Date: 13 March 2026
16:41:43 +01:00

Klaus Grabinski, President of the Court of Appeal

**Nathalie,
Jeanne, Danielle
SABOTIER**

Digitally signed by
Nathalie, Jeanne,
Danielle SABOTIER
Date: 13 March 2026
17:43:44 +01:00

Nathalie Sabotier, legally qualified judge, judge-rapporteur

**Bartholomeus
Johannes van
den Broek**

Digitally signed by Bartholomeus
Johannes van den Broek
Date: 13 March 2026 17:10:38 +01:00

Bart Van Den Broek, legally qualified judge