



Düsseldorf Local
Chamber
UPC_CFI_1928/2025

Order
of the Court of First Instance of the Unified Patent Court
delivered on 7 May 2026
concerning EP 3 001 984 B1

HEADNOTES:

1.

The applicant bears, in principle, the burden of proof regarding the acquisition of knowledge of the existence of the contested embodiment, the potential infringement and its prompt clarification. The relevant period extends from the time of becoming aware of the contested embodiment as a potentially infringing product until all the facts and evidence required to substantiate the full facts of the infringement have been obtained.

2.

It must be assumed that the applicant was aware of the potentially infringing product if, according to conventional understanding and the ordinary course of events, the applicant should have been aware of the potentially infringing characteristics. This is followed by the duty to continue to investigate the facts of the case expeditiously. In this regard, all the circumstances of the individual case are relevant. The respondents bear the burden of proof and presentation regarding the indications from which it can be inferred that they must have had prior knowledge and from which hesitant conduct can be deduced. If such indications are substantiated by the respondents, it is then up to the applicant to rebut them or to explain why she could not have been aware of them and why she acted with sufficient promptness in this respect.

KEYWORDS:

Interim measures, necessity, urgency, unreasonable delay, knowledge, constructive knowledge, R. 211.4 Verfo

APPLICANT:

Ottobock SE & Co. KGaA, Max-Näder-Straße 15, 37115 Duderstadt, Germany, represented by Ottobock Management SE, at the same address, the latter represented by the managing directors Martin Böhm, Dr Arne Kreitz, Oliver Jakobi and Arne Jörn,

represented by: Sören Dahm, Solicitor; Robert Knaps, Solicitor;
Nicole Schopp, Lawyer Christoph Heringlake, Kather Augenstein Law Firm, Bahnstraße 16, 40212 Düsseldorf, Germany

electronic service address: dahm@katheraugenstein.com

supported by: Patent Attorney Kai Stornebel, Gramm, Lins & Partner Patent and Lawyers PartGmbH, Frankfurter Strasse 3C, 38122 Braunschweig, Germany

RESPONDENTS:

1. Wilhelm Julius Teufel GmbH, represented by its legal representatives, Robert-Bosch-Str. 15, 73117 Wangen, Germany,

represented by: Patent Attorney Prof. Dr Alexander Bulling, DREISS Patentanwälte Stuttgart,

solicitors Dr Matthias Sonntag and Mischa Krumm, Gleiss Lutz Hoots Hirsch PartmbB Rechtsanwälte, Dreischeibenhaus 1, 40211 Düsseldorf

electronic service address: bulling@dreiss.de

2. MedEnvoy Global BV, represented by its legal representatives, Prinses Margrietplant-soen 33 — Suite 123, 2595 AM The Hague, Netherlands

represented by: Attorneys Dr Matthias Sonntag and Mischa Krumm, Gleiss Lutz Hoots Hirsch PartmbB Rechtsanwälte, Dreischeibenhaus 1, 40211 Düsseldorf

Patent Attorney Prof. Dr Alexander Bulling, DREISS Patentan-wälte Stuttgart,

electronic service address: mischa.krumm@gleisslutz.com

PATENT IN DISPUTE:

EUROPEAN PATENT NO. EP 3 001 984 B1

Decision-making body/Chamber:

2nd Panel of the Düsseldorf Local Chamber

JUDGES SEATED:

The order was issued by the Presiding Judge, Dr Thom, acting as Rapporteur, the legally qualified Judge Dr Rinken, the legally qualified Judge Agergaard and the technically qualified Judge Michels.

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS: German

SUBJECT: Application for interim measures

ORAL HEARING: 22 April 2026

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE FACTS:

1. The applicant is bringing proceedings against the respondents for infringement of European patent EP 3 001 984 B1 (Annex KAP 9, hereinafter: the patent in suit), of which it is the sole proprietor.
2. The patent in dispute was filed on 5 November 2008 in the German language of the proceedings. It claims the priority of application DE 102007053389 dated 7 November 2011. The patent application was published on 6 April 2016. The notice of grant of the patent in dispute was published on 22 August 2018. The patent in dispute is currently in force in the Federal Republic of Germany, the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Iceland, the Italian Republic and the Kingdom of the Netherlands. No opposition was filed with the European Patent Office (EPO) against the grant of the patent in dispute.
3. The patent in dispute relates to a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint. Its claim 1 is worded as follows:

“Method for controlling an orthopaedic joint of a lower limb in at least one degree of freedom using an adjustable actuator to adapt an orthopaedic device, which comprises upper connection means to a limb and an orthopaedic element arranged in an articulated manner distal to the connection means, to walking situations that deviate from walking on a flat surface, comprising the following steps:

- a) *Detecting a plurality of parameters of the orthopaedic device via sensors,*
- b) *comparing the detected parameters with criteria in which multiple parameters and/or parameter profiles have been summarised and which are stored in a computing unit,*

- c) *selecting a criterion that is suitable on the basis of the determined parameters and/or parameter profiles, and*
 - d) *Adjusting movement resistances, ranges of motion, driving forces and/or their profiles depending on the selected criterion in order to control special functions that deviate from walking on a flat surface, wherein the flexion damping is reduced in the special function.”*
4. In the course of these proceedings, the applicant has based its application for interim measures on a restricted version of claim 1 (bold added by the court), which reads as follows:

*“A method for controlling an orthopaedic joint of a lower limb in at least one degree of freedom using an adjustable actuator to adjust an orthopaedic device, **which is a prosthetic knee joint** and comprises upper attachment means to a limb and an orthopaedic element articulated distally to the attachment means, **and distal attachment means for a prosthetic foot**, to walking situations that deviate from walking on a level surface, comprising the following steps:*

- a) *Detecting a plurality of parameters of the orthopaedic device via sensors,*
 - b) *comparing the detected parameters with criteria in which multiple parameters and/or parameter trends have been summarised and which are stored in a computing unit,*
 - c) *selecting a criterion that is suitable on the basis of the determined parameters and/or parameter profiles, and*
 - d) *Adjusting movement resistances, ranges of motion, driving forces and/or their profiles depending on the selected criterion, in order to control special functions that deviate from walking on a flat surface, wherein in the special function the flexion damping is reduced, **wherein the special function is alternating stair climbing.**”*
5. The applicant operates a care network locally at over 400 locations. Within this care network, companies pursue the primary task of patient care. These include John + Bamberg GmbH & Co. KG and Pohlig GmbH. With regard to patient care, the companies in the Ottobock Care Network are customers of both the applicant and other competitors.
6. In its application, the applicant challenges the artificial knee system “Knreuro microprocessor [model BR4B/BR4C]” (hereinafter: the contested embodiment). A slightly reduced-scale illustration, taken from Annex KAP 2, is shown below.



7. The first respondent distributes the contested embodiment. It has concluded a freedom-to-operate agreement with Brain-Robotics Inc., the manufacturer, in the parallel proceedings CFI 1927/2025. The first defendant does not use the services of the second defendant for the purposes of the contested acts of use (offering and supplying).
8. Respondent 2) performs regulatory tasks in the European Union on behalf of Respondent 1) as its authorised representative (Article 11 of Regulation (EU) 2017/745, Medical Device Regulation (MDR)).
9. On 6 October 2025, the claimant ordered two contested versions via a third-party company, which were delivered on 7 October 2025. Both products arrived at the claimant's premises on 21 October 2025 and 22 October 2025. The installation of the Kneuro app was delayed due to access details not being sent and was finally possible on 4 November 2025. Immediately afterwards, the applicant organised the preparation of measurements in the gait laboratory, for which the relevant sensor technology had to be programmed. The tests in the gait laboratory took place on 18 November 2025 and 19 November 2025 and were carried out for seven potential intellectual property rights. The results were available on 4 December 2025 and were sent to the patent attorney on the same day. The application for interim measures was filed on 10 December 2025 with the Düsseldorf Local Chamber of the Unified Patent Court.
10. The contested embodiment had already been exhibited at various trade fairs in the USA in autumn 2024 and early 2025, at which the applicant was either also present as an exhibitor or whose employees took part in a 'technical workshop'.
11. The contested embodiment had already been advertised in specialist journals such as the Fachmagazin für Orthopädietechnik since February 2025.
12. The market launch in Europe took place at Expolife from 20 March to 22 March 2025 in Kassel at the stand of the first respondent (see Annexes AG 3, AG 4). At the trade fair, the first respondent presented a product video showing the contested embodiment, and two patients demonstrated its use. At the

trade fair, a discussion took place between employees of the first respondent and Mr [Name], an employee of the claimant, regarding the contested embodiment.

13. Respondent 1) presented the contested embodiment immediately after the trade fair in Kassel on 25 March 2025 at the premises of Pohlig GmbH in Traunstein and explained the function at issue, namely the alternating stair-climbing mechanism.
14. Furthermore, the contested embodiment was presented at the Eqwall Excellence in Motion trade fair in Cannes from 14 April to 16 April 2025, at which the claimant was also represented. The first delivery of the contested embodiment to German customers took place on 24 May 2025 following an order dated 7 April 2025. A review and explanatory video had also been available on YouTube since April 2025. The user manual for the contested embodiment had been freely accessible since May 2025 and could be viewed on the website of the first respondent.
15. A further presentation in Europe took place at the ISPO World Congress in Stockholm from 16 June to 19 June 2025. Here, the employees [Name] from [Name] of the first respondent [Name] the head of the Orthopaedic Technology Vienna department at Otto Bock Healthcare Products GmbH, at length about the contested embodiment. **Mr [Name]** is responsible for development processes within the Otto Bock Group and was part of the core team at the applicant responsible for the development of the alleged direct competitor product, the Genium X4.
16. On 4 July 2025, four specialists from John + Bamberg GmbH & Co. KG in Hanover were certified. On 21 July 2025, an employee of Pohlig GmbH was certified for the trial fitting of a patient as part of training in the use of the contested embodiment. A further certification took place on 8 August 2025 at John + Bamberg GmbH & Co. KG, along with an adaptation of the contested embodiment for a female patient. On 29 August 2025, John + Bamberg GmbH & Co. KG ordered two further embodiments, which the first respondent delivered on 1 September 2025.

PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS:

17. The claimant finally requests:

- I. the respondents be ordered

- a) to refrain from

- devices suitable for carrying out a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint of a lower limb in at least one degree of freedom,

- in the Federal Republic of Germany, the French Republic, the Italian Republic and/or the Kingdom of the Netherlands for use in the Federal Republic of Germany, the French Republic, the Italian Republic and/or the Kingdom of the Netherlands,

- wherein the method comprises at least the following:

an adjustable actuator for adapting an orthopaedic device, which is a prosthetic knee joint, to walking situations that deviate from walking on level ground,

upper attachment means to a limb and an orthopaedic element arranged in an articulated manner distal to the attachment means, and distal attachment means for a prosthetic foot,

comprising the following steps:

detecting a plurality of parameters of the orthopaedic device via sensors,

comparing the detected parameters with criteria in which multiple parameters and/or parameter profiles have been summarised and which are stored in a computing unit,

selecting a criterion that is suitable on the basis of the determined parameters and/or parameter curves, and

adjusting movement resistances, ranges of motion, driving forces and/or their profiles depending on the selected criterion in order to control special functions that deviate from walking on a flat surface, wherein in the special function the flexion damping is reduced, wherein the special function is alternating stair climbing;

(indirect infringement of limited claim 1)

- II. For each individual infringement of the above order under point I, the respondents shall pay a (where applicable, repeated) penalty payment of up to EUR 50,000.00 per device and/or, in the case of ongoing acts such as offers on the internet, of up to EUR 100,000.00 per day to the court;
- III. The respondents are further ordered to hand over to a bailiff, for the purpose of safekeeping, the devices referred to in paragraph I, which are suitable for carrying out a procedure to control an orthopaedic joint; this safekeeping shall continue until a final decision has been made on the existence of a claim for destruction between the parties has been finally decided or an amicable settlement has been reached, or the applicant informs the court that custody is no longer required.
- IV. The respondents are further ordered to provide the applicant, within three (3) weeks of service of this order, in writing and in electronic form capable of being processed by a computer, with a breakdown structured by month of the calendar year and by patent-infringing products, commencing from 22 August 2018, information regarding the devices referred to in Section I, which are suitable for carrying out a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint,

- a) the origin and distribution channels of the devices referred to in Section I, which are suitable for carrying out a procedure for controlling an orthopaedic joint, stating
 - the names and addresses of the manufacturers, suppliers and other previous owners;
 - the names and addresses of the commercial customers and the points of sale for which the devices suitable for performing a procedure to control an orthopaedic joint were intended;
 - b) the identity of all third parties involved in the manufacture and distribution of the devices referred to in Section I, which are suitable for carrying out a procedure for controlling an orthopaedic joint.
- V. The respondents are further ordered, in the event of a breach of and/or failure to comply with any of the orders listed under Section IV, after the expiry of a period of three (3) weeks following service of the court order, to pay the court a penalty of up to EUR 50,000.00 per day of delay and/or non-compliance, with any part of a day counting as a full day.
- VI. The respondents are ordered to
- 1. bear the costs and expenses of the proceedings and the ordered measures;
 - 2. to provisionally reimburse the applicant for costs amounting to EUR 47,300.00.
- VII. The orders are effective and enforceable immediately
18. The respondents request that
- I. that the application be dismissed;
 - II. that the applicant bear the costs of the proceedings;
 - III. and that the applicant be ordered to pay the respondents provisional costs of EUR 40,651.20 within 30 days of the decision being served on the applicant;
 - IV. in the event that the court seized affirms the standing to be sued of the second respondent, that the court refer the question of whether an authorised representative within the meaning of the MDR can be regarded as an intermediary within the meaning of the EPGÜ solely on the basis of the fulfilment of the duties incumbent upon him under the MDR, pursuant to Article 267 TFEU, Article 21 of the EPÜG.

I. Scope of protection

19. The applicant submits that the parameters listed in the description of the contested patent are merely illustrative.
20. Feature 1.2b) (see breakdown of features in Section II. 1. b) aa)) requires a comparison of the recorded parameters with criteria. The criteria are trigger criteria for special functions of the invention. The skilled person recognises that several measured values of a single parameter, recorded over a specific period of time, represent a single parameter curve. Within a criterion for multiple parameters, a specific range of values is defined and this is compared with the parameters recorded by the sensors (para. [0017], paras. [0022], [0023] of the contested patent). The specified values or value ranges against which the recorded parameters/sensor data are compared are stored. 'Combining' does not mean 'merging'; rather, the criteria provide for an associated condition for each parameter from which they are combined, e.g. that a specified threshold value is not exceeded (paragraphs 10 to 12).
21. The claim contains no restriction to specific movement situations, so that artificial movements are also covered. Even if these lead to a less than optimal implementation, they are encompassed by the scope of protection of the contested patent. The contested patent acknowledges in several places that a backward movement can provide reliable parameters for initiating the special function. The movement of the foot backwards and then upwards also corresponds to a natural movement pattern for lifting the foot straight up and not getting caught on the step. This is because if the prosthetic leg were lifted solely by hip flexion, the foot would be moved forwards, as the passive knee joint cannot be actively controlled and may buckle. For this reason, the prior horizontal movement of the prosthetic leg backwards is natural and conducive to safely ascending a step.
22. The respondents argue that the overall context of features 1 (method for controlling an orthopaedic joint to adapt an orthopaedic device to walking situations that differ from walking on level ground) and 1.3 (to control special functions that deviate from walking on a level surface, whereby the flexion damping is reduced in the special function) implies that 'special functions' refer to walking situations that deviate from walking on a level surface.
23. From the general description of the contested patent, the person skilled in the art would understand that the special function is not activated by unusual or artificial movements. The contested patent specifically seeks to distinguish itself from this (paragraphs [0009], [0011] of the contested patent). The aim is to enable automatic control without a conscious activation action.
24. Feature 1.2a) requires that several parameters be detected via sensors. The

description of the contested patent mentions here joint angle, change in joint torque,

vertical movement of a component of the orthopaedic device, horizontal movement and/or its trajectory (lower leg moved backwards) or a change in tilt angle.

25. Feature 1.2b) requires a comparison of the detected parameters with criteria. The criteria are not to be equated with parameters. The detected parameters are specifically not compared with stored parameters or parameter curves. The criteria combine several parameters and/or parameter curves. Functionally, the criteria are intended to assign movement or load states of the orthopaedic device to the special functions to be controlled. These movements and loads are not of the kind that would only be measured when performing an artificial movement deviating from the gait cycle.
26. Combining several parameters into a single criterion does not mean that parameters are compared with criteria established on the basis of threshold values, but rather with comparative values in which several parameters or parameter curves are combined. A criterion in accordance with the contested patent is a comparative value consisting of a combination of parameters or parameter curves. In terms of data processing, 'combining' means that at least two conditions (parameters) are condensed (aggregated) or merged (fused) into a (single) comparative value (criterion). The combination of the at least two conditions may be carried out using a calculation rule. The result is a comparative value that integrates several sensory parameters (e.g. joint angle curve and degree of load). Instead of two comparative values (one per parameter) and two individual comparisons of the recorded parameters with the corresponding comparative values, there is only one comparative value against which two parameters/parameter curves are compared. Such a summary criterion could be advantageous in view of the limited computing power of the mobile processors available at the priority date. The claim makes no mention of a value or range of values.
27. Feature 1.3 is to be interpreted as meaning that the flexion damping in the swing phase of the special function must be lower than in the swing phase when walking on a flat surface.

II. Infringement

28. The applicant submits that the contested embodiment, for the mode of alternating stair climbing, would in any event capture joint angle, extension and flexion resistance, load on the product and spatial position. The rapid hip extension, followed by the rapid hip movement, triggers the special function of alternating stair climbing or step-over-step. Logically, the selection can only be made by comparing the measured parameters with the requirements of the criterion. To this end, the criteria must be stored in the computing unit and an adjustment takes place within the special function, as flexion damping must occur during the swing phase to enable flexion of the prosthetic knee joint at all.
29. For the fulfilment of feature 1.2 b), it is sufficient that the contested embodiment provides a sequential IF function, by means of which three parameters are compared

against a

associated threshold value and combined via a logical AND operator. The IF function thus combines several parameters. The threshold values defined therein are determined in advance, which necessitates storage. Both sequential comparison and simultaneous comparison are covered by the contested patent.

30. The parameters covered are also compared against several criteria, as there are a number of special functions (walking to running, anti-stumble protection, descending stairs, etc.).
31. Alternating stair climbing does not require any unusual movement sequences. Furthermore, the so-called 'donkey step' is expressly described in paragraph [0038] of the contested patent. Moreover, it follows from the instructions for use that the special function can also be initiated from a natural walking movement, because each subsequent step requires less effort to initiate the special function.
32. The respondents argue that the claimant has not itself provided any substantiated evidence regarding the control software, in particular as to which parameters are output and which criteria are stored in the microprocessor of the contested embodiment.
33. The respondents had received a flowchart and diagram relating to the relevant part of the control software from the manufacturer Brain Robotics, as well as extracts from its C code, and the programming had been explained to them. Accordingly, the contested embodiment does not infringe feature 1.2(b).
34. For the contested stair-climbing mode, no reference values in accordance with the contested patent are stored as criteria in the control system of the contested embodiment. Instead, three different parameters are recorded and each compared with a threshold value per parameter. The mode is triggered by an artificial movement, the so-called 'donkey kick'. This movement does not correspond to the horizontal movement of the prosthetic foot backwards in conjunction with a hip movement mentioned in paragraph [0038] of the contested patent. The movement described in the contested patent remains within the scope of the natural lifting of the leg for climbing stairs; the hip is bent to lift the foot and the foot is moved backwards.
35. Furthermore, no 'climbing stairs' (step-over-step) criterion is established in which at least two parameters or a sequence are combined. This involves sensor data processing known from the prior art, within the framework of which logically linked individual comparisons of different parameters are carried out with threshold values for each parameter. This is also evident from the sequential comparison of the IF function with three individual comparisons. A single comparison is carried out for each parameter. The respective comparison results are further processed using statement-based decision logic ('AND', 'THEN'). The sequential processing makes a difference, because if a negative result is already present in the first single comparison, there is no longer a comparison with a criterion comprising several parameters.

36. Nor have any criteria in accordance with the contested patent been programmed for the functions 'walking to running, anti-stumble protection and stair descent'.
37. In the absence of the use of a criterion within the meaning of feature 1.2.b), no criterion in accordance with the contested patent is selected pursuant to process step 1.2.c) either. This selection decision presupposes that the determined (= recorded) parameters are first compared with different criteria in order to determine which of the several criteria exhibits the highest match/correlation, and that this is then selected as the appropriate criterion. The contested software does not function in this manner. The recorded parameters do not first undergo at least two different IF-YES-AND...-THEN threshold tests with regard to at least two of the four modes cited by the applicant as 'special functions' ('Step-Over-Step Stair Ascent', 'Walk-to-Run', 'Stumble Recovery' and 'Descending Stairs'), in order subsequently to select which of the two results 'fits better' with the determined parameters and/or parameter trends and is thus the appropriate criterion. The sequential threshold checks of individual parameters all lead to the result 'YES'. In that case, the special function "Step-Over-Step Stair Ascent" is triggered. Or one of the — presumably at least three — sequential threshold checks is negative. In that case, the special function is not triggered. Prior to the "YES" or "NO", no further threshold checks are first carried out in order to then make a selection between different (supposed) criteria.
38. In the absence of the use of a criterion according to the contested patent, no adjustment is made in dependence on a criterion according to the contested patent in accordance with method step 1.2.d).
39. Feature 1.3 is not realised because the damping of flexion is not reduced overall across the entire movement cycle compared to walking on a flat surface. However, in the swing phase of the stair-climbing mode, which begins with hip flexion, the flexion damping is not reduced at all in the contested embodiment; rather, the onset of hip flexion is one of the triggers for increasing the flexion damping to 85%. In the contested embodiment, the reduction is triggered by the 'donkey kick', i.e. the reduction occurs as soon as the foot is moved backwards at a corresponding speed. If the foot and thigh are subsequently moved forwards (i.e. towards the stairs), the flexion damping is in any case increased again as soon as hip flexion begins. The flexion damping values achieved in this process are always at least as high as the maximum values during walking on level ground and — with the maximum flexion damping value of 99% rapidly reached during hip flexion — are even higher than these. The high flexion damping is intended to prepare the foot for stepping onto the step, so that the corresponding load on the knee prosthesis caused by the prosthesis wearer's weight does not lead to the prosthetic knee buckling.

III. State of the art

40. The respondents contend that the contested patent, in its granted version, is not novel in relation to WO 2007/128299 A1 (D1), DE 19 859 931 A1 (D2), EP 1 003 442 B1 (D3) and EP 0 549 855 A2 (D4). Furthermore, the contested patent is also not novel in relation to EP 1

626 B1 (D2 in parallel proceedings CFI_1927/2025). Furthermore, the contested patent in its granted version does not involve an inventive step based on D2 in conjunction with common general knowledge, D2 in conjunction with DE 40 39 648 A1 (D6) or D2 in conjunction with D6 and common technical knowledge, or based on D4 in conjunction with common technical knowledge (Riener (2002), Stair ascent and descent at different inclinations). Furthermore, the contested patent is alleged to have been inadmissibly broadened and not disclosed in a manner capable of being carried out.

41. In the restricted version, the contested patent is unclear and inadmissibly broadened. Furthermore, it is still not novel in relation to D1. In any event, the additional features are obvious to a person skilled in the art, based on D2 from the parallel proceedings CFI_1927/2025 and/or based on US 2005/0283257 A1 (D3 in the parallel proceedings CFI 1927/2025).

IV. Necessity of interim measures

42. The applicant claims that at the trade fair in Stockholm, the function of the contested embodiment was not the subject of the discussions with the employee. The discussions at the trade fair in Kassel had only concerned functions described in the promotional materials; no detailed explanation at a technical level.
43. The employees present at the trade fairs were not from IP management or the departments responsible for technical intellectual property rights. Information was not available there until 4 December 2025.
44. The respondents argue that the fact that the applicant did not make enquiries within its own supply network – given that the two companies John + Bamberg GmbH & Co. KG and Pohlig GmbH had been certified for the contested embodiments since July 2025 – demonstrates that the applicant was in no hurry. It had been possible to obtain and examine a contested embodiment without any difficulty since July 2025 at the very latest.
45. At the trade fair in Kassel, there was also an exchange between (an employee of the first respondent) and two other employees of Ottobock from Duderstadt Sales Manager, and Director of Management DACH) regarding the functionality of the contested embodiment. At the trade fair in Stockholm, there was again an intensive exchange between the first respondent and the Ottobock **employee**, who was a member of Ottobock's R&D team and oversaw the development of the applicant's Genium X4 product.
46. The creation of a fictitious patient profile was not necessary for a test in the gait laboratory. Finally, it is not clear why the app installation is said to have taken almost two weeks after purchase. Here, too, the claimant acted hesitantly.

V. Legal consequences

47. The applicant contends that the second respondent is liable as an intermediary, as its actions constituted mandatory prerequisites for the placing on the market of the contested embodiment. It further takes the view that it is entitled to claims for the surrender of the funds and the provision of information in the proceedings for interim measures.
48. In the respondents' view, the second respondent does not constitute an intermediary within the meaning of Sections 63(1) and 62(1) of the European Patent Act. She acts as a point of contact for the authorities but does not carry out any specific acts that are intrinsically linked to the patent infringement or constitute an adequate causal contribution to the infringement. The mere legally binding contribution to causation is not sufficient for contributory causation. Should the court take a different view, she suggests the referral to the European Court of Justice referred to in the applications.
49. For the parties' full submissions, reference is made to the written pleadings and annexes filed with the court, as well as to the minutes of the oral hearing.

KEY PROCEDURAL STEPS:

50. By written submission of 23 March 2026, the respondents filed an application for the admission of a further written submission to take into account the arguments contained therein, together with the evidence regarding the lack of legal basis and the citations D1 and D2 from the parallel proceedings CFI_1927/2025, the invalidity challenges to the auxiliary claim already introduced in the aforementioned parallel proceedings, the issue of infringement, and the necessity of the requested interim measures.
51. The applicant objected to the admission of the further submissions by written statement dated 31 March 2026.
52. In an order dated 10 April 2026, the rapporteur set out the legal basis for a possible authorisation and discussed the arguments in favour of authorisation, but deferred the decision on the application. She gave the applicant the opportunity to respond in writing to the new submissions and, if necessary, to submit the alternative claim from the parallel proceedings CFI_1927/2025 in the present proceedings.
53. The applicant submitted its response in its written submission of 13 April 2026 and, in the alternative, based its application on a limited form of claim 1, which it had made the main claim during the oral proceedings.

REASONS:

54. The admissible application for an order for interim measures is unsuccessful on the merits. On the one hand, the infringement cannot be established with the requisite certainty; on the other hand, the applicant's hesitant conduct in enforcing the

disputed patent, which negates the need for an interim measure to be ordered.

I. Admissibility

55. The application for interim measures is admissible.

1. Jurisdiction

56. The Düsseldorf Regional Chamber has jurisdiction in any event pursuant to Section 32(1)(c) and Section 33(1)(a) of the European Patent Act (EPGÜ). The contested embodiment is offered and distributed within the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany by the first respondent.

2. Admissibility of the respondents' new submissions

57. Pursuant to Rule 9.1, 209(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure, the respondents' new submissions in the written statement of 31 March 2026 were to be admitted on an exceptional basis.

58. Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure is not relevant here. Reference is made to the remarks of the Rapporteur in the order of 10 April 2026.

59. This discretionary decision is based on the specific circumstances of the present individual case. The new submission relates to the same patent in dispute, the same contested embodiment and the same factual circumstances, which must be assessed in determining the necessity of granting an interim measure. The same applies to the evidence referred to. Different dates of service in the two proceedings have led to different time limits in this case. Nevertheless, both proceedings were heard orally on the same day. Ultimately, this is one and the same case involving four different respondents. The fact that both proceedings could be joined again at the oral hearing means that a purely formal approach does not appear appropriate in the present case. Finally, the applicant was also given the opportunity, in the run-up to the oral hearing, to comment in writing on the submissions with which she was already familiar from the parallel proceedings CFI_1927/2025. No party has therefore suffered any disadvantage.

3. Admissibility of the new claim

60. According to the case law of the Court of Appeal, the unconditional conversion of the original alternative claim into a principal claim is admissible in any event (see UPC_CoA_898/2025, Order of 27 March 2026, ONWARD v Niche Biomedical, para. 38). In this respect, there are no concerns regarding the admissibility of the main claim, which was initially filed as a subsidiary claim.

II. Infringement of the patent in dispute

61. It cannot be established with sufficient certainty (Rule 211(2) of the Rules of Procedure) that the contested embodiment infringes the patent in dispute.

1. Implementation of the features

62. On summary examination, the court is not convinced with the requisite certainty that the contested embodiment (indirectly) carries out the method claimed in the limited version of claim 1 of the contested patent.

a) Relevant person skilled in the art

63. The court is satisfied that the person skilled in the art comprises a team consisting of the following persons: A person with a university degree in mechanical engineering or mechatronics, specialising in biomedical or medical technology, and with several years' practical experience in the development and manufacture of prostheses or comparable biomechanical joints; and a person with a university degree in computer science/software engineering and with several years' practical experience in the processing of sensor data from prostheses or comparable biomechanical joints. As the claimed teaching is directed in particular at details of data processing, it appears appropriate that the skilled person is constituted as a team that also includes a person with relevant knowledge of data processing. In this context, it is also appropriate that the computer scientist/software engineer has specific experience in data processing relating to prostheses and comparable biomechanical joints.

b) Determination of the scope of protection

64. Pursuant to Article 69 EPC in conjunction with the Protocol on its interpretation, the patent claim is not merely the starting point but the decisive basis for determining the scope of protection of a European patent. The interpretation of a patent claim does not depend solely on its exact wording in the linguistic sense. Rather, the description and the drawings must always be taken into account as aids to the interpretation of the patent claim and should not be used merely to resolve any ambiguities in the patent claim. However, this does not mean that the patent claim serves merely as a guideline and that its subject-matter also extends to what, following an examination of the description and the drawings, appears to be the patent proprietor's claim for protection. In applying these principles, appropriate protection for the patent proprietor should be combined with sufficient legal certainty for third parties. The patent claim must be interpreted from the perspective of a person skilled in the art (UPC_CoA_335/2023, Order of 26 February 2024, Headnote 2 and p. 26 et seq. — 10x Genomics v. Nanostring; UPC_CoA_1/2024, Order of 13 May 2024, para. 26 — VusionGroup v. Hanshow; UPC_CoA_182/2024, Order of 25 September 2024, para. 82 — Mammut v. Ortovox).

aa) Subject matter of the contested patent

65. The contested patent relates generally to a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint of a lower limb, wherein an adjustable actuator is used to adapt an orthopaedic device to walking situations that deviate from walking on level ground. The orthopaedic device comprises, on its upper side, means for connection to a limb and an orthopaedic element arranged in an articulated manner distal to the connection means (see paragraph [0001] of the contested patent; hereinafter, paragraphs (para.) without a source reference are those of the contested patent).

66. The prior art discloses the control of a passive prosthetic joint with adjustable damping from the subsequently published DE 10 2006 021 802, which adapts the prosthesis to stair climbing. In this case, the momentary lifting of the prosthetic foot is detected and subsequently the flexion damping is reduced during the lifting phase to below a level suitable for walking on level ground (para. [0002]).
67. US 2006/0224246 A1 and US 2007/0050047 A1 each describe a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint, in which parameters capable of providing information about the respective movement of the joint are measured, and the data thus obtained is used to control the joint and to recognise different movement sequences. The same applies to WO 2006/069264 A1 [para. [0003]].
68. Methods for detecting different phases of a gait cycle are known from WO 01/72245 A2, WO 2006/024876 A2 and EP 0 549 855 A2. The information determined in this way can be used to control flexion and extension damping and to release the knee for free pivoting (para. [0004]). DE 198 59 931 A1, US 2003/0120183 A1 and GB 2 367 753 A also deal with methods for controlling an artificial knee joint, in which, amongst other things, the damping of the knee joint can be adjusted on the basis of measured parameters (para. [0005]).
69. Based on this prior art, the invention is directed to providing a method for controlling an orthopaedic joint, which makes it possible to take specific walking situations into account and to ensure appropriate behaviour of the orthopaedic device (para. [0006]).
70. To solve this problem, the contested patent provides a method having the features of claim 1, which the applicant asserts in the following limited version:

Claim 1

1. A method for controlling an orthopaedic joint of a lower limb in at least one degree of freedom using an adjustable actuator to adapt an orthopaedic device to walking situations that deviate from walking on a flat surface,
 - 1.1. the orthopaedic device is a prosthetic knee joint and comprises upper connection means to a limb and an orthopaedic element arranged in an articulated manner distal to the connection means, and distal connection means for a prosthetic foot,
 - 1.2. comprising the following steps:
 - a) Detecting a plurality of parameters of the orthopaedic device via sensors,
 - b) comparing the detected parameters with criteria in which several parameters and/or parameter profiles have been summarised and which are stored in a computing unit,

- c) selecting a criterion that is suitable on the basis of the determined parameters and/or parameter curves, and
 - d) adjusting movement resistances, ranges of motion, driving forces and/or their profiles depending on the selected criterion,
- 1.3 to control special functions that differ from walking on a flat surface, whereby the flexion damping is reduced in the special function, the special function being the act of walking up stairs.

bb) Interpretation

71. The court is of the opinion that the person skilled in the art understands the parameters taken into account in the criteria to be those based on the natural movement pattern of a person with healthy limbs. This also covers movement patterns that are typical for wearers of (knee joint) prostheses and therefore deviate slightly from the natural pattern, because the natural movement cannot be replicated exactly due to the lack of existing musculature/joints. However, no unusual movement sequences are recorded which, arising from walking, constitute deliberate activation movements and are thus foreign to the movement sequence that occurs when deviating from walking on level ground.
72. This understanding of the skilled person is fundamentally covered by the broad wording of the claim. Feature 1.2b) requires a comparison of the parameters recorded by the sensors (Feature 1.2a) with criteria in which several parameters and/or parameter curves have been summarised and which are stored in a computer unit. When considered together with feature 1, the person skilled in the art understands that one purpose of the method is to adapt the orthopaedic device (the prosthetic knee joint) to walking situations that deviate from walking on level ground. In feature 1.3, as claimed in its restricted form, this deviation is characterised as a special function, namely alternating stair climbing. The person skilled in the art understands the walking situation of alternating stair climbing to be a normal sequence of movements of a prosthesis wearer, which approximates the stair climbing of a person with healthy limbs.
73. Even if the wording of the claim is broader per se, the person skilled in the art finds this understanding confirmed when considering the claim in conjunction with the further description of the patent specification in dispute and the figures. In this respect, there is no interpretation of the claim that falls short of its wording (in the sense of the literal meaning); rather, the patent specification as a whole shows that the claimed criteria include movement sequences that enable the prosthesis wearer to control their movements unconsciously.
74. Thus, right at the outset, the person skilled in the art learns from the general part of the description that the claimed criteria assign certain movement or load conditions of the orthopaedic device to specific walking situations (see para. [0009]). Paragraph [0009] further states:

(...j The sensors determine the parameters whilst walking, preferably whilst walking on level ground, so that the user of the orthopaedic device

has the opportunity to activate the special functions without having to perform movements that do not correspond to the natural pattern. By recording minor deviations in individual parameters and evaluating them during walking in correlation with other parameters and deviations that have been summarised into criteria, it is possible to predict upcoming movement sequences, so that the special function can be initiated whilst walking. Whilst it is known from the prior art to activate special functions through unusual movement sequences whilst standing, e.g. by repeatedly and rapidly loading the forefoot or performing a wave-like movement through an atypical, alternating loading of the heel and forefoot, the method according to the invention allows switching to take place whilst walking, resulting in 'intuitive' control that requires no conscious activation actions. This leads to increased wearing comfort and enhanced safety, particularly for prosthesis wearers, as operational errors are minimised or eliminated."

75. The specification of the contested patent thus distinguishes itself from the prior art precisely in that special functions could previously only be triggered by distinctive movements that do not occur in a normal gait pattern. The contested patent emphasises that, using the method of the invention, the user can intuitively control the special function whilst walking, and that no conscious activation action is required. The advantages of the invention are increased wearing comfort and greater safety, as the risk of incorrect operation is reduced or eliminated.

76. The automatic control is then emphasised again in paragraph [0011], which states:

"[...] This enables automatic control of the joint as a whole, without the user of the orthopaedic device having to consciously perform an action that deviates from a natural sequence of movements."

77. Paragraph [0012] emphasises that the prosthesis/orthosis wearer receives an orthopaedic device that adapts to the respective situation without the need for a lengthy period of adjustment to the extended functionality. In doing so, the contested patent makes use of the fact that the relevant starting positions and walking situations exhibit a specific, significant load or sequence of loads, or sequence of parameters, which are suitable for establishing criteria to activate special functions and to effect a corresponding change in the degrees of freedom, in particular in damping such as flexion damping and/or extension damping (para. [0012]).

78. Paragraph [0018] specifically addresses the different walking situation of climbing stairs with an orthopaedic device. It states:

'[...] When climbing stairs with an orthopaedic device, it has been shown that during walking, a lower leg directed backwards, i.e. against the direction of walking, provides reliable signals. In this case, the knee is positioned significantly ahead of the ankle joint in the direction of walking.'

79. It is clear here that the contested patent deals in particular with walking situations involving prosthesis wearers, i.e. it does not merely summarise parameters of walking situations

as they occur in people who do not use an orthopaedic device. Even though the movement patterns of prosthesis wearers cannot be completely equated with those of people without this disability due to the loss of certain muscle groups, it can nevertheless be inferred from the specification of the contested patent that, when determining parameters, it is based as closely as possible on normal movement patterns. Thus, paragraph [0019] states, regarding the purpose of summarising several parameters, that this is intended to take account of the fact that alternating stair climbing may involve different walking speeds, positions, or may begin with either the prosthetic or non-prosthetic leg. This reflects various everyday conditions, which are intended to enable the user to achieve automatic control or movement.

80. This understanding also runs through the specific part of the description.

81. Paragraph [0048] states:

'(...) Whereas previously the solution involved performing particularly distinctive movements to set a special function S, for example rocking the forefoot several times, the present method allows for automatic adaptation of the damping behaviour to the respective gait situation.'

82. The embodiment in paragraph [0038] also deals with climbing stairs. Provided that active hip flexion supports passive knee flexion here, as indicated by arrow 7 in Figure 2, whereby a (slight) backward movement of the prosthetic foot is also mentioned as a suitable detection parameter, this embodiment captures the natural sequence of movements of a prosthesis wearer upon reaching the next higher step. The slight backward movement is due to the fact that, in the absence of existing musculature in the passive knee joint, this could buckle as a result of the hip movement. However, neither the arrow movements in Figure 2 nor the descriptions in paragraph [0038] indicate that this is a conscious and distinct activation movement or even a swinging/stepping movement. The movement depicted falls within the natural range of motion possible for a prosthesis wearer.

83. All the descriptions in the contested patent therefore show that the criteria correspond to a natural pattern and, in contrast to the prior art, emphasise in various places that no unusual movement sequences are necessary to activate the special function, but rather that 'intuitive control', 'automatic control' or 'automatic adjustment' takes place. Finally, the summarisation of the parameters into criteria for comparison with the recorded parameters is not described as optional anywhere.

cc) Infringement

84. On the basis of such an understanding, the Court is currently unable to establish with the certainty required for the issuance of a provisional injunction that the contested embodiment constitutes an essential means which is objectively suitable for carrying out the limited claim 1 of the contested patent. The court cannot establish that the contested embodiment performs the process step in feature 1.2b). It is not apparent

that criteria are stored in the computer unit of the contested embodiment which summarise parameters reflecting a sequence of movements that is typical for prosthesis wearers and is oriented as closely as possible to a natural movement pattern of climbing stairs.

85. To initiate the alternating stair-climbing function, the stance mode is first required, in which the knee, thigh and calf are positioned almost vertically; this must be followed by two successive partial movements: a gliding movement backwards that extends the hip, and a rapid forward movement that flexes the hip (rapid high-knee). These movements are referred to as a 'donkey kick' and trigger the flexion of the knee joint in the embodiment described. The video submitted to the file (Annex KAP 32) shows that this movement appears like a kick backwards before the supported leg can be lifted onto the step. This is a deliberate and distinctive initial movement which does not suggest intuitive control by the wearer. An infringement is therefore ruled out.
86. Insofar as the applicant further argues that the instructions for use (Annex KAP 12) of the contested embodiment indicate that each subsequent step requires less effort to initiate the ascent of the stairs step by step, this argument also fails to support her application.
87. She submitted the video as Annex KAP 33 to illustrate the alternating ascent of several steps. The respondents objected that these triggering movements did not differ qualitatively from the initial triggering movements. Triggering movements occurring in quick succession still required rapid backward movements of the foot. Rather, the only condition waived is that the user must remain in the stance phase for 0.5 seconds. Furthermore, experienced users might be better able to conceal movements that are unusual in this respect. Taking into account the documents and videos submitted, the Board cannot determine whether the summarised movement parameters for alternating stair climbing, once commenced, constitute movements typical for prosthesis wearers. A backward movement of the foot, comparable to a kick, is still discernible. In particular, the Board is unable to establish with the conviction required for the issuance of an order whether this already constitutes a typical movement of a prosthesis wearer, which thereby already enables intuitive control of the knee joint and therefore merely represents a poorer execution of the method step according to the contested patent.

2. Further discussion of infringement and the legal position

88. As it is not relevant to the decision, no further comments are required on the interpretation and implementation of the remaining features of limited claim 1, the standing to be sued of the second respondent, or the legal position.

III. Necessity of interim measures and balancing of interests

89. Pursuant to Article 62(2) EPGÜ and Rule 211.3 VerfO, the court shall, at its discretion, weigh up the interests of the parties against one another, taking into account in particular the potential harm that would be caused to one of the parties by the granting or refusal of interim measures.
90. According to the Rules of Procedure, both temporal and factual circumstances are relevant to the necessity of ordering interim measures. The relevance of temporal circumstances arises from Rule 209.2(b) of the Rules of Procedure ('Urgency') and, in particular, from Rule 211.4 VerfO, according to which the court takes into account any undue delay in applying for interim measures. The fact that factual circumstances must also be taken into account in the decision on the order of interim measures follows, for example, from Rule 211.3 of the Rules of Procedure, according to which, when deciding on the application for an order, particular consideration must also be given to the potential damage that may be incurred by the applicant. By contrast, potential harm to the respondent must be taken into account in the balancing of interests (UPC CFI 2/2023 (Munich Regional Court), Order of 19 September 2023, p. 84 — Nanostring v. 10x Genomics; UPC_CFI_452/2023 (Düsseldorf Regional Court), Order of 9 April 2024, p. 27 — Ortovox v. Mammut).

1. Unreasonable delay

91. In the present case, it cannot be ruled out that the applicant has waited an unreasonable amount of time before filing its application, thereby removing the urgency, which — for the reasons explained in more detail below — is to the detriment of the applicant.

a) Principles

92. When balancing the interests, the court takes into account any undue delay in applying for provisional measures pursuant to Rule 211.4 of the Rules of Procedure in conjunction with Rule 209.1(b) of the Rules of Procedure. This is based on the fact that the patent holder's conduct demonstrates that the enforcement of his rights is no longer urgent for him. In such a situation, there is no need to order interim measures.
93. The temporal urgency required for the ordering of provisional measures is lacking only if the injured party has pursued its claims so negligently and hesitantly that it can objectively be assumed that it has no interest in the rapid enforcement of its rights and it therefore does not appear appropriate to order provisional measures (UPC_CFI_347/2024 (Düsseldorf Division), Order of 31 October 2024, p. 42 — Magna v. Valeo; see also UPC CFI 2/2023 (Munich Division), Order of 19 September 2023 — 10x Genomics v. Nanostring; UPC CFI 452/2024 (Düsseldorf Division), Order of 9 April 2024, p. 27, para. 126 — Ortovox v. Mammut; UPC CFI 151/2024 (Hamburg Division), order of 3 June 2024 — Ballinno v. UEFA).
94. Pursuant to Rule 213.2 of the Rules of Procedure, the Court may, in the course of its decision-making, request the applicant to submit all evidence at its disposal in order

to satisfy itself that the applicant is entitled to initiate proceedings under Article 47 of the EPGÜ, that the patent in question is valid, and that its rights are being infringed or are at risk of being infringed. In summary proceedings, the applicant must, as a

rule respond to such an order within a short period, which requires adequate preparation for the proceedings. The applicant must therefore only apply to the court if he has reliable knowledge of all the facts that make legal action in proceedings for interim measures appear promising, and if he can substantiate these facts. They may prepare for all possible procedural scenarios that may arise from the circumstances in such a way that, upon the court's order, they can submit the requested information and documents and successfully rebut the opposing party's arguments. In principle, the applicant cannot be required to conduct the necessary investigations only during the course of the proceedings and, where necessary, to obtain the required documents retrospectively. On the other hand, the applicant must not unnecessarily delay the proceedings. As soon as he becomes aware of the alleged infringement, he must investigate it, take the necessary steps to clarify the matter and obtain the documents required to substantiate his claims. In doing so, they must carefully initiate and complete the necessary steps at every stage (UPC_CFI_452/2023 (Düsseldorf), Order of 9 April 2024, para. 128 — Ortovox v. Mammut; UPC_CFI_151/2024 (Hamburg Division), Order of 3 June 2024 — Ballinno v. UEFA; UPC_CFI_347/2024 (Düsseldorf Division), Order of 31 October 2024, p. 42 — Magna v. Valeo).

95. On this basis, the time limit within the meaning of Rule 211.4 of the Rules of Procedure is to be calculated from the date on which the applicant was aware of, or ought to have been aware of, the infringement which would have enabled him to file a promising application for interim measures pursuant to Rule 206.2 of the Rules of Procedure. Whether a delay within the meaning of Rule 211.4 of the Rules of Procedure is unreasonable depends on the circumstances of the individual case (UPC_CoA_182/2024, Order of 25 September 2024, paras. 228 and 232 — Mammut v. Ortovox; UPC_CFI_347/2024 (Düsseldorf Regional Court), Order of 31 October 2024, p. 42 — Magna v. Va-leo). Ultimately, it must always be examined whether the applicant's conduct as a whole justifies the conclusion that the enforcement of their rights is not urgent.

b) Application to the present case

96. Based on these principles, it cannot be ruled out that the applicant's conduct in the present case was unreasonably hesitant, because, given all the circumstances, she should have known at an earlier stage that the contested embodiment could potentially infringe the patent in dispute, and she could therefore have made more prompt efforts to further clarify the facts of the case.
97. The applicant generally bears the burden of proof regarding the acquisition of knowledge of the existence of the contested embodiment, the potential infringement and its prompt clarification. The relevant period extends from the time of becoming aware of the contested embodiment as a potentially infringing product until all the facts and evidence required to substantiate the full facts of the infringement are available. It must be assumed that the applicant was required to be aware of the potentially infringing product if, according to conventional understanding and the ordinary course of events, the applicant should have been aware of potentially infringing characteristics. This is followed by the duty to continue to investigate the facts of the case expeditiously. In this regard, all the circumstances of the individual case are relevant. The respondents bear the burden

of proof and presentation regarding the indications from which it can be concluded that they must have been aware of the matter at an earlier stage

and from which hesitant behaviour can be inferred. If such indications are substantiated by the respondents, it is then up to the applicant to rebut them or to explain why she could not have been aware of them and why she acted with sufficient speed in this respect. The applicant has not succeeded in doing the latter.

98. The applicant had been monitoring the market since the beginning of 2025. It is true that the applicant rightly argues that any product launches in China and the presentations in the USA at the end of 2024/beginning of 2025 are not relevant to the design of the contested embodiment, as these products were not available on the European market until spring 2025. However, this does not alter the fact that the applicant had already developed an awareness of the contested embodiment. This is also evidenced by the written statement of Mr (Exhibit PD with reference to Exhibit KAP 37 in parallel proceedings 1927/25), an employee of Otto Bock Healthcare Products GmbH and an active user within the Ottobock Group responsible for the entire lower limb prosthetics portfolio. Thus, an initial internal enquiry regarding the procurement of the contested embodiment had already been made to Ottobock Health Care Deutschland in January 2025. Ottobock Health Care Deutschland is the sales organisation within the Ottobock Group responsible for purchasing and sales. This procurement attempt was unsuccessful.
99. The applicant had been aware of the launch of the contested embodiment in Europe since the Expolife trade fair in Kassel in March 2025. It is undisputed that a discussion took place between Mr responsible for strategic purchasing of the prosthetics product group at the applicant's company, and the respondents' employees regarding the contested embodiment. In favour of the applicant, it may be assumed here that Mr did not report any technical details to the applicant (see Annex PD, with reference to Annex KAP 40 in the parallel proceedings 1927/25). In response to the respondents' valid objection that Mr certainly reported his observations of new products at trade fairs to the applicant, the applicant did not comment either on any reporting obligations or on the flow of information to the relevant organisational units within its corporate structure.
100. At the latest, however, following the trade fair in Stockholm in June 2025, at which an exchange took place between the first respondent and the Ottobock **employee**, the claimant should have obtained sufficient technical information to further investigate the potential infringement and to commence the procurement of an infringed embodiment.
101. ██████████ is Head of Department at Orthopaedic Technology Vienna, part of Ottobock Healthcare Products GmbH. The latter is a subsidiary of the applicant, where the Ottobock Group's IP-related activities and development processes are based. At the oral hearing, the applicant neither objected to this description of the company's purpose—which the court had set out for the parties in its introduction—as incorrect nor commented on it in any other way. As an employee of the research and development group, who was also entrusted with the development of the allegedly directly competing product (Genium X4) at the same time, he saw the contested embodiment at the trade fair. Even though, according to his witness statement (Annex KAP 35), no technical implementation of individual functions had been discussed and he could not recall

that a 'walk-to-run' function (which is not at issue here) had been discussed, he did, at the time, essentially take note of the technical design of the contested embodiment. Even if one assumes, in favour of the applicant, that not all functionalities were discussed in detail, it stands to reason that he (also) passed on his understanding of the contested embodiment to those responsible for intellectual property. The applicant makes no submissions on this point. In particular, it does not explain why, from that point onwards, it did not have sufficient information to investigate the suspected infringement of the contested patent further and to initiate a purchase. It does not specify any date or period from which it specifically attempted again to procure the contested embodiment (following the unsuccessful attempt in January 2025).

102. In this context, the respondents have provided further evidence as to why the applicant must have been aware of the full alleged facts of the infringement at an earlier stage and acted hesitantly in this respect:
103. The user manual, which explains the function at issue of alternating stair climbing and which the claimant submitted as Annex KAP 12, was available on the website of the first respondent from May 2025. The claimant has not commented on this either, as to whether, when or how it became aware of this.
104. Furthermore, the respondents have demonstrated that, in the period from early July 2025 to the end of August 2025, various certifications of specialists for the contested embodiment took place in companies belonging to the applicant's own care network. In August 2025, an adjustment was even carried out on a patient. In this respect, the applicant could have undertaken or attempted to obtain further information or carry out closer investigations within its own network.
105. The applicant is unable to demonstrate whether it attempted this at all and, if so, when or why any such attempts failed. Her initial objection that the acquisition of the contested embodiment was not readily possible, but could only be carried out by trained, manufacturer-certified orthopaedic technicians within a medical supply centre, does not hold water in this respect, because such trained specialists were available within her own supply network. The applicant further unsuccessfully falls back on the general argument that acquisition without a genuine patient connection within the healthcare system is not possible without considerable effort. Creating a fake profile is said to be time-consuming and requires third parties to ultimately lie on the applicant's behalf. However, the applicant does not specify when and how she undertook such efforts. Rather, it can be inferred from the written witness statement in Exhibit PD, with reference to Exhibit KAP 37 in the parallel proceedings 1927/25) that the 'procurement' did not commence until 22 September 2026.
106. Insofar as the applicant withdrew during the oral hearing to the position that she would not disclose the identity and details of the person who ultimately organised the procurement for her, because that person had suffered disadvantages in their business activities as a result, this is not strictly necessary. Firstly, for a substantiated counter-argument as to why she was unable to acquire and further examine the contested embodiment between June 2025 and September 2025, it would have sufficed merely to describe her efforts and why these failed. This has not yet been

done. Even if a specific third party were to have been named in the event of further dispute regarding the

respondents, the Rules of Procedure provide for confidentiality rules which can reduce the circle of persons with access to confidential information among the respondents to a minimum. In this respect, the applicant's silence works to its disadvantage.

107. Finally, the applicant no longer disputed that the acquisition via Innteo GmbH took place in October 2025 and that, at that time, no orthopaedic technician was certified there for the contested embodiment, which in any case undermines the persuasiveness of her argument based on the necessity of certification.
108. The applicant was therefore unable, on the whole, to explain why it should not already have been aware of the potentially infringing characteristics at the beginning of July 2025 and should have sought to acquire the licence from that point onwards. It does not state what steps it took, nor why — if it did not act during the summer months — it was not required to do so. In view of all the circumstances, the court cannot rule out that the applicant should have attempted, from the beginning of July 2025, to further clarify the potential infringement or to acquire an alternative embodiment. Even if one assumes, in the applicant's favour, that further investigations were necessary after acquisition and were also carried out promptly, the applicant could and should have filed the application with the court by mid- to late October 2025 at the latest, not only in mid-December 2025. Therefore, hesitant conduct cannot be ruled out.

2. Objective necessity and balancing of interests in the strict sense

109. In the absence of a finding of infringement and of time pressure, no further comments are required regarding objective necessity and the balancing of interests in the strict sense.

IV. Provisional reimbursement of costs

110. Pursuant to Article 69 EPGÜ in conjunction with Rule 211.1(d) of the Rules of Procedure, the respondents may request provisional reimbursement of costs.
111. A provisional order for costs in favour of the defendant may also be made. The fact that Rule 211.1(d) of the VerfO, unlike Rule 150.2 VerfO, does not expressly provide for a provisional order for costs in favour of the successful party does not preclude this, but is justified on grounds of equality of arms. This enables the successful party to provisionally recover at least part of the costs incurred from the unsuccessful party until the subsequent separate proceedings for a decision on costs pursuant to R. 150 et seq. VerfO has commenced and been finally concluded (see UPC_CoA_317/2025, Order of 28 November 2025, Barco v Yealink, para. 96 et seq.).
112. The respondents have calculated their provisionally claimed costs in accordance with the Lawyers' Fees Act. There are no objections to this.

V. Costs


113. A decision on the basis for costs must be made. This follows the guidelines of the Court of Appeal, according to which a decision on the basis for costs is to be issued in proceedings for the granting of interim measures conducted inter partes (UPC_CoA_523/2024, Order of 3 March 2025, para. 117 — Sumi Agro v. Syngenta). Pursuant to Article 69(1) of the UPC Rules of Procedure, the reasonable and proportionate costs of the proceedings and other expenses of the successful party are, in principle, to be borne by the unsuccessful party, unless equity dictates otherwise. Therefore, in the present case, the applicant is liable for the costs.

ORDER:

- I. The application for interim measures is dismissed.
- II. The costs of the proceedings are to be borne by the applicant.
- III. The applicant shall pay provisional costs of €40,651.20 to the respondents within 30 days of service of the order on the applicant.
- IV. The value in dispute is set at €1,500,000.00.

Düsseldorf, 7 May 2026

NAMES AND SIGNATURES

Presiding Judge Dr Thom	To na Bérénice Dr THOM Digitally signed von Anna Bérénice Dr. THOM Datum: 06/05/2026 5:52:1 +02'00'
Legally qualified judge Dr Rincken	In go Rincken Digital signed by Ingo vORincken Datum 6 May 2026 15:59:25 +02'00'
Legally qualified judge Argergaard	Peter Juul signed Agergaar d 026.05.06 Digitally signed by Peter Juul Ag ergaard Dato:2 16:23:30+02'0
Technically qualified judge Michels	 <p>Digitally signed 06/05/2026 17:08:10 *0200</p> <p>Unified Patent Court Einheitliches Patentgericht Jurisdiction unifiée du brevet</p>
For the Deputy Registrar	LAURA CHANTAL DANIEL Digitally signed von LAURA CHANTAL DANIEL Datum: 07/05/2026 07:14:00 +0200

Information regarding the appeal:

The unsuccessful party may appeal against this order within 15 days of its service (Art. 73(2)(a), 62 EPGÜ, R. 220.1(c), 224.2(b) Verfo).

Information on enforcement (Art. 82 EPC, Art. 37(2) EPGS, R. 118.8, 158.2, 354, 355.4 Verfo):

A certified copy of the enforceable decision or the enforceable order shall be issued by the Deputy Registrar at the request of the enforcing party, R. 69 RegR.