

**DECISION**  
**of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court**  
**issued on 9 January 2026**  
**regarding an application to withdraw the appeal pursuant to R. 265 RoP and**  
**an Application for reimbursement of Court fees (R. 370.9 RoP)**

HEADNOTE

R. 370.9 (b) RoP has been amended from 1 January 2026, providing for reimbursement of court fees with 50 % in case of the withdrawal of an action before the closure of the written procedure instead of, as previously, 60 %. The entry into force provides that amendments shall enter into force on 1 January 2026. The amendments apply only to those actions and applications filed after 31 December 2025.

KEYWORDS

Court fees, reimbursement

APPELLANT (AND DEFENDANT BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

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

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

RESPONDENT (AND CLAIMANT BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE)

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

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

PATENT AT ISSUE

EP 3 498 115

## PANEL AND DECIDING JUDGES

### Panel 2

Rian Kalden, presiding judge and legally qualified judge  
Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge and judge-rapporteur  
Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge  
Wiem Samoud, technically qualified judge  
Andrea Scilletta, technically qualified judge

## IMPUGNED DECISION OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

Central Division Paris, 5 November 2024, revocation action UPC\_CFI\_309/2023

## LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

English

## SUMMARY OF FACTS AND PARTIES' REQUESTS

1. NJOY brought an action for revocation of the patent at issue against Juul Labs before the Central Division Paris. The Central Division revoked the patent at issue with effect for the territories of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden and ordered Juul Labs to bear the costs of the proceedings.
2. Juul Labs appealed. The Court of Appeal ordered a stay of the revocation proceedings before the UPC until the rendering of the final decision in the parallel proceedings, where the Opposition Division of the EPO had revoked the patent at issue on 4 March 2024, a decision which Juul Labs had appealed. On 17 October 2025 the Boards of Appeal of the EPO dismissed the appeal.
3. In view of this, NJOY lodged an application with the Court pursuant to R. 360 RoP. NJOY requested that the appeal be dismissed, and in the alternative, that the revocation action be disposed of by way of order. In addition, NJOY requested that Juul Labs be ordered to bear the costs of the proceedings.
4. Juul Labs in turn lodged an application pursuant to R. 265 RoP and is requesting the Court to permit the withdrawal of its appeal. In the alternative, Juul Labs requests the revocation action to be disposed of by way of order according to R. 360 RoP. If the withdrawal request is permitted by the Court, Juul Labs requests a partial refund of the appeal fee. Additionally, Juul Labs requests that NJOY be ordered to bear the costs of the proceedings. Juul Labs sets forth that NJOY initiated the revocation action without any provocation or legitimate cause, well aware of the pending and parallel EPO opposition proceedings.
5. NJOY has replied that it consents to the withdrawal of the appeal. NJOY requests that Juul Labs be ordered to bear the costs of the appeal; in the alternative be ordered to bear the costs of the first instance proceedings and the appeal.
6. The parties have both informed that they have concluded a settlement regarding the recovery of costs from the first instance proceedings so that the decision on costs to be rendered by the Court only relates to the appeal proceedings.

## REASONS

### *Conditions for permitting the withdrawal*

7. As long as there is no final decision in an action, a claimant may apply to withdraw his action. The Court shall decide the application after hearing the other party. The application to withdraw shall not be permitted if the other party has a legitimate interest in the action being decided by the Court (R. 265.1 RoP).
8. This applies also to withdrawals of appeals (CoA, order of 5 July 2024, CoA\_234/2024, *10x Genomics vs Curio Bioscience*, para 9).
9. The application to withdraw the appeal is admissible since there is no final decision in the action in view of the pending appeal, and the Court of Appeal is responsible for deciding on the permissibility of the application for withdrawal (CoA, 15 January 2025, UPC\_CoA\_637/2024, UPC\_CoA\_638/2024, UPC\_CoA\_639/2024, *Avago vs Tesla* and CoA, 15 January 2025, UPC\_CoA\_629/2024, UPC\_CoA\_631/2024, and UPC\_CoA\_632/2024, *Avago Technologies International Sales vs Tesla Germany and Tesla Manufacturing Brandenburg*).
10. In view of NJOYs' consent, it cannot be considered to have a legitimate interest in the actions being decided by the Court, and the application to withdraw the appeal can be permitted.

### *Reimbursement of Court fees*

11. In the event of the withdrawal of the action (R. 265 RoP), the party obliged to pay the Court fees shall receive a refund of 60 % in accordance with R. 370.9(b)(i) RoP if the action is withdrawn before the written proceedings have been concluded. R. 370.9 (b) RoP has been amended from 1 January 2026, providing for reimbursement of court fees with 50 % in case of the withdrawal of an action before the closure of the written procedure. The entry into force provides that amendments shall enter into force on 1 January 2026. The amendments apply only to those actions and applications filed after 31 December 2025 (see page 4 of the AdminComm Amendment of the table of court fees and other related changes to the Rules of Procedure and Guidelines). In this case, the application was filed before this date, which makes the previous rule applicable. Reimbursement is to be ordered in accordance with this provision.

### *Cost decision*

12. Juul Labs' request that NJOY shall be ordered to bear the costs of the appeal proceedings is unsuccessful.
13. According to Juul Labs, NJOY started a revocation action which was without merit from the beginning, but also objectively unnecessary. Juul Labs never made any infringement allegations against NJOY, and NJOY could have awaited the outcome of the pending EPO opposition proceedings and, in the event that an infringement action was brought, joined those EPO opposition proceedings accordingly. Those proceedings were already in an advanced stage at the time NJOY lodged its revocation action on 11 September 2023, six months after the Opposition Division had issued its preliminary opinion. NJOY was fully able to monitor those proceedings through the EPO's online file inspection system, and based its

revocation action on the same grounds that, according to the preliminary opinion, would either a) lead to a retroactive revocation of the patent in suit or b) render its own attacks baseless.

14. This line of argument fails. As a general rule, in case of a withdrawal of an appeal, the appellant shall be considered to be the unsuccessful party who shall bear the costs (as referred to in R.151(d) RoP) incurred in relation to the appeal proceedings (*10x Genomics vs Curio Bioscience*, para 13).
15. An exception to the general rule of Art. 69 (1) UPCA that the unsuccessful party must bear the reasonable and proportionate legal costs and other expenses incurred by the successful party may apply if a claimant files a revocation action without the patent holder having given rise to the action and the patent holder surrenders the patent immediately at the beginning of the proceedings. For this rule to apply, it is generally necessary that within the time limit for filing a defence to revocation the patent holder not only surrenders the patent but within the same time period also files a request for revocation of the patent pursuant to Art. 105a EPC with the European Patent Office and pays the required fee within that time period (CoA, order of 26 March 2025, *Stäubli Tec vs Respondents*, UPC\_CoA-290/2024).
16. This exception does not apply. Juul Labs defended its patent in the first instance proceedings. There is furthermore no reason to extend the case-law to a situation such as the present one.
17. Juul Labs, being the unsuccessful party, shall be ordered to bear the costs for the appeal proceedings.

#### DECISION

- I. The Court of Appeal permits the withdrawal of the appeal 5/2025 and declares the proceedings closed.
- II. Juul Labs is ordered to bear the reasonable and proportionate legal costs and other expenses incurred by NJOY for the appeal proceedings.
- III. The Court of Appeal orders that 60 % of the appeal Court fees be refunded to Juul Labs.

Issued on 9 January 2026

Rian Kalden, legally qualified judge and presiding judge

Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge and judge-rapporteur

Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge

Wiem Samoud, technically qualified judge

Andrea Scilletta, technically qualified judge