



Appeal n° : UPC\_CoA\_0000004/2026

**PROCEDURAL ORDER**  
**of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court**  
**issued on 21 January 2026**

APPELLANT AND PLAINTIFF IN THE INFRINGEMENT ACTION BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

VALEO SYSTEMES D'ESSUYAGE, 34, RUE SAINT-ANDRE 93012 BOBIGNY CEDEX, FRANCE

(hereinafter referred to as the "**Appellant**")

represented by M. Lionel Martin, Avocat au Barreau de Paris, representative before the UPC, and other representatives of Cabinet August Debouzy, Paris, France

RESPONDENTS, DEFENDANTS TO THE INFRINGEMENT ACTION BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE AND PLAINTIFFS TO THE PRELIMINARY OBJECTION

- ROBERT BOSCH FRANCE SAS, 32 AVENUE MICHELET, 93400, SAINT-OUEN-SUR-SEINE, FRANCE
- ROBERT BOSCH GMBH, 1 ROBERT-BOSCH-PLATZ, 70839 GERLINGEN, GERMANY
- ROBERT BOSCH S.A, 1 RUE HENRI-JOSEPH GENESSE, 1070 ANDERLECHT, BELGIUM
- ROBERT BOSCH PRODUKTIE S.A, HAMELENDREEF 80, 3300 TIENEN, BELGIUM

DEFENDANTS IN THE INFRINGEMENT ACTION BEFORE THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

- ROBERT BOSCH DOO BEOGRAD, 90E/IV OMLADINSKIH BRIGADA, 11070, BEOGRAD, SERBIA
- BOSCH AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS (CHANGSHA) CO. LTD, 26, LIXIANGZHONG ROAD, ECONOMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT ZONE, CHANGSHA COUNTY, HUNAN PROVINCE, 410100 CHANGSHA, CHINA

hereinafter together referred to as the "**Respondents**

represented by Mr Johannes Heselberger, representative before the UPC, Bardehle Pagenberg, Munich, Germany

LITIGIOUS PATENT

EP 2671766

DECIDING JUDGE

Emmanuel Gougé, legally qualified Judge and Judge-Rapporteur

LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDINGS

French

IMPUGNED ORDER OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

□ Order of the Central Division (Paris section) of 23 December 2026, UPC\_CFI\_809/2025 FACTS AND

PROCEDURE

1. The Appellant brought an action for infringement of the contested patent against the Respondents before the Central Division (Paris Section) of the Court of First Instance of the Unified Patent Court (hereinafter the "Paris DC").
2. Four of the Respondents - Robert Bosch France SAS, Robert Bosch GmbH, Robert Bosch SA, and Robert Bosch Produktie SA - filed a preliminary objection (R. 19 RoP) concerning the jurisdiction of the Paris CD and the language of the proceedings.
3. The Paris DC upheld the preliminary objection and the Appellant's subsidiary request, ordered the infringement action to be transferred to the local division in Düsseldorf and ruled that the language of proceedings would be English (procedural order of the judge-rapporteur of 23 December 2025).
4. By memorandum dated 7 January 2026, the Appellant appealed the contested order on the basis of Rule 220.2 RoP. In particular, the Appellant asks the Court of Appeal to rule that the Paris DC has jurisdiction to hear the infringement action (UPC\_CFI\_809/2025), to order the referral of the infringement action to the Paris DC and to rule that the language of proceedings shall be French.
5. Following observations made by the Registry as part of the formal examination of the statement of appeal (R. 229 RoP), the Appellant remedied the formal deficiencies and filed additional observations concerning the basis on which it had appealed the contested order. The Registry entered the appeal file in the register (R.230 RoP) on 20 January 2026.

REASONS

6. As part of the preliminary examination of the brief setting out the grounds of appeal, the Judge-Rapporteur took note of the observations submitted by the Appellant concerning the applicable appeal regime with regard, in particular, to Article 73 of the UPC Agreement and Rules 21 and 220 RoP (written observations of the Appellant dated 19 January 2026).
7. The appeal route chosen by the Appellant and the observations made by the Appellant on 19 January 2026 raise the question of the admissibility of its appeal.
8. In the interests of efficient organisation of the proceedings (RoP, preamble, para 4) it is desirable to examine the admissibility of the appeal and to hear the Respondents on this issue before examining the merits of the appeal.
9. The Respondents are invited to submit their comments, within seven days of this Procedural Order, on the question of the admissibility of the appeal and on the written observations submitted by the Appellant on 19 January 2026.
10. The time limit referred to in Rule 235 RoP for the Respondents to file their statement of defence is suspended pending the forthcoming decision on the admissibility of the appeal in which the timetable for the next procedural steps, if any, will be set out.

ORDER

The Judge-Rapporteur

- invites the Respondents to present their comments, within seven (7) days of this procedural order, on the question of the admissibility of the appeal and on the written observations presented by the Appellant on January 19, 2026 ;
- orders the suspension of the time limit referred to in Rule 235 RoP for the filing of the defence by the Respondents pending the decision on the admissibility of the appeal.

Delivered in Luxembourg on 21 January 2026.

EMMANUEL  
LUCIEN, RENÉ  
GOUGE



Digitally signed by  
EMMANUEL, LUCIEN,  
RENÉ GOUGÉ  
Date: 2026.01.21 16:36:43  
+01'00'

Emmanuel Gougé, legally qualified Judge and Judge-Rapporteur