



LISBON – LOCAL DIVISION

UPC CFI 850/2026

ORDER

of the Court of First Instance of the Unified Patent Court
issued on 7 April 2026

CLAIMANT:

Shenzhen Transsion Holdings Co. Ltd.

Unit 1, Floor 24, Chuanyin Building, No.8, Xianyuan Road,
Xili Sub-district, Nanshan District, 518000,
Shenzhen City, People's Republic of China

represented by
Mr. Andreas Kramer
Mr. Alex Wilson
Mr. Ari Laakkonen

DEFENDANTS:

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (Publ)

Torshamnsgatan 21, Kista, 164 83 Stockholm, Sweden

Ericsson Holding International B.V.

Stationslaan 222, Platform C, 3rd floor, 4815 GW Breda, the Netherlands

Ericsson Telecommunicatie B.V.

Stationslaan 222, 4815 GW Breda, the Netherlands

Ericsson Telecomunicações, Lda.

Lagoas Park, Edifício 4, Piso 0, 2740-267 Porto Salvo, Portugal

represented by
Mr. Wim Maas

PATENT AT ISSUE:
EUROPEAN PATENT NO EP4123910

PANEL:

Presiding judge and
Judge-rapporteur: Rute Lopes
Legally qualified judge: Andras Kupecz
Legally qualified judge: François Thomas

DECIDING JUDGE:

This order is issued by Judge Rute Lopes, acting as judge-rapporteur.

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS: English.

SUBJECT: SUBJECT:

Alignment of deadlines – R. 9 RoP

REQUEST

- 1 On 7 April 2026, the Defendants requested that the Court align the terms for submitting the Defendants' Preliminary Objection, Statements of Defence and lodging a Counterclaim for Revocation as follows:
 - Preliminary Objection - **1 May 2026**; and
 - Statement of Defence and the Counterclaim for Revocation - **1 July 2026**
- 2 The Defendants argued that until the present moment, only the First, Third and Fourth Defendants have been effectively served with the Statement of Claim and that in order to simplify the proceedings, the parties have come to an agreement on the appointment of representatives for all Defendants in exchange for the alignment of deadlines.

GROUND FOR THE ORDER

- 3 Given that the request was made following an agreement between the parties, it is not necessary to hear the other party.
- 4 The Court may extend or shorten a time period referred to in the RoP - R. 9.3 RoP.
- 5 The Court acknowledges that the appointment of a representative for all Defendants, made it possible to expedite the proceedings for the Defendant not yet effectively served.

- 6 The request for an extension of the deadline should be granted in circumstances that justify it, in view of the principles of proportionality, flexibility, fairness, and equity, without unduly compromising the principle of ensuring expeditious decisions.
- 7 The request for the alignment of dates is perfectly reasonable, having in consideration that the First, Third and Fourth Defendants were served on 26 March 2026. Furthermore, such alignment is desirable, as it will allow all Defendants to file a consolidated defence and counterclaim, resulting in significant efficiency gains in case management, as the case is treated uniformly.
- 8 The request is therefore granted.

ORDER

The request for the alignment of deadlines for all Defendants is granted as follows:

- The Preliminary Objection is due **on 1 May 2026**, for all Defendants.
- The Statement of Defence and logging of a Counterclaim for revocation are due **on 1 July 2026**, for all Defendants.