



Düsseldorf Local Division
UPC_CFI_460/2024
UPC_CFI_658/2024

Decision
of the Court of First Instance of the Unified Patent Court
issued on 10 January 2025
concerning EP 3 320 604 B1

CLAIMANT:

Valeo Electrification, 14 avenue des Béguines, 95800 Cergy, France, represented by the President Thierry Kalanquin, with the same address,

Represented by: Attorney-at-law Felix Rödiger, Attorney-at-law Jonas Smeets, Attorney-at-law Fabian Saupe, Bird & Bird LLP, Carl-Theodor-Straße 6, 40213 Düsseldorf, Germany,

Electronic address for service: felix.roediger@twobirds.com

Contributing European patent attorneys: Nicolas Cardon, Amandine Ricard, Pierre Prigent, Valeo Electrification, Cergy

DEFENDANTS:

- 1. Magna PT B.V. & Co. KG**, Herrmann-Hagenmeyer-Str. 1, 74199 Untergruppenbach, Germany, represented by its general partner, Magna PT Management B.V., with the same address, which is jointly represented by the managing directors Thomas Klett and Sandro Gildo Morandini, with the same address,
- 2. Magna PT s.r.o.**, Perinska cesta 282, Kechnec 044 58, Slovakia, represented by its managing directors Martin Hluchý und Katarína Vaškovičová, with the same address,
- 3. Magna International France, SARL**, 4 route de Gisy Bâtiment 26, Bièvres 91570, France, represented by its managing directors Thierry Servouse and Franz Trummer, with the same address,

All Defendants represented by: Attorney-at-law Klaus Haft, Attorney-at-law Sabine Agé, Attorney-at-law Sebastian Kratzer, Hoyng, ROKH, Monegier, Steinstraße 20, 40213 Düsseldorf, Germany,

Collaborating attorney:

Attorney-at-law Dr Wolfgang Kellenter, Hengeler
Müller, Benrather Straße 18-20, 40213 Düsseldorf,
Germany,

Collaborating European Patent attorney:

European Patent Attorney Jan Ackermann, Euro-
pean Patent Attorney Felipe von Heereman, Euro-
pean Patent Attorney Dr Margarete Rittstieg, Co-
hausz & Florack, Bleichstraße 14, 40211 Düsseldorf,
Germany

PATENT IN SUIT:

EUROPEAN PATENT NO. EP 3 320 604 B1

PANEL/DIVISION:

Panel of the Düsseldorf Local Division

DECIDING JUDGES:

This decision was issued by Presiding Judge Thomas acting as judge-rapporteur, legally qualified judge Dr Thom, legally qualified judge Bessaud and technically qualified judge Sanchini.

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS: English

SUBJECT: R. 265 RoP – Application for leave to withdraw an action

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS:

On 2 August 2024, the Claimant filed a patent infringement action against the Defendants. The Defendants' counterclaim for revocation is dated 8 November 2024.

Prior to the closure of the written procedure, the Claimant, by brief dated 30 December 2024, withdrew the infringement action (App_68581/2024) and informed the Court that the parties have agreed that neither party shall file an Application for reimbursement of costs.

On 2 January 2025, the Defendants consented to the withdrawal and also stated that the parties have agreed that neither party shall file an application for reimbursement of costs versus the other party.

By brief submitted at the same day, the Defendants withdrew the counterclaim for revocation (App_68643/2024) and informed the Court that the parties have agreed that neither party shall file an application for reimbursement of costs versus the other party. In addition, Defendants reserved the right to apply for a reimbursement of court fees according to R. 370.9 (b) (i), 370.11 RoP.

The following day, the Claimant consented to the withdrawal and confirmed that the parties have agreed that neither party shall file an application for reimbursement of costs versus the other party.

On 6 January 2025, Defendants clarified that their statement shall be understood that also Defendants' counterclaim for a licence in the Statement of Defence dated 8 November 2024 is withdrawn. By brief of 8 January 2025, the Claimant consented to the withdrawal of the counterclaim for a licence and informed the Court that the parties have agreed that neither party shall file an application for reimbursement of costs versus the other parties.

GROUNDS FOR THE DECISION:

The decision follows the parties' jointly expressed will.

Insofar as R. 265.2 (c) RoP requires a decision on costs in accordance with Part 1, Chapter 5 RoP, the decision takes into account the agreement reached between the parties.

At present, no party has filed an application for a partial reimbursement of court fees (R. 370.11 RoP in conjunction with R. 370.9 (b) (i) RoP), so that no such order could be made.

ORDER:

1. The withdrawal of the infringement action is allowed at the application of the Claimant and with the consent of the Defendants.
2. The withdrawal of the counterclaim for revocation and the counterclaim for a licence are allowed at the application of the Defendants and with the consent of the Claimant.
3. All proceedings referred to in points 1. and 2. are declared closed.
4. This decision shall be entered in the register.
5. The value in dispute for the infringement action and the counterclaim for revocation is set at EUR 1,500,000 each.

DETAILS OF THE ORDER:

App_68581/2024, App_68643/2024 and App_311/2025 under main file references ACT_44736/2024 and CC_59744/2024

UPC number: UPC_CFI_460/2024 and UPC_CFI_658/2024

Type of procedure: Infringement Action and Counterclaim for Revocation

Issued in Düsseldorf on 10 January 2025

NAMES AND SIGNATURES

Presiding Judge Thomas	
------------------------	--

Legally Qualified Judge Dr Thom	
Legally Qualified Judge Bessaud	
Technically Qualified Judge Sanchini	
for the Sub-Registrar Boudra-Seddiki	