

UPC Court of Appeal, 22 May 2024, Audi v NST

PATENT LAW – SUBSTANTIVE LAW

Request by the Appellants to expedite the appeal against an order in which an application for security for costs was dismissed

- and shorten any deadlines where possible is denied for being too unspecified and insufficiently substantiated. (Rule 9(3) RoP, Rule 224(2)(b) RoP)

6. Audi has not explained that and why it would have a particular interest in the Statement of response being filed before any particular date, prior to the end of the time period of 15 days as provided for in R.224.2(b) RoP. Failing such a reason, the Court of Appeal cannot, in view of the interests of NST and the principles of proportionality, fairness and equity, also taking into account the time period Audi has taken to lodge its Statement of grounds of appeal, see any reason to shorten the time period within which NST is to lodge its Statement of response. 7. Insofar as the further appeal proceedings are concerned, the request is too unspecified and insufficiently substantiated to justify the shortening of any of the future time periods at this stage of the proceedings

Source: [Unified Patent Court](#)

Similar orders at the same date between the same parties in [App 29006/2024](#) and [App 29007/2024](#)

**UPC Court of Appeal,
22 May 2024**

(Kalden, Simonsson, Rombach)

UPC Court of Appeal

UPC_CoA_223/2024

APL_25926/2024

App_28988/2024

Order

of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court issued on 22 May 2024

concerning a request for expedition of the appeal pursuant to [R.225\(e\)](#), [R.9.3\(b\)](#) Rules of Procedure

HEADNOTES:

In the appeal against an order in which an application for security for costs was dismissed, a request by the Appellants to expedite the appeal and shorten any deadlines where possible in accordance with [R. 9.3 \(b\) RoP](#) is denied for being too unspecified and insufficiently substantiated.

KEYWORDS

Expedition of the appeal, [R.225 \(e\)](#), [R.9.3 \(b\) RoP](#)

**APPELLANT/APPLICANT IN THE
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF
FIRST INSTANCE**

Audi AG, Ingolstadt, Germany

Hereinafter also referred to as: ‘Audi’

represented by: Dr. Jan Bösing, Rechtsanwalt, Bardehle Pagenberg, Munich, German

**RESPONDENT / CLAIMANT IN THE MAIN
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF
FIRST INSTANCE**

Network Systems Technologies LLC., Portland, ME,
Unites States of America

Hereinafter also referred to as NST,

represented by: Dr Thomas Gniadek,
Simmons&Simmons, Munich, Germany

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS:

English

PATENT AT ISSUE

[EP 1 552 669](#)

PANEL

Second Panel

DECIDING JUDGES:

This order has been adopted by

Rian Kalden, Presiding judge and judge-rapporteur

Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge

Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge

**IMPUGNED ORDER OF THE COURT OF FIRST
INSTANCE**

□ Date: 23 April 2024 (signed 25 April 2024);
ORD_12484/2024 in related proceedings (requests for security for costs) App_11444/2024, App_11431/2024 and App_11835/2024 in the main infringement action ACT_597691/2023)

□ Action number attributed by the Court of First Instance Local Division Munich): UPC_CFI_513/2023

SUMMARY OF FACTS

On 1 March 2024 Audi filed an application under [Art. 69.4 UPCA](#) and [R.158.1 RoP](#) (App. 11444/2024), requesting the Court to order NST to provide adequate security for legal costs and other expenses incurred by Audi. The Court of First Instance denied the Application. Leave to appeal was granted in the Order.

INDICATION OF PARTIES’ REQUESTS

In the appeal proceedings, Audi requests that the impugned order shall be set aside. It argues that the Court of First Instance applied legally erroneous standards of examination and of burden of proof for the decision on the provision of security for costs. The Court of First Instance furthermore misapplied the undisputed facts of the case at hand, Audi contends.

In the request for expedition of the appeal, Audi requests the Court of Appeal pursuant to [R.225\(e\)](#) and [R.9.3 RoP](#) to expedite the appeal and shorten any deadlines where possible. Audi argues that it already incurred significant legal costs for the filing of the statement of defence in the main infringement proceedings on the merits without any security that such costs will be reimbursed by NST. These legal costs continue to increase and thus need to be secured as soon as possible.

POINTS AT ISSUE

Request for expedition of the appeal, [R.225 \(e\)](#), [R.9.3 \(b\) RoP](#)

GROUNDNS FOR THE ORDER

1. The request for expedition is admissible.
2. There is no need to consult NST about this request.
3. Pursuant to [R.235](#) and [R.224.2\(b\) RoP](#) a respondent has 15 days from service of the Statement of grounds of appeal to lodge a Statement of response.

4. **R.9.3(b) RoP** empowers the Court to shorten any time period on a reasoned request by a party.

5. Audi filed the request for expedition of the appeal, at the same time as it lodged the Statement of appeal, containing the grounds of appeal, 15 days after the signature date of the impugned order.

6. Audi has not explained that and why it would have a particular interest in the Statement of response being filed before any particular date, prior to the end of the time period of 15 days as provided for in **R.224.2(b) RoP**. Failing such a reason, the Court of Appeal cannot, in view of the interests of NST and the principles of proportionality, fairness and equity, also taking into account the time period Audi has taken to lodge its Statement of grounds of appeal, see any reason to shorten the time period within which NST is to lodge its Statement of response.

7. Insofar as the further appeal proceedings are concerned, the request is too unspecified and insufficiently substantiated to justify the shortening of any of the future time periods at this stage of the proceedings

ORDER

The request for expedition of the appeal is rejected.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE PARTIES AND TO THE REGISTRY CONCERNING THE NEXT STEPS

This order closes App_27157/2024.

Issued on 22 May 2024

NAMES AND SIGNATURES

Judges Rian Kalden, Presiding judge and judge-rapporteur

Ingeborg Simonsson, legally qualified judge

Patricia Rombach, legally qualified judge
