

JULY/AUGUST 2023  
VOLUME 29 NUMBER 4

DEVOTED TO  
INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY  
LITIGATION &  
ENFORCEMENT

*Edited by Gregory J. Battersby  
and Charles W. Grimes*

# IP *Litigator*®

---

# Unified Patent Court Strategic Considerations

**Steven Pepe, Matthew Shapiro, Josef Schenker, and Alexis Ramsey**

*Steve Pepe is a partner and chair of Ropes & Gray's intellectual property litigation practice in New York. He is an accomplished trial lawyer who focuses on patent litigation in nearly every significant patent jurisdiction, including the International Trade Commission, the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware, the Eastern District of Virginia, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the PTAB. Steve has litigated patent cases for over 20 years, including as lead or co-lead counsel in over a dozen lawsuits. He specializes in complex infringement cases and has achieved numerous successes for companies in the fields of computer technology, semiconductors, telecommunications, consumer products, and mechanical systems. He can be reached at Steven.Pepe@ropesgray.com*

*Matthew Shapiro is counsel and a Unified Patent Court specialist in Ropes & Gray's intellectual property litigation practice in New York. He has more than a decade of experience across all major patent venues, including patent-centric district courts, the International Trade Commission, and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Matthew's experience spans a broad range of technical fields, including computer-based technologies in the consumer electronics, insurance, digital printing, and internet-based service industries. Matthew also has considerable experience with post-grant proceedings before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, where he has served as counsel in more than thirty proceedings. He can be reached at Matthew.Shapiro@ropesgray.com*

*Josef Schenker is a senior attorney in Ropes & Gray's intellectual property litigation practice in New York. He specializes in complex patent litigations in the electronics, computer, and software industries. Josef has litigated cases in nearly every significant jurisdiction, including the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware, the Northern District of California, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the PTAB. He can be reached at Josef.Schenker@ropesgray.com*

*Alexis Ramsey is a former associate in Ropes & Gray's intellectual property litigation practice in*

*Silicon Valley. She focused her work on patent litigation involving a variety of technologies, including semiconductors, network security, content distribution, and telecommunications.*

The new Unified Patent Court (UPC) and Unitary Patent (UP) system launched on June 1, 2023, following years of preparation by the EU member states. While the UPC is, as of now, an untested system without its own substantive law, it has enormous potential to reshape global patent law, with jurisdiction over patent infringement and revocation actions across seventeen EU member states, including some of the largest patent forums like Germany and France, but notably excluding the United Kingdom and Spain.

Patent holders and challengers need to give immediate thought to strategies for maximizing their competitive positions in this new, untested forum. For example, patent owners should consider whether to opt out certain patents, patent challengers should monitor whether patents of concern have been opted out and develop offensive strategies based on the patent owner's decision, patent applicants should decide whether to seek traditional European Patent (EP) or UP protection, and licensees should consider how to ensure that their interests in licensed patents can be maximized.

## What Is the UPC's "Opt-Out" Procedure?

On March 1, 2023, the court entered its seven-year transitional period, during which patent owners were provided with the ability to opt out of the UPC in favor of traditional European patent litigation in national courts. As of the launch of the UPC on June 1, 2023, patent owners had opted out more than 400,000 patents, and the number of opted-out patents continues to grow.

This fundamental choice of whether to opt out an EP or an issuing UP continues to raise a number of new strategic considerations for patent owners, patent challengers, applicants, and licensees alike. For example, the lack

---

of a track record and precedent creates inherent uncertainty surrounding the UPC, which further complicates the opt-out decision-making process. We address some of those strategic considerations below.

## What Should Current Patent Owners Consider?

For patents that are likely to be litigated, it is imperative that patent owners immediately evaluate whether those patents should be opted out of the UPC system, because once a UPC action is brought against an EP (e.g., a revocation action by a patent challenger), the patent will be subject to a single UPC action that will be effective across all states in which the patent was validated, the patent owner will have lost its ability to opt the patent out of future UPC proceedings, and the patent owner will also be precluded from adjudicating at least the validity of its patent through the national court system. Thus, a patent owner will be undertaking significant risk by not opting out of the UPC, especially if there is a risk that the patent's validity will be challenged.

On the other hand, if a patent is initially opted out (and therefore not subject to a single UPC action), the patent owner has one opportunity to withdraw the opt-out to bring the patent back within the UPC's jurisdiction. Risk-averse patent owners who may be skeptical of the untested UPC system could benefit from a "wait and see" approach, by initially opting out of the UPC regime. In most cases, the patent owner will have the opportunity to reevaluate whether to proceed before the UPC or national courts after considering the precedent developed by the UPC over the coming months and years.

Applying an opt-out strategy is not without its own set of risks, however. If a patent challenger files an action against an opted-out patent in a national court, the patent owner will no longer be able to withdraw its opt-out, even if that national court action is later terminated. This strategy has been nicknamed the "opt-out torpedo." For certain patent owners, the benefits of a single UPC infringement action and the risk of a patent challenger filing an action in a national court may outweigh the benefits of opting out or applying the "wait-and-see" approach.

In considering whether to opt out, patent owners should at least weigh the following factors: the value of the patent; the likelihood of litigation and in which jurisdictions the patent may need to be litigated; and the likelihood that the patent's validity may be preemptively challenged. In some cases, it may be prudent to opt-out part of a patent family while maintaining other family members within the jurisdiction of the UPC.

Any attempt by joint owners to opt out requires scrupulous attention to detail. An opt-out is only effective if all owners of a patent agree. For example, if an existing EP's ownership is jurisdiction-dependent, and the opt-out does not cover all jurisdictions in which the EP was validated, the patent will remain subject to attack at the UPC despite a partial owner's attempt to opt out of the UPC's jurisdiction.

## What Should Potential Patent Challengers Consider?

Patent challengers, including anyone facing a potential patent assertion in Europe, should review the UPC's list of opted-out patents and consider filing revocation proceedings for patents that remain within the UPC's jurisdiction. It is likely that certain patent owners are not currently focused on protecting their patent assets and may not be diligent in seeking to opt out. It is therefore important to act expeditiously to challenge these patents at the UPC prior to the patent owner opting out.

This strategy allows patent challengers to attack the validity of a patent in every state in which the patent was validated through a single proceeding. It also reduces the patent owner's ability to forum shop across the national courts and local/regional divisions, because revocation proceedings are assigned to the central division (currently Munich and Paris, and Milan in the future).

If a patent has already been opted out, then litigation must take place in individual national courts. However, the patent owner can withdraw the opt-out so long as a national litigation has not been filed. One strategy for an opted-out patent is the "opt-out torpedo," in which a patent challenger files an action in a favorable national court to prevent the patent owner from withdrawing an opt-out and entering the UPC. Patent challengers will likely identify national jurisdictions with low filing fees and a minimal risk of cost reimbursements by the losing party for these torpedo actions.

## What Should Patent Applicants Consider?

Applicants should weigh the comparative benefits of a UP, including broader protection and decreased costs, against a traditional EP. Critically, a granted UP does not include protection in two of Europe's largest economies—the United Kingdom and Spain. In fact, excluding Germany, France, and Italy, the remaining 14 UPC participating states collectively represent a population that is

---

not much larger than the United Kingdom. Applicants should therefore consider whether to rely upon the streamlined UP process or instead a combination of the German, French, Italian, U.K., and Spanish national systems for greater protection and enforcement potential.

Applicants looking for a balanced approach may consider filing some patent applications (such as fundamental or apparatus patents) as EPs, while filing other patent applications directed to narrower applications of those fundamental patents (such as methods of use) as UPs. In other words, the increased scope or importance of a patent may justify seeking EP protection in important jurisdictions, such as Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Spain, while other less valuable patents would benefit from the decreased cost and efficiencies of the UPC.

Patent applicants will have one month after a pending application is granted to opt out of the Unitary System, but unlike patents issued prior to June 1, 2023, a patent that issues with unitary effect cannot later be opted out.

## What Should Patent Licensees Consider?

Licensees may be in a challenging position because the decision to opt out of UPC jurisdiction rests solely with

the patent owners rather than the licensees, and most current license agreements are unlikely to address the opt-out decision-making process. For example, a patent owner seeking to minimize costs may seek UPC protection, while an exclusive licensee interested in maintaining broad exclusion may believe that a traditional EP validated in multiple states is the better option, albeit at a higher cost. Where a licensee's interest diverges from the patent owner's, there may be no existing framework to address those differences or ability for the licensee to dictate how the licensed assets should be treated. For any patent that is opted out, licensees should scrutinize the patent owner's filings to confirm that all owners have properly opted out.

## Conclusion

After decades of planning, the supranational UPC with jurisdiction over infringement and revocation proceedings across all seventeen member states is now a reality. Now is the time to consider the impact of the UPC on existing patent portfolios, patent applications, and patent licenses.

Copyright © 2023 CCH Incorporated. All Rights Reserved.  
Reprinted from *IP Litigator*, July/August 2023, Volume 29, Number 4, pages 10–12,  
with permission from Wolters Kluwer, New York, NY,  
1-800-638-8437, [www.WoltersKluwerLR.com](http://www.WoltersKluwerLR.com)

