# Recent Case Law in German Patent Law



2021

# © Eisenführ Speiser Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB

Eisenführ Speiser Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB is a partnership with limited professional liability registered in the Partnerships Register of Bremen Local Court, Registration no. PR 30.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of Eisenführ Speiser Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB.

Nothing in this publication constitutes legal advice. Eisenführ Speiser Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB assumes no responsibility for information contained in this publication or on the website www.eisenfuhr.com and disclaims all liability with respect to such information.

# **CONTENTS**

Foi	rew	ord2
I.	Pat	tent interpretation
	1.	Specific functions of features and their relevance for interpretation
	2.	Relevance of the state of the art as acknowledged in the patent for interpretation
II.	Pat	tent infringement / Equivalence
	3.	On the question of the same effect9
	٥.	Federal Court of Justice judgment of 17 November 2020 in case no. X ZR 132/18 – Kranarm
	4.	On the question of the equivalent solution / considerations based on the essential meaning of the claim
		Düsseldorf Higher Regional Court judgment of 8 April 2021 in case no. 2 U 42/20 – Abstreifeinheit
	5.	Liability in case of activities performed in foreign countries
		Federal Court of Justice judgment of 8 June 2021 in case no. ZR 47/19 – Ultraschallwandler
	6.	Liability in case of activities performed only in foreign countries
		Düsseldorf Higher Regional Court judgment of 30 September 2021 in case no. I-2 U 52/20 – CE-Kennzeichnung
III.	Validity	
	7.	On inadmissible amendments
		Federal Court of Justice judgment of 20 October 2020 in case no. X ZR 158/18 – Zigarettenpackung
	8.	On the validity of the priority claim – "the same invention"25
		Federal Court of Justice judgment of 20 May 2021 in case no. X ZR 62/19 – Bodenbelag
IV.	Other issues in substantive law	
	9.	Standard-essential patents / FRAND principles
		Karlsruhe Higher Regional Court court order of 12 February 2021 in case no. 6 U 130/20 – Wurzelsequenzen
		Mannheim Regional Court judgment of 2 March 2021 in case no. 2 O 131/19 – (Uplink)-Synchronisation
		Munich Regional Court judgment of 9 September 2021 in case no. 7 O 15350/19 – Sprachsignalcodierer
		Düsseldorf Higher Regional Court judgment of 7 February 2022 in case no. I-2 U 27/21 – AASI
		Düsseldorf Regional Court judgment of 11 May 2021 in case no. 4b O 83/19 – Matrixvorgang
	10	Düsseldorf Regional Court judgment of 21 December 2021 in case no. 4c O 42/20 – Entropiedecodierer
	10.	. May artificial intelligence be an inventor?
	11	Federal Patent Court judgment of 11 November 2021 in case no. 11 W (pat) 5/21 – DABUS
	11.	Requirements regarding the employer's notification of intention to abandon
V.	Procedural law issues	
	12.	On the applicability and scope of Section 145 PatG36
		Federal Court of Justice judgment of 3 November 2020 in case no. X ZR 85/19 – Fensterflügel
	13.	Protection of secrets38
		Munich Regional Court court order of 21 January 2022 – Inhouse-Mitarbeiter

#### **FOREWORD**

This year's Case Law Review begins once again with two supreme court judgments on a classic issue in patent law, namely claim interpretation. As expected, there are no surprises in the major premises behind the judgments. However, the interested reader who focuses on the details of the arguments put forward by the Federal Court of Justice will find once again that patent interpretation according to German law is founded on very systematic basic concepts that need 'only' be applied anew in each particular case.

This year, a primary focus in (infringement) case law is on acts committed at least partly abroad. The German infringement courts are starting, cautiously but with a clear tendency, to widen the circle of those who are liable for patent infringement in Germany. The attitude of German courts can be summarised as follows: anyone who knows that his actions also have repercussions for the German market must also concern himself with German patent law.

The section on 'Other issues in substantive law' includes a novelty of our annual case law reviews: a (Federal Patent

Court) judgment on artificial intelligence and the question of who is or can be inventor in the case of inventions, in the making of which neural networks were involved. This question will certainly occupy our courts and us in the years ahead.

Following the landmark decisions of the Federal Court of Justice in 2020 with regard to FRAND, one might have hoped for consolidation of the established legal practice of the courts of instance. Unfortunately, however, there are still major differences in the interpretation of those decisions between the Munich and the Mannheim/Karlsruhe courts, on the one hand, and the Düsseldorf courts, on the other – especially as regards the parties' respective obligations in negotiations. A different situation prevails in respect of anti-anti-suit injunctions, where Düsseldorf has adopted the practices of the Munich courts (their substantive core at least).

May 2022

**EISENFÜHR SPEISER** 

2 Foreword



#### **Bremen**

Am Kaffee-Quartier 3 28217 Bremen Tel.+49 421 3635-0 Fax+49 421 3378788 mail@eisenfuhr.com



#### Munich

Arnulfstraße 27 80335 Munich Tel.+49 89 549075-0 Fax+49 89 55027555 mailmuc@eisenfuhr.com



### Berlin

Stralauer Platz 34
10243 Berlin
Tel.+49 30 841887-0
Fax+49 30 841887-77
mailbln@eisenfuhr.com



## **Hamburg**

Johannes-Brahms-Platz 1 20355 Hamburg Tel.+49 40 309744-0 Fax+49 40 309744-44 mailham@eisenfuhr.com