

Redacted Version

## Regional Court Munich I

Ref. 21 O 12112/25

[Seal]

**Document contains information that is protected by the following confidentiality order pursuant to Secs. 145a German Patent Act (PatG), 16 et seqq. German Trade Secrets Act (GeschGehG)**

In the legal dispute

- 1) **InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc.** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Applicant -
- 2) **InterDigital Patent Holdings, Inc.** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Applicant -
- 3) **InterDigital Madison Patent Holdings, SAS** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Applicant -
- 4) **InterDigital CE Patent Holdings, SAS** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Applicant -

Attorneys of record 1 - 4:

**Arnold & Ruess**, Rechtsanwälte [attorneys-at-law], Königsallee 59a, 40215 Düsseldorf, [redacted]  
[redacted]

against

- 1) **Amazon.com, Inc.** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Respondent -  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]
- 2) **Amazon Digital UK Limited** [redacted]  
[redacted]  
- Respondent -

3) **Amazon Europe Core S.à.r.l. (Société à responsabilité limitée)** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Respondent -

4) **Amazon EU S.à.r.l. (Société à responsabilité limitée)** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Respondent -

5) **Amazon Technologies, Inc.** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Respondent -

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

regarding an anti-interim license injunction (ALI) with effect for the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Decision

The decision of the Regional Court Munich I – 21<sup>st</sup> Civil Chamber – dated September 26, 2025 (Ref. 21 O 12112/25) is corrected for the sake of clarification (solely) in the operative part and reworded as follows:

- I. The respondents are, under threat of a fine of up to EUR 250,000.00 or administrative detention of up to six months for each case of infringement – administrative detention also in the event that the fine cannot be collected – the administrative detention or substitute administrative detention being enforced on an authorized representative of the respective respondent

### **prohibited from**

1. applying to the UK High Court for a preliminary injunction requiring the applicants to grant the respondents an interim license for the applicants' patents that are granted and validated for the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, insofar

as this prevents and/or is intended to prevent the applicants from bringing or continuing patent infringement proceedings before national courts in the Federal Republic of Germany and/or from enforcing any resulting judgments or measures;

2. applying to the UK High Court for a preliminary injunction declaring that the applicants are in breach of RAND obligations if they do not grant the respondents an interim license to the applicants' patents on the terms determined by the UK High Court, which are granted and validated for the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, insofar as this prevents and/or is intended to prevent the applicants from bringing or continuing patent infringement proceedings before national courts in the Federal Republic of Germany and/or from enforcing any resulting judgments or measures;
3. not withdrawing any applications under paragraphs 1 and 2 within 24 hours of service of this injunction order or not taking any other procedural measures to revoke them with effect for the Federal Republic of Germany;
4. continuing any interim licensing proceedings with effect for the Federal Republic of Germany, except for the purpose of withdrawing the application;
5. having the applicants indirectly prohibited by a court or administrative order aimed at prohibiting the present proceedings from conducting patent infringement proceedings based on their patents in the Federal Republic of Germany and/or from enforcing any judgments resulting thereof;

whereby the above prohibitions also include having to exert influence on affiliated companies in accordance with the possibilities offered by corporate law.

II. The respondents shall bear the costs of the proceedings.

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Large redacted block]

■

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

■

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

### Reasons:

The substantiating clarification corresponds to the applicants' request. Any deviations in the operative part of the decision of September 26, 2025 from the applicants' application of September 24, 2025 are, according to the reasons given in the decision, merely clarifications for the sake of specificity and proportionality in accordance with Sec. 938 (1) of the German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO). This does not involve any deviation from the scope of the applicants' application for an injunction.

Reference is otherwise made to the reasons for the decision of September 26, 2025. These continue to apply. Only the operative part is affected by the clarification.

# Landgericht München I

Az.: 21 O 12112/25



**Dokument enthält Informationen, die durch  
den folgenden Geheimhaltungsbeschluss  
nach §§ 145a PatG, 16 ff. GeschGehG  
geschützt sind**

In dem Rechtsstreit

1) **InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc.** [REDACTED]  
- Antragstellerin -

2) **InterDigital Patent Holdings, Inc.** [REDACTED]  
- Antragstellerin -

3) **InterDigital Madison Patent Holdings, SAS** [REDACTED]  
- Antragstellerin -

4) **InterDigital CE Patent Holdings, SAS** [REDACTED]  
- Antragstellerin -

Prozessbevollmächtigte zu 1 - 4:

Rechtsanwälte **Arnold & Ruess**, Königsallee 59a, 40215 Düsseldorf, [REDACTED]

gegen

1) **Amazon.com, Inc.** [REDACTED]  
- Antragsgegnerin -

[REDACTED]

2) **Amazon Digital UK Limited,** [REDACTED]  
- Antragsgegnerin -

3) **Amazon Europe Core S.à.r.l. (Société à responsabilité limitée)**, [REDACTED]

- Antragsgegnerin -

4) **Amazon EU S.à.r.l. (Société à responsabilité limitée)**, [REDACTED]

- Antragsgegnerin -

5) **Amazon Technologies, Inc.**, [REDACTED]

- Antragsgegnerin -

wegen Anti-Interim-Licence-Injunction (AILI) mit Wirkung für das Staatsgebiet der Bundesrepublik Deutschland

## Beschluss

Der Beschluss des Landgerichts München I - 21. Zivilkammer - vom 26.09.2025 (Az. 21 O 12112/25) wird (allein) im Tenor klarstellend korrigiert und wie folgt neu gefasst:

- I. Den Antragsgegnerinnen wird bei Meidung eines für jeden Fall der Zuwiderhandlung festzusetzenden Ordnungsgeldes bis zu 250.000,00 € oder einer Ordnungshaft bis zu sechs Monaten – Ordnungshaft auch für den Fall, dass das Ordnungsgeld nicht beigetrieben werden kann –, die Ordnungshaft oder Ersatzordnungshaft zu vollziehen an einem vertretungsberechtigten Organ der jeweiligen Antragsgegnerin,

**untersagt,**

1. beim UK High Court eine vorläufige Anordnung zu beantragen, die den Antragstellerinnen aufgibt, den Antragsgegnerinnen eine Interimslizenz an Patenten der Antragstellerinnen zu gewähren, die für das Gebiet der Bundesrepublik Deutschland erteilt und validiert sind, soweit damit die Antragstellerinnen daran gehindert werden



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Gründe:

Die konkretisierende Klarstellung entspricht dem Begehren der Antragstellerinnen. Bei Abweichungen des Tenors im Beschluss vom 26.09.2025 vom Antrag der Antragstellerinnen vom 24.09.2025 handelt es sich ausweislich der Gründe des Beschlusses lediglich um Konkretisierungen unter Bestimmtheits- und Verhältnismäßigkeitsgesichtspunkten gemäß § 938 Abs. 1 ZPO. Eine Abweichung vom Umfang des Verfügungsantrages der Antragstellerinnen ist damit nicht verbunden.

Im Übrigen wird auf die Gründe Beschlusses vom 26.09.2025 Bezug genommen. Diese gelten weiterhin. Von der Konkretisierung ist allein der Tenor betroffen.