

Kluwer Patent Blog

Denmark: Coloplast A/S obtains preliminary injunction against MBH-International A/S and its Danish distributor OneMed A/S

Nicolaj Bording, Nicolai Lindgreen (Kromann Reumert) · Wednesday, July 12th, 2017

*On 30 June 2017, the Danish Maritime and Commercial High Court issued a preliminary injunction against **MBH-International A/S** and its Danish distributor's, **OneMed A/S**, import, offer for sale and sale of the urinary catheter assembly “**Qufora OneStep**”.*

***Coloplast** had applied for a preliminary injunction against the “**Qufora OneStep**” catheter assembly with reference to its European patents, **DK/EP 2 216 064** and **DK/EP 1 145 729**.*

***MBH** and **OneMed** had defended **Coloplast**'s motion for preliminary injunction by arguing invalidity of the asserted patent rights, but this argument was dismissed by the Court, as it had not been ‘established’ that the patents were invalid. Conversely, **Coloplast** had ‘rendered it likely’ that the asserted patents were valid.*

*On infringement the dispute concentrated on whether the “**Qufora Onestep**” catheter assembly fulfilled the features of “the cavity contains a liquid swelling medium for provision of a ready to use catheter assembly” and whether the gas impermeable material, which the “**Quofra Onestep**” package is made of, “comprises aluminium”. The Court found that **Coloplast** had ‘rendered it likely’ that the liquid in the “**Qufora OneStep**” package constitutes “a liquid swelling medium for the provision of a ready to use catheter assembly” and that the “**Qufora OneStep**” packaging material contained a layer of aluminium in sufficient quantities to obtain the purpose of making the package, as a whole, gas impermeable, which was all the patents required on this feature.*

*Accordingly, **Coloplast** had ‘rendered it likely’ that the asserted patent rights were valid and infringed, and, thus, an injunction was granted.*

*As an interesting ‘innovation’, the operative part of the injunction order contains specific wording, in addition to the traditional ban against offering for sale, importing and selling “**Qufora OneStep**”. It also enjoins **MBH** from negotiating, entering into or maintaining any facility under existing agreements, with its distributors, agents or customers in Denmark or abroad, allowing them to continue to source “**Qufora OneStep**”, to the extent **MBH**'s activities are performed in or from Denmark. Also, **MBH** is ordered to notify its distributors, stockists, agents or customers that they cannot any longer source “**Qufora OneStep**” under the terms of any existing agreements. Further, **MBH** is enjoined from instructing its Turkish manufacturer to undertake supply of “**Qufora OneStep**” products to **MBH**'s customers elsewhere, to the extent such instructions are given in or from Denmark.*

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please subscribe [here](#).

Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer IP Law** can support you.


79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



Wolters Kluwer



2022 SURVEY REPORT

The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer
Leading change

This entry was posted on Wednesday, July 12th, 2017 at 9:49 am and is filed under [Case Law](#), [Denmark](#), [European Union](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.

