北京知识产权法院
药品专利链接制度运行五周年司法审判工作情况通报

各位新闻媒体朋友，女士们、先生们:

大家上午好。值我国药品专利链接制度运行五周年之际，我们在此将北京知识产权法院药品专利链接案件审判工作情况予以通报。

我国药品专利链接制度自2021年6月1日起正式实施。该制度不仅标志着我国医药知识产权保护体系的升级完善，更是我国积极参与国际医药知识产权治理、打造国际化、法治化营商环境的关键举措。五年来，北京知识产权法院作为集中管辖相关案件的一审法院，成为该项制度的司法实践者，通过专业化审判实践，妥善解决大量涉及国内外制药企业的诉讼纠纷。药品专利链接制度的实施与运行，兼顾了创新药企业与仿制药企业的合理诉求，不仅为平衡医药创新保护与药品可及性提供了坚实制度支撑，也为我国从医药大国迈向医药强国、深度融入全球医药创新链条奠定了坚实基础。

五年来，北京知识产权法院立足全国药品专利链接案件一审集中管辖的司法定位，深入贯彻习近平总书记关于“人民健康是民族昌盛和国家强盛的重要标志”的重要指示精神，严格落实最高人民法院相关司法解释，全面履行制度运行“护航者”的职责，以提升审判质效、提炼裁判规则为核心，

通过建立全流程专业化审理机制、深化府院协同等一系列创新实践，积极回应国内外医药产业的司法需求。这些努力成为了制度准确、高效运行的基础，有效推动了从法律条文到市场实践的良性转化，为我国医药产业在法治化、国际化轨道上实现高质量发展提供了坚实的司法保障。

一、制度背景与司法定位：服务大局发展，彰显司法担当

作为技术密集型产业的典型代表，医药领域具有研发投入高、周期长、风险大的显著特征，其发展既离不开原研药企长时间、高强度的研发投入与创新突破，也需要仿制药企的快速跟进以提升药品可及性、降低用药成本，让低价好药尽快惠及病患。近年来，随着我国医药市场在全球版图中重要性的不断提升、我国医药领域创新研发能力的提高和制度政策的赋能，我国逐渐成为中外药企专利布局和市场竞争的关键地区。而药品专利链接制度的核心价值，正在于将仿制药上市审评审批与原研药专利保护相衔接，提前化解仿制药上市后的专利侵权风险，实现“创新者有回报、仿制者有遵循、病患者有希望”的制度目标。这也使得我国药品专利链接制度的落地运行成为全球原研药企在我国实施本土化战略，促进我国医药产业与国际接轨的重要契机。

2021 年 6 月 1 日施行的《专利法》第七十六条正式在法律层面确立了我国药品专利链接制度。最高人民法院于 2021 年 7 月 4 日发布《关于审理申请注册的药品相关的专利权纠纷民事案件适用法律若干问题的规定》，国家药品监督管理

局、国家知识产权局于2021年7月4日发布施行《药品专利纠纷早期解决机制实施办法（试行）》，国家知识产权局于2021年7月5日发布施行《药品专利纠纷早期解决机制行政裁决办法》，标志着我国药品专利链接制度正式落地。

根据最高人民法院《关于审理申请注册的药品相关的专利权纠纷民事案件适用法律若干问题的规定》，全国范围内药品专利链接案件一审由北京知识产权法院集中管辖。五年来，北京知识产权法院始终立足集中管辖职能，聚焦药链案件“国际化、类型新、专业性强、社会关注度高”特点，构建起全流程、专业化、高效率的审判模式，为制度运行提供了坚实司法保障。

自2021年6月至2026年6月药链制度实施五年来，北京知识产权法院共受理药品链接案件382件。其中，民事案件358件，行政案件24件。审结药品链接案件369件。其中，民事案件348件，行政案件21件。北京知识产权法院受理的药品链接案件中，超90%的案件为涉外案件，当事人包括艾伯维、默沙东、罗氏、阿斯利康等全球销售额前十的国际医药巨头。北京知识产权法院依法平等保护中外当事人的合法权益，妥善审结艾地骨化醇胶囊首案、玛巴洛沙韦片案、尼洛替尼胶囊案等一批具有规则指引作用和国际关注度的典型案件，逐步形成可复制、可推广、可借鉴的裁判规则。这些审理实践不仅为相关法律规范的完善提供了鲜活的实践支撑，推动制度从“条文”走向“实践”、从“纸面”走向“市场”，实现了司法实践与立法完善、市场运营的良性

互动，也为相关领域国际治理提供重要参考。

二、机制创新与审判实践：在破解难题中推动制度落地

五年来，北京知识产权法院以破解药链案件难点、提升审判质效为目标，通过强团队、提质效、建机制、优流程、树规则、促协同，推动药品专利链接制度效能充分释放。

强化专业队伍建设，着力提升审判能力。药品专利链接制度施行之初，北京知识产权法院即成立审判专班集中审理药品专利链接案件。审判专班通过固定合议庭、集中授课、庭审观摩、案例教学等方式，发挥审判业务专家的“传帮带”作用，用“专班”培养“专才”。为适应审判实践需求，于2024年创设“知药学堂”例会机制，通过30余次集中研讨，着力解决程序适用、实体认定、机制衔接等全领域审判难题，努力打造一支既懂法律又懂医药的复合型审判队伍，为案件审理的专业性提供人才保障，也为裁判规则的精准提炼奠定专业基础。

大幅压缩审理周期，着力提升审判效率。北京知识产权法院针对药链案件审判效率问题，从立案识别、流程管控、节点督促等方面出台系列举措。2025年，药链案件一审平均审理时长缩短至101天（3.4个月）。同时，考虑到《药品专利纠纷早期解决机制实施办法（试行）》关于国家药监局对化学仿制药注册申请设置9个月等待期的规定，为确保司法审判周期与行政裁决周期的一致性，力争在9个月内完成两审程序，北京知识产权法院超8成药链案件实现“五个月

审结”，高效的审判节奏既保障了当事人的合法权益，也契合了药品上市审批的时效性需求。

完善技术查明体系，着力破解专业难题。药链案件中有关医药的技术事实认定是审理的核心也是审理的难点，北京知识产权法院依托由专业化人民陪审员、技术调查官、司法鉴定人、专家辅助人共同参与的“四位一体+智库咨询”的技术事实查明机制，有效破解专业壁垒。在“比索洛尔氨氯地平片案”这一技术复杂型案件中，技术调查官全程参与技术事实认定，结合专家咨询意见，法院依法作出公正裁判，取得了良好的政治效果、法律效果和社会效果。

不断深化机制创新，着力保障制度落地。构建贯穿“立案-审理-裁判-判后-成果转化”全流程的药链案件审理机制。立案阶段，加强前端指导，确保立案庭在立案阶段准确识别；审理阶段，全程护航案件推进，协调解决送达、开庭、技术查明等难点堵点；判后阶段，与最高人民法院知识产权法庭建立“点对点”联络机制，依托北京知识产权法院审判全流程电子化和电子卷宗随案同步生成及深度应用机制，实现案件材料快速上诉移送；成果转化阶段，及时总结裁判规则、发布典型案例，增强司法裁判的可预期性。这一全流程机制，既保障了案件审理质量，也为制度实施提供了顺畅的司法衔接。

持续深化府院协同，着力凝聚解纷合力。深入贯彻习近平总书记关于“要坚持把推进医疗、医保、医药协同发展和治理作为医药卫生体制改革的主攻方向”的重要指示精神、

落实《中共中央关于加强新时代审判工作的意见》关于“加强人民法院与政府部门、社会力量的协调联动”的要求，建立与国家知识产权局、国家药监局、国家医保局的沟通协作机制，畅通信息共享、业务协同、问题会商渠道。2025年北京知识产权法院牵头组织召开药品专利链接案件专题研讨会，推动典型问题实质性解决。跨部门协同机制的构建，形成了“司法审判+行政监管+行业指导”的多元解纷，提升了制度运行整体效能。

三、规则确立与制度完善：在审判实践中贡献司法智慧

五年的审判实践，不仅是对现有法律的适用，更是对法律规则的细化和完善。北京知识产权法院通过个案审理，针对药品专利链接制度运行中的难点、痛点，努力理清案件复杂技术事实背后的法律关系，走通法律适用的“最后一公里”，为相关司法解释和立法完善提供鲜活的实践样本。

发布典型案例形成裁判规则，逐步实现司法标准统一。五年来，北京知识产权法院妥善审结了药链“首案”艾地骨化醇胶囊案，以及玛巴洛沙韦片案、尼洛替尼胶囊案、哌柏西利片案、巴瑞替尼片案、芦曲泊帕片案等重点案件。其中，药链首案入选《中国审判》2022年度十大典型案例、新时代推动法治进程2022年度十大提名案件，玛巴洛沙韦片案获评2023年中国法院50件典型知识产权案例。这些案例不仅解决了具体纠纷，更通过确立裁判规则，为行业发展提供了明确指引。甲苯磺酸艾多沙班片案中明确的仿制药技术方案

以审评阶段的申报资料为准，适配了制度早期解决纠纷的定位，为药链制度的运行范式提供了实践样本，实现了司法实践对法律制度完善的积极反哺。

此外，北京知识产权法院针对药链案件立案、审理中的突出问题，先后发布中英文版《关于申请注册的药品相关的专利权纠纷民事案件立案指引（试行）》（一）（二），明确立案条件、材料要求、程序规范，充分保障当事人诉讼权利；编写《北京知识产权法院关于申请注册的药品相关专利权民事纠纷案件内部培训手册》，从立案审查、庭前准备、案件审判、判后工作四个方面提供系统化审理指南。

明确药品专利链接制度的规制边界，确保制度行稳致远。制度的生命力在于实施，而实施的关键在于恪守规制边界。北京知识产权法院通过一系列案件，厘清了药品专利链接案件的受理条件、当事人资格、起诉期限等程序性问题，确保制度运行不偏航、不走样。

在“盐酸鲁拉西酮片案”中，明确涉案专利已被宣告无效的，在药品专利链接案件中亦可裁定驳回起诉，避免程序空转。在“哌柏西利片案”中，明确未在我国注册上市的药品，即便其相关专利已获授权，也不符合受理条件。在“磷酸奥司他韦颗粒案”中，明确原告药品非参比制剂的，涉案专利不属于“被仿制药的相关专利”。在“巴瑞替尼片案”中，明确仿制药在起诉前已获上市许可的，不再属于“申请注册的药品”，应当驳回起诉，但诉讼中获批准的除外。

细化实体裁判规则，引导企业诚信规范行为。药品专利

链接案件系早期纠纷解决机制，其被诉侵权技术方案的载体主要是仿制药企的申报资料。针对这一特性，北京知识产权法院细化实体规则，引导企业从申报环节起就秉持诚信原则。

在“甲苯磺酸艾多沙班片案”中，针对申报资料变更情形，明确仿制药技术方案通常以申报资料记载为准，若药审中心以变更后方案完成审评，则以变更后内容为准。在“乌帕替尼缓释片案”中，针对仿制药企不当声明情形时，是否符合声明类型这一受理条件的审查，明确应当考量仿制药企作出声明时是否存在主观过错，进一步指引仿制药企应筑牢诚信、审慎作出声明的理念。在“富马酸伏诺拉生片案”中，针对仿制药企拒绝提供申报资料的情形，明确了仿制药申请人的初步举证责任，未履行且无法确定技术方案的，推定落入保护范围。这一规则有效遏制了仿制药企的不诚信行为，保障了诉讼程序的顺利进行。

四、未来与展望：为医药产业高质量发展提供坚实司法保障

五年的实践探索证明，药品专利链接制度运行成效显著。北京知识产权法院通过不懈努力与持续创新，有效引导了医药企业优化创新路径与经营策略，增强了司法裁判的可预期性，净化了医药健康产业营商环境。典型案例确定的裁判规则，已成为原研药企和仿制药企合规经营的重要依据，为提升涉案专利质量、促进产业健康发展发挥了积极作用。

2026 年是药品专利链接制度运行五周年的关键节点，北京知识产权法院将持续深化审判机制创新，进一步推动形成

协同保护格局，推动构建高效衔接的医药健康知识产权协同保护格局。持续强化裁判规则提炼，聚焦新靶点、新结构、新适应症等医药前沿领域，提前研判法律适用难点，通过典型案例明确裁判规则。持续优化审判质效，完善技术事实查明体系，依法平等保护中外当事人合法权益。

北京知识产权法院将始终秉持专业、审慎的司法态度，让更多优质医药创新成果惠及广大人民群众，让医药健康产业在法治化、国际化的营商环境中行稳致远，为营造激励创新、公平竞争的医药生态环境提供坚实法治保障！

Beijing Intellectual Property Court Report on Judicial Work During the First Five Years of the pharmaceutical Patent Linkage System

Friends from the media, ladies and gentlemen:

Good morning. As China’ s pharmaceutical patent linkage system reaches its fifth anniversary, we are here to report on the Beijing Intellectual Property Court’s adjudication of drug patent linkage cases.

China’ s drug patent linkage system took effect on June 1, 2021. It represents an important improvement to the country’ s pharmaceutical intellectual property protection framework. It is also a key measure in China’ s participation in international pharmaceutical intellectual property governance and its efforts to foster an international, law-based business environment. Over the past five years, as the court with centralized first-instance jurisdiction over these cases, the Beijing Intellectual Property Court has resolved numerous disputes involving Chinese and foreign pharmaceutical companies through specialized adjudication. The system takes account of the legitimate interests of both innovative-drug and generic-drug companies. It provides an institutional foundation for balancing protection of

pharmaceutical innovation with access to medicines, and supports China's development from a major pharmaceutical market into a leader in the field, more closely connected to the global pharmaceutical innovation chain.

Over these five years, the Court has carried out its responsibilities in light of President Xi Jinping's statement that "the health of the people is an important indicator of national prosperity and strength." We have strictly implemented the relevant judicial interpretations of the Supreme People's Court and worked to safeguard the system's operation. Focusing on adjudication quality and efficiency and on developing clear rules, we have established a specialized process covering every stage of a case and strengthened coordination between the Court and government agencies. These efforts respond to the needs of the pharmaceutical industry in China and abroad. They have helped translate legal provisions into sound market practice and provided judicial support for the high-quality development of China's pharmaceutical industry under the rule of law and in an international setting.

I. Institutional Background and the Court's Role: Serving Broader Development Goals Through Judicial Responsibility

The pharmaceutical industry is technology-intensive. Research and development require substantial investment, take a

long time and involve considerable risk. Progress depends both on sustained research and breakthroughs by original drug companies and on timely follow-on development by generic drug companies. The latter improves access to medicines and lowers costs so that patients can benefit sooner from affordable, effective drugs.

In recent years, as China’ s pharmaceutical market has become more important globally, domestic research and development capabilities have grown, and supporting policies have taken effect, China has increasingly become a key market for patent planning and competition among Chinese and foreign pharmaceutical companies. The central value of drug patent linkage lies in connecting review and approval of generic drug applications with protection of original drug patents. By addressing potential patent infringement disputes before a generic drug reaches the market, the system seeks to ensure that innovators receive returns, generic developers have clear rules to follow, and patients have greater hope. Its implementation also creates an important opportunity for global original drug companies to pursue localized strategies in China and for China’ s pharmaceutical industry to align more closely with international practice.

Article 76 of the Patent Law, effective June 1, 2021, formally established China’ s drug patent linkage system in

legislation. On July 4, 2021, the Supreme People's Court issued the Provisions on Several Issues Concerning the Application of Law in the Trial of Civil Cases Involving Patent Disputes Related to Drugs Applied for Registration. On the same day, the National Medical Products Administration and the China National Intellectual Property Administration issued and brought into effect the Measures for the Implementation of the Early Resolution Mechanism for Drug Patent Disputes (Trial). On July 5, 2021, the China National Intellectual Property Administration issued and brought into effect the Measures for Administrative Adjudication under the Early Resolution Mechanism for Drug Patent Disputes. Together, these measures marked the system's full implementation.

Under the Supreme People's Court's provisions, the Beijing Intellectual Property Court has centralized first-instance jurisdiction over drug patent linkage cases nationwide. Recognizing that these cases often have an international dimension, involve novel issues and specialized subject matter, and attract substantial public attention, the Court has built a comprehensive, specialized and efficient adjudication model.

From June 2021 to June 2026, the Court accepted 382 drug patent linkage cases: 358 civil cases and 24 administrative cases. It concluded 369 cases: 348 civil cases and 21 administrative cases. More than 90% of the cases accepted involved a foreign

element. The parties included major international pharmaceutical companies such as AbbVie, Merck, Roche and AstraZeneca.

The Court protects the lawful rights and interests of Chinese and foreign parties equally. It has concluded a number of representative cases that have attracted international attention and provided guidance on legal rules, including the first eldecalcitol capsules case and cases concerning baloxavir tablets and nilotinib capsules. Through these cases, it has developed rules that can be applied and drawn upon more broadly. This work has provided practical support for refining the relevant legal framework, helped move the system from statutory text into market practice, and created a constructive interaction among adjudication, legislation and market operations. It also offers a reference for international governance in this field.

II. Procedural Innovation and Adjudication: Putting the System into Practice by Solving Difficult Problems

Over the past five years, the Beijing Intellectual Property Court has sought to resolve the challenges presented by drug patent linkage cases and improve adjudication quality and efficiency. It has strengthened its teams, improved procedures, developed rules and deepened coordination to realize the system's benefits.

Building specialized trial teams and strengthening adjudication capacity. When the system first took effect, the Court established a dedicated trial team to hear drug patent linkage cases. Through relatively stable collegial panels, focused training, courtroom observation and case-based teaching, experienced judges have helped develop specialist expertise. In 2024, the Court introduced a regular forum called the "Pharmaceutical IP Classroom." More than 30 group discussions have addressed issues ranging from procedure and substantive determinations to coordination between mechanisms. The aim is to build a trial team with expertise in both law and pharmaceuticals, providing a strong professional foundation for case decisions and the development of precise adjudication rules.

Shortening case duration and improving efficiency. The Court has introduced measures covering identification at filing, case-flow management and monitoring of key procedural stages. In 2025, the average duration of a first-instance drug patent linkage case fell to 101 days, or approximately 3.4 months. The Measures for the Implementation of the Early Resolution Mechanism for Drug Patent Disputes (Trial) provide for a nine-month waiting period in the regulatory approval process for chemical generic drugs. With that period in mind, and seeking to align judicial proceedings with administrative processes by

completing both court instances within nine months, the Court concluded more than 80% of its drug patent linkage cases within five months at first instance. This pace protects the parties' lawful rights while meeting the time-sensitive needs of drug approval.

Improving technical fact-finding. Establishing pharmaceutical technical facts is central to these cases and often their most difficult aspect. The Court uses a "four-part mechanism plus expert consultation," bringing together specialized people's assessors, technical investigation officers, forensic appraisers and expert assistants, with additional support from an expert advisory pool. In the technically complex Bisoprolol and Amlodipine Tablets Case, a technical investigation officer participated throughout the fact-finding process. Drawing also on expert advice, the Court reached a fair decision in accordance with the law.

Developing a process that covers the full life of a case. The Court has established procedures spanning filing, hearing, judgment, post-judgment work and the wider application of case outcomes. At the filing stage, it provides guidance so that relevant cases are accurately identified. During adjudication, it coordinates the resolution of difficulties concerning service of process, hearings and technical fact-finding. After judgment, a direct liaison mechanism with the Intellectual Property Court of

the Supreme People's Court facilitates prompt transfer of appeal materials, supported by the Court's electronic case-management system and case files generated in parallel with proceedings. Finally, the Court promptly summarizes adjudication rules and publishes representative cases to make outcomes more predictable. This end-to-end approach supports both adjudication quality and the effective operation of the system.

Deepening coordination between the Court and government agencies. In keeping with President Xi Jinping's call to promote coordinated development and governance of medical services, medical insurance and pharmaceuticals, and with the requirement in the *Opinions of the CPC Central Committee on Strengthening Adjudication in the New Era* to improve coordination between courts, government departments and other social actors, the Court has established channels for cooperation with the China National Intellectual Property Administration, the National Medical Products Administration and the National Healthcare Security Administration. These channels support information-sharing, operational coordination and joint discussion of difficult issues. In 2025, the Court led a dedicated seminar on drug patent linkage cases to advance the substantive resolution of recurring problems. Cross-agency cooperation has brought judicial adjudication, administrative regulation and industry guidance together in a more effective

approach to dispute resolution.

III. Developing Rules and Improving the System: Drawing on Judicial Experience

Five years of adjudication have involved not only applying existing law, but also clarifying and refining its rules. Through individual cases, the Court has addressed difficult questions arising in the operation of drug patent linkage, identified the legal relationships behind complex technical facts, and helped bridge the gap between legal provisions and their application. This work provides practical examples for future judicial interpretations and legislative improvements.

Publishing representative cases and promoting consistent judicial standards. The Court has concluded the first drug patent linkage case, concerning eldecalcitol capsules, as well as important cases concerning baloxavir tablets, nilotinib capsules, palbociclib tablets, baricitinib tablets and lusutrombopag tablets. The eldecalcitol case was selected as one of *China Trial*’ s Top Ten Representative Cases of 2022 and as a nominee among the Top Ten Cases Advancing the Rule of Law in the New Era in 2022. The baloxavir tablets case was named one of the 50 Representative Intellectual Property Cases of Chinese Courts in 2023.

These cases did more than resolve individual disputes: they established rules that guide the industry. In the Edoxaban

Tosylate Tablets Case, for example, the Court clarified that the technical solution of a generic drug is ordinarily determined by the application materials used during regulatory review. That rule reflects the system's purpose of resolving disputes early and provides a practical model for its operation.

The Court has also published, in Chinese and English, Parts I and II of its *Guidelines for Filing Civil Cases Involving Patent Disputes Related to Drugs Applied for Registration (Trial)*. The guidelines clarify filing conditions, documentation requirements and procedural rules, helping protect parties' litigation rights. An internal training manual on these civil cases provides systematic guidance on filing review, pretrial preparation, adjudication and post-judgment work.

Defining the boundaries of the drug patent linkage system. A system works effectively only when its scope is clear. Through a series of cases, the Court has clarified procedural issues including acceptance requirements, who may bring an action and filing deadlines, helping ensure that the system operates as intended.

In the Lurasidone Hydrochloride Tablets Case, the Court held that an action under the drug patent linkage system may be dismissed where the patent has been declared invalid, avoiding proceedings that would serve no practical purpose. In the Palbociclib Tablets Case, it held that a drug not registered and

marketed in China does not meet the relevant acceptance requirements, even if a related patent has been granted. In the Oseltamivir Phosphate Granules Case, it held that where the plaintiff's drug is not the reference product, the patent at issue is not a "patent related to the drug being copied." In the Baricitinib Tablets Case, it held that a generic drug already approved for marketing before the action is filed is no longer a "drug applied for registration," so the action should be dismissed. Approval granted during litigation is treated differently.

Refining substantive rules and encouraging honest, compliant conduct. Drug patent linkage is an early dispute resolution mechanism. The allegedly infringing technical solution is generally found in the generic-drug company's regulatory application materials, rather than in a marketed product. The Court has tailored its rules to that feature and encouraged companies to act in good faith from the application stage onward.

In the Edoxaban Tosylate Tablets Case, the Court held that the generic drug's technical solution is ordinarily determined by its application materials, but where the Center for Drug Evaluation completes its review on the basis of an amended solution, that amended solution governs. In the Upadacitinib Extended-Release Tablets Case,Regarding the review, in

circumstances where a generic drug company has made an improper declaration, of whether the acceptance condition concerning the type of declaration is met. It held that the company's fault, if any, when making the original declaration must be considered, underscoring the need for careful and honest declarations.

In the Vonoprazan Fumarate Tablets Case, the Court clarified the generic applicant's initial burden to provide evidence where it controls the application materials. If the applicant fails to discharge that burden and the technical solution cannot otherwise be established, the generic drug may be presumed to fall within the patent's scope of protection. This rule discourages withholding of information and helps proceedings move forward.

IV. Looking Ahead: Providing Judicial Support for High-Quality Pharmaceutical Development

Five years of practice demonstrate that the drug patent linkage system has achieved significant results. Through sustained effort and innovation, the Beijing Intellectual Property Court has helped guide pharmaceutical companies toward sound innovation and business strategies, made judicial outcomes more predictable and improved the business environment for the pharmaceutical and healthcare sector. Rules established in representative cases have become important references for

compliant operation by both original and generic drug companies. They also support better patent quality and healthy industry development.

The fifth anniversary in 2026 is an important milestone. The Court will continue to improve its adjudication mechanisms and promote coordinated intellectual property protection across the pharmaceutical and healthcare sector. It will further develop adjudication rules, anticipate legal questions raised by advances involving new targets, structures and indications, and provide guidance through representative cases. It will continue to improve adjudication quality and efficiency, strengthen technical fact-finding and protect the lawful rights and interests of Chinese and foreign parties equally.

The Beijing Intellectual Property Court will maintain a professional and careful judicial approach. We will work to ensure that more high-quality pharmaceutical innovations benefit the public, that the pharmaceutical and healthcare industry develops steadily in a law-based and international business environment, and that innovation and fair competition are supported by strong legal protections.