EN

 order EUIPO's Opposition Division to adopt a decision in relation to opposition B 3006619 (MUE No 17 174 236 AICOOK) finding that the use of the opposing trade mark has been established in relation to 'Food processors' in Class 7.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 47(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 30 May 2020 — Hypo Vorarlberg Bank v SRB

(Case T-336/20)

(2020/C 240/44)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Hypo Vorarlberg Bank AG (Bregenz, Austria) (represented by: G. Eisenberger and A. Brenneis, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board (SRB)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the Single Resolution Board of 19 March 2020 on the calculation of the 2016 ex-ante contributions due by Banco Cooperativo Español S.A., Hypo Vorarlberg Bank AG (formerly: Vorarl-berger Landes- und Hypothekenbank AG), and Portigon AG to the Single Resolution Fund (SRB/ES/2020/16), including the annexes thereto, and in any event in so far as that decision, including the annexes thereto, concerns the contribution to be paid by the applicant;
- order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law which are, in essence, identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-479/19; Hypo Vorarlberg Bank v SRB. (1)

(¹) OJ 2019 C 305, p. 58.

Action brought on 2 June 2020 — Portigon v SRB

(Case T-339/20)

(2020/C 240/45)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Portigon AG (Düsseldorf, Germany) (represented by: D. Bliesener, V. Jungkind and F. Geber, lawyers)