

— order EASO to pay all the costs incurred by the applicant.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by infringement of the applicant's rights of defence.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by infringement of the right to sound administration.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by infringement of the applicant's right to effective judicial protection.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by infringement of the general principle of procedural economy.

---

## **Action brought on 27 October 2021 — Paraskevaidis v Council and Commission**

**(Case T-698/21)**

(2022/C 2/65)

*Language of the case: English*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Georgios Paraskevaidis (Wezembeek-Oppem, Belgium) (represented by: S. Pappas and D.-A. Pappa, lawyers)

*Defendants:* Council of the European Union and European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of 4 February 2021 of the Commission and the instalment plan of 9 March 2021 and the decision of the Council of 19 July 2021, by which the complaint of the applicant against the decision of the Commission was rejected, to the extent it contains additional reasoning; and
- order the defendants to bear the costs.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested decisions infringed the principle of legality. It is also alleged that the Revised Conclusion No 237/05 <sup>(1)</sup> was not applicable for the period the applicant claimed the educational allowance.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Revised Conclusion No 237/05 was illegally applied retroactively.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Revised Conclusion No 237/05 was adopted by the Heads of Administration beyond their remit.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the Revised Conclusion infringes Article 3(1) of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Revised Conclusion No 237/05 on the education allowance within the meaning of Article 3(1) of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations approved by the Heads of Administration at their 284<sup>th</sup> meeting on 1 July 2020.