

**Action brought on 1 July 2022 — Volkskreditbank v SRB****(Case T-406/22)**

(2022/C 368/43)

*Language of the case: German***Parties***Applicant:* Volkskreditbank AG (Linz, 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 11 April 2022 on the calculation of the 2022 ex ante contributions to the Single Resolution Fund (SRB/ES/2022/18), including the annexes thereto, in any event in so far as it concerns the applicant; and
- order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**In support of the action, the applicant relies on eight pleas in law, which are identical to the pleas in law put forward in Case T-395/22, *Hypo Vorarlberg Bank v SRB*.

---

**Action brought on 20 July 2022 — QP v Commission****(Case T-460/22)**

(2022/C 368/44)

*Language of the case: Portuguese***Parties***Applicant:* QP (represented by: S. Gemas Donário and S. Soares, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Commission Decision C(2020) 8550 final of 4 December 2020 on aid scheme SA.21259 (2018/C) (ex 2018/NN) implemented by Portugal for Zona Franca da Madeira (ZFM) — Regime III;
- order the Commission to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging an error of assessment regarding fulfilment of the requirements for the compatibility of the aid scheme Zona Franca da Madeira — Regime III ('ZFM'), in particular as regards the origin of the profits and the creation and maintenance of jobs in the region.
2. Second plea in law, alleging undue delay on the part of the Commission in amending the successive versions of the ZFM scheme as regards the criterion for calculating the number of jobs created/maintained.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons, in so far as the decision adopted is not sufficiently reasoned as regards the meaning of ZFM jobs and as regards the activity effectively and materially performed in Madeira.