

- Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the competition notice, Article 5(1) of Annex III to the Staff Regulations and a consequential manifest error of assessment since, in the AD 7 competition, the candidates' leadership abilities were assessed, whereas that quality should have been assessed solely vis-à-vis the AD 9 candidates.
- Sixth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principles in the case-law in *Di Prospero v Commission* and infringement of Article 27 of the Staff Regulations and of the principle of equality in that the competition notice did not allow candidates to participate in both the AD 7 and AD 9 competitions, whereas certain candidates who had applied for the AD 9 competition were automatically transferred to the AD 7 reserve list.
- Seventh plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of equality of candidates and lack of objectivity of assessment, due to the lack of stability in the selection board as a result of frequent changes to the composition of the selection board and the absence of shadowing by the President.

**Action brought on 19 May 2023 — Impossible Foods v EUIPO — Société des produits Nestlé
(IMPOSSIBLE)**

(Case T-273/23)

(2023/C 252/77)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Impossible Foods Inc. (Redwood City, California, United States) (represented by: T. Cohen Jehoram, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Société des produits Nestlé SA (Vevey, Switzerland)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the trade mark at issue: Applicant before the General Court

Trade mark at issue: European Union word mark IMPOSSIBLE — European Union trade mark No 12 775 664

Procedure before EUIPO: Cancellation proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 17 March 2023 in Case R 665/2022-5

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs of these proceedings.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 58(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 18 May 2023 — Tinkoff Bank v Council

(Case T-275/23)

(2023/C 252/78)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Tinkoff Bank SA (Moscow, Russia) (represented by: A. Genko, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- find its application for annulment to be admissible and well-founded and therefore:
- annul Council Regulation (EU) 269/2014 of 17 March 2014 as amended on 25 February 2023 by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/429 (OJ L 59 I/ 278) in so far as it adds the applicant to the list of sanctioned entities under number 200;
- annul Council Decision 2014/145/CFSP of 17 March 2014 as amended on 25 February 2023 by Council Decision (CFSP) 2023/432 (OJ L 59 I/ 437) in so far as it adds the applicant to the list of sanctioned entities under number 200;
- annul Council Regulation (EU) 269/2014 of 17 March 2014 as amended on 25 February 2022 by Regulation (EU) 2022/330 (OJ 51/ 1) by the addition of a new criterion making it possible to sanction ‘leading businesspersons or legal persons, entities or bodies involved in economic sectors providing a substantial source of revenue to the Government of the Russian Federation ...’ in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- annul Council Decision 2014/145/CFSP of 17 March 2014 as amended by Council Decision (CFSP) 2022/329 of 25 February 2022 (OJ L 50/1) by the addition of a new criterion making it possible to sanction ‘leading businesspersons involved in economic sectors providing a substantial source of revenue to the Government of the Russian Federation ...’ in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- annul the maintaining acts in so far as they concern the applicant;
- order the Council 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, in essence, identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-270/23, *Rosbank v Council*.

Action brought on 22 May 2023 — Global 8 Airlines v Commission

(Case T-277/23)

(2023/C 252/79)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Global 8 Airlines (Bichkek, Kirghizstan) (represented by: E. Novicāne, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the individual measure adopted by the European Commission (Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport) regarding inclusion of the two light business jets (‘the aircrafts’) owned by the applicant in the list subject to grounding ban under Council Regulation (EU) No 833/2014 of 31 July 2014 concerning restrictive measures in view of Russia’s actions destabilising the situation in Ukraine, in its entirety as it relates to the applicant (‘the contested decision’), of which the applicant learned on 20 March 2023;
- order the defendant to pay the costs incurred by the applicant.