Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 12 May 2014 given in Case R 442/2013-4;
- Order the defendant to pay the costs of proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Registered Community trade mark in respect of which a declaration of invalidity has been sought: Community trade mark registration No 668 566

Proprietor of the Community trade mark: The applicant

Applicant for the declaration of invalidity of the Community trade mark: The other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Grounds for the application for a declaration of invalidity: Absolute grounds for invalidity pursuant to Article 52(1)(a) CTMR in conjuction with Article 7(1)(b) and (c)

Decision of the Cancellation Division: Rejected the request for declaration of invalidity

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Annulled the contested decision and declared the Community trade mark invalid

Pleas in law: Infringement of Articles 7(1)(b) and 7(1)(c) CTMR.

Action brought on 28 July 2014 — Yoo Holdings v OHIM — Eckes-Granini Group (YOO) (Case T-562/14)

(2014/C 351/22)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Yoo Holdings Ltd (London, United Kingdom) (represented by: D. Farnsworth, Solicitor)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Eckes-Granini Group GmbH (Nieder-Olm, Germany)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

 Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 29 April 2014 given in Case R 762/2013-2.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Applicant for a Community trade mark: The applicant

Community trade mark concerned: The word mark 'YOO' for the services in Classes 35, 41 and 43 — Community trade mark application No 10 487 924

Proprietor of the mark or sign cited in the opposition proceedings: The other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Mark or sign cited in opposition: National and International trade mark registration for the word mark 'YO' for goods in Classes 29, 30 and 32

Decision of the Opposition Division: Rejected the opposition in its entirety

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Partially annulled the contested decision and upheld the opposition in part

Pleas in law: Infringement of Article 8(1)(a) and (b) CTMR.

Action brought on 29 July 2014 — Hewlett Packard Development Company v OHIM (ELITEDISPLAY)

(Case T-563/14)

(2014/C 351/23)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Hewlett Packard Development Company LP (Dallas, United States) (represented by: T. Raab and H. Lauf, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 19 May 2014 given in Case R 1539/2013-2;
- Order the defendant to bear the costs of proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Community trade mark concerned: The word mark 'ELITEDISPLAY' for goods and services in Class 9 — Community trade mark application No 11 541 901

Decision of the Examiner: Rejected the CTM application

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Dismissed the appeal

Pleas in law: Infringement of Articles 7(1)(b), 7(1)(c) and 7(2) CTMR.

Action brought on 4 August 2014 — Gascogne Sack Deutschland and Gascogne v Court of Justice

(Case T-577/14)

(2014/C 351/24)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicants: Gascogne Sack Deutschland GmbH (Wieda, Germany) and Gascogne (Saint-Paul-lès-Dax, France) (represented by: F. Puel and E. Durand, lawyers)

Defendant: Court of Justice of the European Union