

— take such other or further actions as justice may require.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging a manifest error in assessment and error of law by infringing the Commission's obligations in handling a complaint by incorrectly assessing the European Union interest with regard to all three reasons brought forward by the Commission;
2. Second plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment and error of law by infringing the Commission's obligations in handling a complaint, in particular failing to take into consideration all relevant matters of law and fact.

Action brought on 12 February 2015 — Jaguar Land Rover v OHIM — Nissan Jidosha (Land Glider)

(Case T-71/15)

(2015/C 118/48)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Jaguar Land Rover Ltd (Coventry, United Kingdom) (represented by: R. Ingerl, lawyer)

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

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Nissan Jidosha KK (Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa-ken, Japan)

Details of the proceedings before OHIM

Applicant: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: Community word mark 'Land Glider' — Community trade mark application No 8 324 196

Procedure before OHIM: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 9 December 2014 in Case R 1415/2013-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order OHIM to pay the costs incurred by the applicant.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009;
 - Infringement of Article 8(5) of Regulation No 207/2009.
-