

- error in fact and in law as regards the date of liberalisation of the market.
- 2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested decision classifies the scheme as a new aid scheme for the period of 1994 to 1998. In that context, the applicant alleges:
 - infringement of the procedural rights of the parties and of the principles of legal certainty and legitimate expectations in that the Commission extended the scope of its investigation beyond the framework laid down by the opening decision;
 - infringement of Article 17 of Regulation No 2015/1589, in that the Commission took the view that an application for repeal made by a private individual interrupted the limitation period.

Action brought on 1 June 2017 — Campbell v Commission

(Case T-312/17)

(2017/C 249/47)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Liam Campbell (Dundalk, Ireland) (represented by: J. MacGuill, Solicitor)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the Commission's decision of 7 April 2017 refusing the applicant access to documents concerning infringement proceedings initiated against Lithuania for alleged non-implementation of Directive 2010/64/EU.⁽¹⁾

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging the failure by the defendant to conduct a concrete assessment of the request for access to documents under Regulation 1049/2001, in breach of relevant case-law.
2. Second plea in law, alleging the defendant's unlawful reliance on certain general presumptions relating to the disclosure of documents, in breach of the principles identified in the relevant case-law.
3. Third plea in law, alleging the defendant's failure to process a specific and effective examination of the risk for each document, likewise in breach of relevant case-law.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging the defendant's failure to carry out a specific and effective examination of potential partial access in breach of the case-law.
5. Fifth plea in law alleging a manifest error of assessment by the defendant regarding the existence of an overriding public interest, in breach of the principles in the case-law.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings (OJ 2010, L 280, p. 1).

Action brought on 15 May 2017 — Hebberecht v EEAS

(Case T-315/17)

(2017/C 249/48)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Chantal Hebberecht (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia) (represented by: B. Maréchal, lawyer)