

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 and of the general principle of non-retroactivity.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the general principle of non-retroactivity and the general principle of legal certainty.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 266 TFEU and Article 264 TFEU.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality and Article 5(1) and 5(4) TEU.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to an effective remedy and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 103 of the Union Customs Code and Article 296 TFEU.
7. Seventh plea in law, alleging lack of competence of the Commission to impose registration of Jindal's imports and infringement of Article 14(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009.

---

**Action brought on 10 July 2020 — Jindal Saw and Jindal Saw Italia v Commission****(Case T-441/20)**

(2020/C 297/59)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

*Applicants:* Jindal Saw Ltd (New Delhi, India), Jindal Saw Italia SpA (Trieste, Italy) (represented by: R. Antonini, E. Monard and B. Maniatis, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/526 of 15 April 2020 re-imposing a definitive countervailing duty on imports of tubes and pipes of ductile cast iron (also known as spheroidal graphite cast iron) originating in India as regards Jindal Saw Limited following the judgment of the General Court in T-300/16;
- order the Commission to bear the costs of these proceedings.

**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 infringement of Article 16(1) of Regulation (EC) No 597/2009 and of the general principle of non-retroactivity.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the general principle of non-retroactivity and the general principle of legal certainty.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 266 TFEU and Article 264 TFEU.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality and Article 5(1) and 5(4) TEU.

5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to an effective remedy and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 103 of the Union Customs Code and Article 296 TFEU.
7. Seventh plea in law, alleging lack of competence of the Commission to impose registration of Jindal's imports and infringement of Article 24(5) of Regulation (EC) No 597/2009.

---

**Action brought on 13 July 2020 — Grangé and Van Strydonck v EUIPO — Nema (âme)**

**(Case T-442/20)**

(2020/C 297/60)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicants:* Isaline Grangé (Edegem, Belgium) and Alizée Van Strydonck (Strombeek-Bever, Belgium) (represented by: M. De Vroey, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Nema Srl (San Lazzaro di Savena, Italy)

**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Applicants of the trade mark at issue:* Applicants before the General Court

*Trade mark at issue:* Application for European Union word mark âme — Application for registration No 17 895 139

*Procedure before EUIPO:* Opposition proceedings

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 4 June 2020 in Case R 2960/2019-4

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO and any intervener to pay the costs.

**Plea in law**

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

---

**Action brought on 13 July 2020 — Sanford v EUIPO — Avery Zweckform (Labels)**

**(Case T-443/20)**

(2020/C 297/61)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Sanford LP (Atlanta, Georgia, United States) (represented by: J. Zecher, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Avery Zweckform GmbH (Oberlaindern/Valley, Germany)