

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul the European Commission's decision of 15 March 2021 on State aid SA.55805 (2020/FC) — Czech Republic — Extension of DTT network operators' frequency licences;
- order the Commission to bear the costs.

### **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 of assessment;
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission's decision is not duly reasoned.

---

**Action brought on 28 June 2021 — Česká asociace satelitních operátorů v Commission**  
**(Case T-363/21)**  
(2021/C 368/38)

*Language of the case: English*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Česká asociace satelitních operátorů z. s. (Prague, Czech Republic) (represented by: R. Kubáč, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul the European Commission's decision of 15 March 2021 on State aid SA.55805 (2020/FC) — Czech Republic — Extension of DTT network operators' frequency licences;
- order the Commission to bear the costs.

### **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 of assessment;
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission's decision is not duly reasoned.

---

**Action brought on 28 June 2021 — TJ v EEAS**  
**(Case T-365/21)**  
(2021/C 368/39)

*Language of the case: English*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* TJ (represented by: A. Véghely, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European External Action Service (EEAS)

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Appointing Authority for the selection of Civilian Operations Commander and Director of CPCC;
- Compensate for damages under Article 340 of the TFEU suffered as a result of the above mentioned decision.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging a violation of Article 98 of the Staff Regulations and Council Decision 2010/427/EU;
2. Second plea in law, alleging a violation of Article 27 of the Staff Regulations;
3. Third plea in law, alleging violations of the principle of equal treatment;
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging a violation of the principle of good administration.

---

**Action brought on 1 July 2021 — Di Taranto v European Public Prosecutor's Office****(Case T-368/21)**

(2021/C 368/40)

*Language of the case: Italian***Parties**

*Applicant:* Alessandro Di Taranto (Rome, Italy) (represented by: G. Pellegrino, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO)

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the Decision of the College of the European Public Prosecutor's Office of 3 May 2021 on the appointment of fifteen European Delegated Prosecutors of the EPPO in the Italian Republic, appointing the European Delegated Prosecutors of the Italian State;
- order the defendant to pay the costs incurred by the applicant in the present proceedings.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on a single plea in law alleging unlawfulness as a result of the unlawful nature of the preliminary and binding decision of 28 April 2021 adopted by the Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura (Supreme Council of the Judiciary), which is the competent authority in Italy for designating European Delegated Prosecutors (EDPs).

As an interim measure, the applicant challenges the decision of the College of the EPPO appointing the EDPs, claiming that it is vitiated as a result of the unlawfulness of the decision of 28 April 2021 by which the Supreme Council of the Judiciary approved the final determination in which Dottore Di Taranto, with regard to the three prosecutors to be appointed for the office in Rome, was classified after the other candidates.

---