

**Action brought on 18 July 2022 — Columbus Stainless v Commission****(Case T-445/22)**

(2022/C 326/41)

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

*Applicant:* Columbus Stainless (Pty) Ltd (Middleburg, South Africa) (represented by: L. Catrain González and F. Pili, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/664 of 21 April 2022 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/159 imposing definitive safeguard measures against imports of certain steel products <sup>(1)</sup>, in its entirety or in so far as it affects the applicant;
- Order the Commission to pay the costs of the proceedings

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, divided in two limbs, alleging the Commission's failure to issue a Notice of initiation and carry out an investigation in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2015/478 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2015 on common rules for imports <sup>(2)</sup> ahead of adopting the Contested Regulation. The applicant claims that the Commission's failure constitutes a serious breach of EU law, insofar it violates, first, the provisions and underlying principles of the basic Safeguard Regulation as interpreted in the light of the WTO rules (first limb of the first plea in law), and, second, the applicant's fundamental rights of defence (second limb of the first plea in law).
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission's statement of reasons in the Contested Regulation falls short of the standards set out in Article 296 TFEU and settled case law, which requires the statement of reasons to be appropriate to the measure at issue and to disclose in a clear and unequivocal fashion the reasoning followed by the Institution concerned.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Commission's assessment of the conditions to impose safeguard measures against imports from South Africa is based on several manifest errors of assessment of the relevant facts that led to the adoption of the Contested Measures.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2022, L 121, p. 12.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ 2015, L 83, p. 16.

---

**Action brought on 19 July 2022 — Corver v EUIPO (CHR ME)****(Case T-446/22)**

(2022/C 326/42)

*Language of the case: German***Parties**

*Applicant:* Serge-Paul Corver (Lanaken, Belgium) (represented by: C. König, lawyer)

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