Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-432/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [1]

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 13.

Action brought on 22 February 2012 — Makhlouf v Council

(Case T-98/12)

(2012/C 151/50)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Ehab Makhlouf (Damas, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

— Declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;

— In consequence, annul Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 and Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 and their subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;

— Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-433/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [1]

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 14.

Action brought on 22 February 2012 — Syriatel Mobile Telecom v Council

(Case T-99/12)

(2012/C 151/51)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Syriatel Mobile Telecom (Joint Stock Company) (Damas, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

— Declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;

— In consequence, annul Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 and Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 and their subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;

— Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law, the first three of which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Cases T-432/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*, [1] and T-433/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [2]

The fourth plea alleges infringement of the principle of equal treatment, the consequence of which is to distort competition both within the European Union and Syria and as between those two territories.

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 13.
[2] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 14

Action brought on 22 February 2012 — Almashreq Investment v Council

(Case T-100/12)

(2012/C 151/52)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Almashreq Investment Co. (Joint Stock Holding Company) (Damas, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

— Declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;

— In consequence, annul Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 and Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 and their subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;

— Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Cases T-432/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*, [1] and T-433/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [2]

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 13.
[2] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 14.

Action brought on 22 February 2012 — Cham v Council

(Case T-101/12)

(2012/C 151/53)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Cham Holding Co. SA (Damas, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

— Declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;

— In consequence, annul Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 and Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 and their subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;

— Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Cases T-432/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*, [1] and T-433/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [2]

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 13.
[2] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 14.

Action brought on 22 February 2012 — Sorouh v Council

(Case T-102/12)

(2012/C 151/54)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Sorouh Joint Stock Company (Damas, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

— Declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;

— In consequence, annul Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 and Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 and their subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;

— Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those relied on in Cases T-432/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*, [1] and T-433/11 *Makhlouf* v *Council*. [2]

[1] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 13.
[2] OJ 2011 C 290, p. 14.

Action brought on 24 February 2012 — T&L Sugars and Sidul Açúcares v Commission

(Case T-103/12)

(2012/C 151/55)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: T&L Sugars Ltd (London, United Kingdom) and Sidul Açúcares, Unipessoal L^{da} (Santa Iria de Azóia, Portugal) (represented by: D. Waelbroeck, lawyer, and D. Slater, Solicitor)

Defendants: European Commission and the European Union, represented by the European Commission