3. The third plea in law alleges a lack of sufficient and precise reasoning, in that the Council merely provided vague and general considerations without stating the specific and concrete reasons why it considered that the applicant needed to be made subject to restrictive measures.

4. By its fourth plea in law, the applicant claims that there were insufficiencies surrounding the adoption of the contested measures, in so far as the Council failed to set out therein the fundamental rights and principles which European Union law grants to the addresses of those measures, and in so far as those measures were adopted on the basis of Article 215 TFEU, which the applicant regards as devoid of any democratic guarantees.

Action brought on 20 April 2012 — Wirtgen v OHIM (Shape of a chisel holder)

(Case T-179/12)

(2012/C 184/34)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Wirtgen GmbH (Windhagen, Germany) (represented by S. Jackermeier, lawyer)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

— annul the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 15 February 2012 in Case R 1923/2011-4;

— order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Community trade mark concerned: the three-dimensional mark in the form of a chisel holder for goods in Class 7 — application No 9 749 631

Decision of the Examiner: rejection of the application

Decision of the Board of Appeal: dismissal of the appeal

Pleas in law: Infringement of Article 37(3), the second sentence of Article 75, Article 63(2), the first part of Article 76(1) and Article 77(1) of Regulation No 207/2009 and infringement of Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009

Order of the General Court of 27 April 2012 — Commission v Smadja

(Case T-513/08 P) [1]

(2012/C 184/35)

Language of the case: French

The President of the Appeal Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

[1] OJ C 44, 21.2.2009.

Order of the General Court of 27 April 2012 — Spa Monopole v OHIM — Club de Golf Peralada (WINE SPA)

(Case T-183/09) [1]

(2012/C 184/36)

Language of the case: Spanish

The President of the Fifth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

[1] OJ C 153, 4.7.2009.

Order of the General Court of 20 April 2012 — Entegris v OHIM — Optimize Technologies (OPTIMIZE TECHNOLOGIES)

(Case T-163/10) [1]

(2012/C 184/37)

Language of the case: English

The President of the Sixth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

[1] OJ C 161, 19.6.2010.

Order of the General Court of 3 May 2012 — Consorzio del vino nobile di Montepulciano and Others v Commission

(Case T-318/10) [1]

(2012/C 184/38)

Language of the case: Italian

The President of the Eighth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

[1] OJ C 260, 25.9.2010.