

Form of order sought

- Annul the decision of 23 September 2005 of the Director-General of DG INFSO to transfer the applicant in the interest of the service as head of unit INFSO.G.2 'Micro and nanosystems';
- annul the appointing authority's express decision of 2 February 2006 giving a negative response to the applicant's complain R/764/05;
- order the Commission of the European Communities to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The applicant, an official of the Commission transferred in the interest of the service to the post of head of unit INFSO.G.2 'Micro and nanosystems', claims that that transfer is contrary to the interest of the service. He relies on a breach of Article 7 of the Staff Regulations and a manifest error of assessment of the concept of 'interest of the service', a misuse of powers and a breach of the principle of equal treatment.

Action brought on 9 May 2006 — Chassagne v Commission

(Case F-56/06)

(2006/C 154/66)

*Language of the case: French***Parties**

Applicant: Olivier Chassagne (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by: S. Rodriques, Y. Minatchy and A. Jaume, lawyers)

Defendant: Commission of the European Communities

Form of order sought

- Annul the applicant's career development report for 2004;
- annul the Directorate-General's decision allocating priority points during the 2005 promotion exercise;

- annul the appointing authority's decisions of 30 January 2006 and 14 March 2006 rejecting the applicant's complains against the abovementioned decisions;
- award nominal damages of one euro for professional harm and one euro for non-pecuniary harm arising from the adoption of the contested decisions;
- order the Commission of the European Communities to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of his action, the applicant relies first of all on the unlawfulness of the General implementing provisions of Articles 43 and 44 of the Staff Regulations.

He claims, next, that there has been a breach of a number of procedural requirements, such as the rights of the defence, the obligation to state reasons and compliance with the rules of procedure.

The applicant further maintains that the administration has made a number of manifest errors of assessment, notably in the context of considering comparative merits and in allocating priority points.

Last, in the applicant's submission, the defendant has infringed the principle of sound administration.

Order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 18 May 2006 — Eerola v Commission(Case F -110/05) ⁽¹⁾

(2006/C 154/67)

Language of the case: French

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 48, 25.2.2006.