

Order of the General Court of 4 June 2012 — Eurofer v Commission

(Case T-381/11) ⁽¹⁾

(Action for annulment — Environment — Directive 2003/87/EC — Free allocation of greenhouse gas emission quotas from 2013 — Commission decision determining the product benchmark to be applied for the calculation of the allocation of emission quotas — Fourth paragraph of Article 263 of the TFEU — Lack of individual concern — Regulatory instrument containing implementation measures — Inadmissibility)

(2012/C 217/50)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Europäischer Wirtschaftsverband der Eisen- und Stahlindustrie (Eurofer) ASBL (Luxembourg, Luxembourg) (represented by: S. Altenschmidt and C. Dittrich, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: G. Wilms, K. Herrmann and K. Mifsud-Bonnici, Agents)

Re:

Application for the annulment of Commission Decision 2011/278/EU of 27 April 2011 determining transitional Union-wide rules for harmonised free allocation of emission allowances pursuant to Article 10a of Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ 2011 L 130, p. 1).

Operative part of the order

1. *The action is dismissed as inadmissible.*
2. *There is no need to rule on the application for leave to intervene of Euroalliages.*
3. *Europäischer Wirtschaftsverband der Eisen- und Stahlindustrie (Eurofer) ASBL is ordered to pay the costs, including those relating to the proceedings for interim relief.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 269, 10.9.2011.

Action brought on 16 May 2012 — Al Assad v Council

(Case T-202/12)

(2012/C 217/51)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Bouchra Al Assad (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: G. Karouni, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul Implementing Decision 2012/172/CFSP of 23 March 2012 implementing Decision 2011/782/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria, in so far as it refers to Mrs Bouchra (aka Bushra) Al Assad;
- Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs, in accordance with Articles 87 and 91 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on seven pleas in law, which are for all essential purposes identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-383/11 *Makhlouf v Council*. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2011 C 282, p. 30.

Action brought on 16 May 2012 — Alchaar v Council

(Case T-203/12)

(2012/C 217/52)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Mohamad Nedal Alchaar (Aleppo, Syria) (represented by: A. Korkmaz, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul, as far as those acts concern the applicant:
- Implementing Regulation No 1244/2011 of 1 December 2011;
- Decision No 2011/782/CFSP as amended and supplemented up to now, in particular by implementing Decision No 2012/37/CFSP, Decision 2012/122/CFSP, Implementing Decision 2012/172/CFSP and Decision 2012/206/CFSP;
- Council Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 as amended and supplemented up to now, in particular by Implementing Regulation No 55/2012, Regulation No 168/2012 and Implementing Regulation No 266/2012