

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: F. Dintilhac and A. Steiblyté, Agents)

Re:

Application for annulment of the decision allegedly contained in the Commission's letter of 18 November 2011, mentioning as its subject: 'Closure of the program "Atlantic Area" 2000-2006, Approval of the Final Report, CCI: 2001 RG 16 OPC 006'.

Operative part of the order

1. *The action is dismissed as inadmissible.*
2. *The Région Poitou-Charentes shall bear its own costs and pay those incurred by the European Commission.*

(¹) OJ C 109, 14.4.2012.

Order of the General Court of 8 October 2012 — ClientEarth v Council

(Case T-62/12) (¹)

(Action for annulment — Access to documents — Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 — Opinion issued by the legal service of the Council concerning a draft regulation of the Parliament and of the Council related to public access to the documents of the Parliament, of the Council and of the Commission — Confirmation of a refusal to grant full access — Inadmissibility — Period allowed for commencing proceedings — Notion of measure open to challenge for the purposes of Article 263 TFEU — Confirmatory measure)

(2012/C 366/70)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: ClientEarth (London, United Kingdom) (represented by: O. Brouwer and P. van den Berg, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: B. Driessen and C. Fekete, Agents)

Re:

Annulment of the Council's decision of 1 December 2011 confirming the decision to refuse the applicant full access to an opinion issued by the legal service of the Council (Document No 6865/09) concerning a draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (OJ 2001 L 145, p. 43).

Operative part of the order

1. *The action is dismissed as inadmissible.*
2. *There is no need to adjudicate on the applications for leave to intervene of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden.*

3. *ClientEarth is ordered to pay the costs.*

(¹) OJ C 109, 14.4.2012.

Order of the General Court of 11 October 2012 — EDF v Commission

(Case T-389/12 R)

(Application for interim measures — Competition — Concentrations — Electricity market — Decision authorising a concentration operation subject to compliance with certain commitments — Refusal to grant the postponement of the deadline set for fulfilling those commitments — Application for interim measures — Lack of urgency)

(2012/C 366/71)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Électricité de France (EDF) (Paris (France)) (represented by: A. Creus Carreras and A. Valiente Martin, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: C. Giolito and S. Noë, Agents)

Re:

Application for interim measures in relation to Commission Decision C(2012) 4617 final of 28 June 2012 refusing to grant the applicant the postponement of the deadline fixed for fulfilling some of its commitments set out in Decision C(2009) 9059 of 12 November 2009, which authorises the concentration operation whereby Électricité de France was to acquire exclusive control of the assets of Segebel (Case COMP/M.5549 — EDF/Segebel).

Operative part of the order

1. *The application for interim measures is dismissed.*
2. *Costs are reserved.*

Action brought on 14 August 2012 — Capitalizaciones Mercantiles v OHIM — Leineweber (X)

(Case T-378/12)

(2012/C 366/72)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Capitalizaciones Mercantiles Ltda (Bogota, Colombia) (represented by: J. Devaureix, and L. Montoya Terán, lawyers)

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