Re:

First, application for annulment of Council Decision 2011/522/CFSP of 2 September 2011 amending Decision 2011/273/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria (OJ 2011 L 228, p. 16), of Council Decision 2011/628/CFSP of 23 September 2011 amending Decision 2011/273/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria (OJ 2011 L 247, p. 17), of Council Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 concerning restrictive measures against Syria and repealing Decision 2011/273/CFSP (OJ 2011 L 319, p. 56), of Council Regulation (EU) No 878/2011 of 2 September 2011 amending Regulation (EU) No 442/2011 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria (OJ 2011 L 228, p. 1), and of Council Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria and repealing Regulation (EU) No 442/2011 (OJ 2012 L 16, p. 1), in so far as the applicant is named in the list of persons subject to the restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria, and, second, application for payment of compensation for damage suffered.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- Declares that there is no need to adjudicate on the Commission's application for leave to intervene;
- 2. Dismisses the application;
- 3. Orders Mr Issam Anbouba to bear his own costs.

(1) OJ C 25, 28.1.2012.

Judgment of the General Court of 13 September 2013 — Anbouba v Council

(Case T-592/11) (1)

(Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures against Syria — Freezing of funds and economic resources — Presumption of innocence — Burden of proof — Manifest error of assessment — Rights of defence — Obligation to state reasons)

(2013/C 313/49)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Issam Anbouba (Homs, Syria) (represented by: M.-A. Bastin, J.-M. Salva and J.-N. Louis, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented: initially by R. Liudvinaviciute-Cordeiro and M.-M. Joséphidès, then R. Liudvinaviciute-Cordeiro and A. Vitro, Agents)

Re:

First, application for annulment of Council Decision 2011/684/CFSP of 13 October 2011 amending Decision

2011/273/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Syria (OJ 2011 L 269, p. 33), of Council Decision 2011/782/CFSP of 1 December 2011 concerning restrictive measures against Syria and repealing Decision 2011/273/CFSP (OJ 2011 L 319, p. 56), of Council Regulation (EU) No 1011/2011 of 13 October 2011 amending Regulation (EU) No 442/2011 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria (OJ 2011 L 269, p. 18), of Council Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 of 18 January 2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria and repealing Regulation (EU) No 442/2011 (OJ 2012 L 16, p. 1), and of Council Implementing Regulation No 410/2012 of 14 May 2012 Implementing Article 32(1) of Regulation No 36/2012 (OJ 2012 L 126, p.3) in so far as the applicant is named in the list of persons subject to the restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria, and, second, application for payment of compensation for damage suffered.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Dismisses the application;
- 2. Orders Mr Issam Anbouba to pay his own costs.

(1) OJ C 25, 28.1.2012.

Judgment of the General Court of 16 September 2013 — De Nicola v EIB

(Case T-618/11 P) (1)

(Appeal — Civil service — EIB staff — Appraisal — Promotion — 2008 appraisal and promotion period — Decision of the Appeals Committee — Scope of review — Assessment report — Plea of illegality — Reasonable period — Claim for setting aside — Claim for damages — Lis pendens)

(2013/C 313/50)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Appellant: Carlo De Nicola (Strassen, Luxembourg) (represented by: L. Isola, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: European Investment Bank (EIB) (represented by: initially by T. Gilliams and F. Martin, and subsequently by Gilliams and G. Nuvoli, acting as Agents, and by A. Dal Ferro, lawyer)

Re:

Appeal against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of the European Union (First Chamber) in Case F-13/10 *De Nicola* v *EIB*, not yet published in the ECR, seeking the setting aside of that judgment.