

*Proprietor of the mark or sign cited in the opposition proceedings:* Ferdinand Richter GmbH

*Mark or sign cited in opposition:* the word mark 'RICHTER', the figurative mark 'RICHTER edition' and the non-registered mark 'Richter' used in the course of trade in Austria

*Decision of the Opposition Division:* the opposition was upheld in part

*Decision of the Board of Appeal:* the appeal was dismissed

*Pleas in law:* Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009

**Action brought on 14 August 2013 — Brouillard v Court of Justice**

(Case T-420/13)

(2013/C 325/57)

*Language of the case:* French

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Alain Laurent Brouillard (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by: J.-M. Gouazé, lawyer)

*Defendant:* Court of Justice of the European Union

**Form of order sought**

The applicant requests the General Court to:

— annul the decision of 5 June 2013 of the Court of Justice of the European Union — Directorate-General for Translation — concerning contract 2013/S 047-075037, eliminating Mr Brouillard from the lot for translation into French;

— order the defendant to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

By this action, the applicant seeks annulment of the decision to invite the candidate selected to tender in the context of a negotiated tender procedure relating to the conclusion of framework contracts for the translation of legal texts from certain official languages of the European Union into French (OJ 2013/S 47-075037) to submit a tender in which it is confirmed that the applicant will not be engaged in providing the services concerned on the ground that the applicant does not fulfil the full legal education requirement.

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law:

1. The first plea in law, alleging lack of competence of the authority which adopted the contested act.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of Directives 2000/78/EC <sup>(1)</sup> and 2005/36/EC, <sup>(2)</sup> and the case-law of the Court of Justice.
3. Third plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment concerning the applicant's academic and professional qualifications.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation (OJ 2000 L 303, p. 16).

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications (OJ 2005 L 255, p. 22).

**Action brought on 14 August 2013 — CPME and Others v Council**

(Case T-422/13)

(2013/C 325/58)

*Language of the case:* English

**Parties**

*Applicants:* Committee of Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Manufacturers in Europe (CPME) (Brussels, Belgium); Artenius España, SL (El Prat del Llobregat, Spain); Cepsa Quimica, SA (Madrid, Spain); Equipolymers Srl (Milan, Italy); Indorama Ventures Poland sp. z o.o. (Włocławek, Poland); Lotte Chemical UK Ltd (Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom); M&G Polimeri Italia SpA (Patrica, Italy); Novapet, SA (Zaragoza, Spain); Ottana Polimeri Srl (Ottana, Italy); UAB Indorama Polymers Europe (Klaipėda, Lithuania); UAB Neo Group (Rimkai, Lithuania); and UAB Orion Global pet (Klaipėda) (represented by: L. Ruessmann, lawyer, and J. Beck, Solicitor)

*Defendant:* Council of the European Union

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- Declare the application admissible and well-founded;
- Annul Council Implementing Decision 2013/226/EU <sup>(1)</sup>;