

— order the Commission to pay the costs of these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are those put forward in Case T-700/13 *Bankia v Commission*.

Action brought on 2 January 2014 — Anudal Industrial v Commission

(Case T-3/14)

(2014/C 52/96)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Anudal Industrial, SL (Badalona, Spain) (represented by: J. García Muñoz, J. Jiménez-Blanco and J. Corral García, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul Articles 1 to 6 of the Decision;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the Decision in so far as it orders recovery of the aid; and
- order the Commission to pay all the costs arising from these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The decision contested in the present proceedings is the same as that contested in Case T-515/13 *Spain v Commission*.

In support of its action, the applicant relies on five pleas in law.

1. The contested decision is vitiated by breach of essential procedural requirements and infringement of Articles 20, 21 and 41(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in that it was adopted following an investigation procedure in which there were substantial irregularities.
2. Error of law: infringement of Articles 107 TFEU and 108 TFEU, inasmuch as the Commission found that the measures covered by the present proceedings constitute State aid, without establishing that they were selective.
3. Error of law: infringement of Articles 107 TFEU and 108 TFEU, inasmuch as the Commission found that the measures covered by the present proceedings constitute State aid, without establishing that they affect Community trade.

4. Error of law: infringement of Article 107(1) TFEU and failure to state reasons, inasmuch as the Commission found that there was State aid and categorised the Economic Interest Groupings and their investors as beneficiaries, in circumstances in which the aid neither confers competitive advantages on those parties nor affects trade between Member States in their respective sectors.

5. Error of law in ordering recovery of the alleged aid in breach of the principles of legal certainty, protection of legitimate expectations and equal treatment, as well as of Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 659/1999.

Action brought on 2 January 2014 — Industrias Ponsa v Commission

(Case T-4/14)

(2014/C 52/97)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Industrias Ponsa, SA (Manresa-Barcelona, Spain) (represented by: J. García Muñoz, J. Jiménez-Blanco and J. Corral García, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul Articles 1 to 6 of the Decision;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the Decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the aid; and
- order the Commission to pay all the costs arising from these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are those put forward in Case T-3/14 *Anudal Industrial v Commission*.

Action brought on 2 January 2014 — Anudal v Commission

(Case T-5/14)

(2014/C 52/98)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Anudal, SL (Badalona, Spain) (represented by: J. García Muñoz, J. Jiménez-Blanco and J. Corral García, lawyers)