

Action brought on 31 December 2013 — Mikhalchanka v Council**(Case T-693/13)**

(2014/C 93/42)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Aliaksei Mikhalchanka (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: M. Michaluskas, lawyer)*Defendant:* Council of the European Union**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul Council Decision 2013/534/CFSP of 29 October 2013 amending Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- annul Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1054/2013 of 29 October 2013 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- order the Council to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the rights of defence, since the prior inter partes procedure was not respected by the Council.
2. Second plea in law, alleging insufficient reasoning, since the reasons for the measures do not allow the applicant to contest their validity before the General Court and the latter to exercise its review of their lawfulness.
3. Third plea in law, alleging an error of assessment, in so far as the contested measure lacks all factual justification.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality in particular with regard to the restriction on entry into, and transit through, the territory of the European Union.

Action brought on 31 December 2013 — Ipatau v Council**(Case T-694/13)**

(2014/C 93/43)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Vadzim Ipatau (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: M. Michaluskas, lawyer)*Defendant:* Council of the European Union**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul Council Decision 2013/534/CFSP of 29 October 2013 amending Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- annul Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1054/2013 of 29 October 2013 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- order the Council to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main argumentsIn support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law, which are, in essence, identical or similar to those relied on in the context of Case T-693/13 *Mikhalchanka v Council*.**Action brought on 27 December 2013 — Kinnarps v OHIM (MAKING LIFE BETTER AT WORK)****(Case T-697/13)**

(2014/C 93/44)

*Language in which the application was lodged: Swedish***Parties***Applicant:* Kinnarps AB (Falköping, Sweden) (represented by: M. Wahlin, lawyer)*Defendant:* Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)