

Appeal brought on 15 April 2014 by the European Medicines Agency against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 5 February 2014 in Case F-29/13 Drakeford v EMA

(Case T-231/14 P)

(2014/C 202/34)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: European Medicines Agency (EMA) (represented by T. Jabłoński and N. Rampal Olmedo, acting as Agents, and by D. Waelbroeck and A. Duron, lawyers)

Other party to the proceedings: David Drakeford (Dublin, Ireland)

Form of order sought by the appellant

- Set aside the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal in Case F-29/13 in so far as it annuls the decision of the EMA not to renew the respondent's contract;
- grant the form of order sought at first instance by the appellant: to dismiss the action as entirely unfounded;
- order the respondent to pay the costs of these appeal proceedings and of the proceedings before the Civil Service Tribunal.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the appeal, the appellant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging errors of law by the Civil Service Tribunal with regard to the interpretation of the first paragraph of Article 8 of the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union, in so far as it held that the words 'any further renewal' should be interpreted as referring to any process that leads to temporary staff, within the meaning of Article 2(a) of the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union, at the end of their engagement for a fixed period, continuing, in that capacity, their employment relationship with their employer, even if such renewal is accompanied by grade progression or a change in the duties performed.
 2. Second plea in law, alleging error of law by the Civil Service Tribunal as regards the stating of the exception to the interpretation of the first paragraph of Article 8 of the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union.
 3. Third plea in law, alleging error of law on the part of the Civil Service Tribunal in so far as it used its unlimited jurisdiction.
-