

— Order the Commission to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The present action has been brought against the European Commission's decision of 19 March 2014 rejecting the request for initiation of a withdrawal procedure in respect of the preferential tariff arrangements granted to India, Pakistan and Ethiopia with regard to the raw hides and semi-manufactured leather goods referred to in Sections S-8a, S-8b and S-12a of [the GSP Sections, as set out in Annex V to] Regulation (EU) No 978/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 applying a scheme of generalised tariff preferences and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 732/2008 (OJ 2012 L 303, p. 1).

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 296 TFEU and of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

— The applicant claims, in this regard, that the contested decision does not comply with the obligation, as interpreted by the case-law of the Court of Justice, to provide a clear, precise and unequivocal statement of reasons.

2. Second plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment.

— The applicant claims, in this regard, that there has been a manifest error of assessment regarding (i) whether the temporary withdrawal of preferential arrangements is a sufficient response to the raw material supply problem and (ii) the existence of preconditions for the temporary withdrawal, pursuant to Article 19(1)(d) of Regulation No 978/2012, of the general preferential arrangements granted to India, Ethiopia and Pakistan.

3. Third plea in law, alleging failure to respect the right to good administration as described in Article 41(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

— The applicant claims, in this regard, that there has been a failure to verify whether the conditions listed in Article 19(1)(d) of Regulation No 978/2012 for initiating the procedure for withdrawing generalised tariff preferences have been satisfied.

Appeal brought on 19 May 2014 by CR against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 12 March 2014 in Case F-128/12, CR v Parliament

(Case T-342/14 P)

(2014/C 212/54)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: CR (Malling, France) (represented by A. Salerno, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: European Parliament and Council of the European Union

Form of order sought by the appellant

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- set aside the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 12 March 2014;
- itself settle the dispute between the appellant and the European Parliament, by annulling the decision which the appellant challenged before the Civil Service Tribunal, in so far as that decision requires him to reimburse all the sums which he unlawfully received in respect of family allowances; or
- in the alternative, refer the case back to the Civil Service Tribunal;
- order the European Parliament to pay all the costs of both sets of proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The appellant contests the rejection of the objection of illegality brought against the last sentence of the second paragraph of Article 85 of the Staff Regulations of Officials. In support of the appeal, the appellant relies on two pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of legal certainty.

2. Second plea in law, alleging a failure to respond to the appellant's arguments as regards the disproportionate nature of the absence of any limitation period should the appointing authority be able to establish that the person concerned deliberately misled the administration with a view to obtaining payment of the sum in question.

Action brought on 23 May 2014 — Italy v Commission

(Case T-353/14)

(2014/C 212/55)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Applicant: Italian Republic (represented by: P. Gentili, avvocato dello Stato, and G. Palmieri, Agent)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the notice of open competition EPSO/AD/276/14 Administrators (AD 5) for drawing up a reserve list of 137 candidates to fill vacant posts for Administrators (AD 5), published in volume C 74 A of the *Official Journal of the European Union* on 13 March 2014;
- Order the Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments raised are those set out in Case T-275/13 *Italy v Commission* (OJ 2014 C 74 A, p. 4).
