

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).
