

Action brought on 24 June 2014 — Holistic Innovation Institute v Commission**(Case T-468/14)**

(2014/C 292/61)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

Applicant: Holistic Innovation Institute, SLU (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: R. Muñiz García, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should annul the decision to exclude the applicant from the eDIGIREGION project, order the applicant to be indemnified for the losses suffered, order the defendant to pay the sum of EUR 3 055 000, or in the alternative the amount determined by the judicial expert, together with the interest accruing in accordance with the expert's report, and expressly order that this be paid by the defendant.

Pleas in law and main arguments

This action has been brought against the decision to refuse to allow the applicant — an undertaking engaged principally in telecommunications, R&D and consultancy services in telecommunications, research and innovation — to participate in the European eDIGIREGION project under the Seventh Framework Programme.

In this regard, the applicant states that it has participated in developing the proposal for the eDIGIREGION project since its creation, in close connection with other entities and held a number of meetings in Brussels and several audio conferences between July 2011 and January 2012, resulting in the formation of a European Consortium which submitted a proposal for an eDIGIREGION project (Realizing the Digital Agenda through Transnational Cooperation between Regions). The applicant is partner number 5 of the Consortium with a budget of EUR 491 400.00 and a contribution from the Commission of EUR 438 165,00. (14,61 % of the total requested).

In support of its action, the applicant claims that the arguments put forward by the European Commission are totally unjustified, as they infringe the main requirement necessary if the latter is to be able to decide to suspend the participation of an undertaking in a project which has been positively appraised; the arguments must be clear, unequivocal and properly substantiated.

Specifically, the applicant states that it is technically and operationally prepared to participate in the eDIGIREGION Consortium, it has sufficient financial capacity to take on its share of the co-financing, and it has sufficient experience in the management and administration of projects.

In this respect, the applicant considers that there is a manifest inconsistency between what the Director General signed in the text of the letter giving notice of the suspension of the participation in the project and the arguments set out in the Annex to that letter.

Action brought on 24 June 2014 — Hewlett Packard Development Company v. OHIM (ELITEPAD)**(Case T-470/14)**

(2014/C 292/62)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

Applicant: Hewlett Packard Development Company LP (Houston, United States) (represented by: T. Raab and H. Lauf, lawyers)