

Appeal brought on 16 July 2014 by Desislava Kolarova against the order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 30 April 2014 in Case F-88/13, Kolarova v REA

(Case T-533/14 P)

(2014/C 351/14)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: Desislava Kolarova (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by F. Frabetti, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: Research Executive Agency (REA)

Form of order sought by the appellant

- Set aside the order of the Civil Service Tribunal (Third Chamber) of 30 April 2014 in Case F-88/13 Ms *Desislava Kolarova v Research Executive Agency*, seeking the annulment of the decision of PMO.1, served on 28 November 2012, by which the appellants application of 20 July 2012 concerning the treatment of her mother, Ms Anna Borisova Petrova, as a person to be treated as a dependent child under Article 2(4) of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations for the period from 1 November 2012 to 31 October 2013;
- Declare the action of 17 September 2013 admissible and uphold the claims of the appellant made at first instance;
- Consequently, refer the case back to the Civil Service Tribunal;
- Rule on costs and order REA and/or the Commission to pay the costs.

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 breach of the law and a restriction of the rights of the defence of the appellant, since the Civil Service Tribunal (CST) wrongly considered that it had insufficient information from the documents produced by the parties and, in consequence, took the view that the oral procedure should not be opened.
2. Second plea in law, alleging an error of law, since the CST wrongly considered that the appellant's argument that an agreement such as the service agreement 'does not remove the responsibility from the proxy holder', manifestly failing to taking account of the wording of Article 2(2) and Article 91a of the Staff Regulations.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the appellant's right to effective access to the courts.

Action brought on 16 July 2014 — Murnauer Markenvertrieb v OHIM — Bach Flower Remedies (MURNAUERS Bachblüten)

(Case T-534/14)

(2014/C 351/15)

Language in which the application was lodged: German

Parties

Applicant: Murnauer Markenvertrieb GmbH (Egelsbach, Germany) (represented by: F. Traub and H. Daniel, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Bach Flower Remedies Ltd (London, United Kingdom)