Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: M. Rajh and J. Crespo Carrillo, acting as Agents)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM, intervening before the General Court: Belron Hungary Kft — Zug Branch (Zug, Switzerland) (represented by: L. Christy, lawyer)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of OHIM of 3 April 2013 (Case R 206/2012-2) concerning opposition proceedings between Belron Hungary Kft — Zug Branch and Junited Autoglas Deutschland GmbH & Co. KG.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1) Dismisses the action;
- 2) Orders Junited Autoglas Deutschland GmbH & Co. KG to pay the costs.
- (1) OJ C 215, 27.7.2013.

Judgment of the General Court of 16 October 2014 — Federación Española de Hostelería v EACEA (Case T-340/13) (¹)

(Action for annulment — Lifelong learning programme — Contract concerning the 'Virtual simulator for language training for tourism professionals (e-client)' — Pre-information letter — Contractual nature of dispute — Act not subject to appeal — No reclassification of contract)

(2014/C 421/52)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Federación Española de Hostelería (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: B. Miguelsanz Roldán, F.J. del Nogal Méndez, R. Fernández Flores and M.P. Abad Marco, lawyers)

Defendant: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) (represented by: H. Monet and A. Jaume, Agents, assisted initially by J.L. Buendía Sierra, N. Ruiz García and A. Balcells Cartagena, then, J.L. Buendía Sierra and A. Balcells Cartagena, lawyers)

Re:

Application for annulment of the EACEA's pre-information letter of 5 April 2013 informing the applicant that it had to reimburse EUR 181 686,11 following the audit of the 'Virtual simulator for language training for tourism professionals (eclient)'.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Dismisses the action as inadmissible;
- 2. Orders the Federación Española de Hostelería to pay the costs.
- (¹) OJ C 245, 24.8.2013.