

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- order the defendants to pay the applicants the sums shown in the Schedule annexed to the application plus interest accruing from 16 March 2013 until the judgment of the Court;
- order the defendants to pay the costs.

In the alternative, by way of subsidiary claim, the applicants claim that the Court should:

- find that the European Union and/or the defendant institutions have incurred non-contractual liability;
- determine the procedure to be followed in order to establish the recoverable loss actually suffered by the applicants;
- order the defendants to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The applicants (48 in total) are depositors and/or shareholders and/or bondholders of the Bank of Cyprus Public Company Ltd and/or Cyprus Popular Bank Public Co. Ltd. They seek compensation pursuant to Articles 268, 340(2) and 340(3) TFEU, governing the extra-contractual liability of the EU, for the loss that they have suffered as a result of the measures taken by the defendant institutions imposing a bail-in scheme on the Republic of Cyprus.

The applicants consider that the defendant institutions adopted a bail-in scheme for the Republic of Cyprus which led directly to the loss of their deposits and shareholdings. In the view of the applicants, the bail-in measures adopted by the Republic of Cyprus were introduced solely in order to implement measures adopted by the defendants and were also approved by the defendant institutions.

The applicants consider that the bail-in scheme violates the right to property, as protected by Article 17(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU and Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms. The applicants also argue that the bail-in scheme infringes the principle of proportionality, the principle of protection of legitimate expectations, and the principle of non-discrimination.

Action brought on 8 December 2014 — Unilever v OHIM — Technopharma (Fair & Lovely)

(Case T-811/14)

(2015/C 073/53)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Unilever NV (Rotterdam, Netherlands) (represented by: A. Fox, Solicitor)

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

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

Details of the proceedings before OHIM

Applicant: Applicant

Trade mark at issue: Community figurative mark containing the word elements 'Fair & Lovely' — Application for registration No 4 045 092

Procedure before OHIM: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 6 October 2014 in Case R 1004/2013-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision and grant a suspension of the proceedings in Case R 1004/2013-4 pending determination of the national cancellation actions against the prior national registrations and application relied on by Technopharma Ltd. in Spain, Germany, France, the Benelux and the United Kingdom;
- order OHIM and any intervener to pay the costs.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Articles 64(1) and 75 of Regulation No 207/2009;
- Infringement of Rules 20(7)(c) and 50(1) of Regulation No 2868/95.

Action brought on 24 December 2014 — Alfamicro v Commission

(Case T-831/14)

(2015/C 073/54)

Language of the case: Portuguese

Parties

Applicant: Alfamicro — Sistemas de Computadores, Sociedade Unipessoal, Lda (Cascais, Portugal) (represented by: G. Gentil Anastácio and D. Pirra Xarepe, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- Annul the Commission's decision of 28 October 2014, adopted in the context of the implementation of Financial Audit 12-DAS-03, concerning Grant Agreement No 238882, with all legal consequences arising therefrom, in particular annulling the debit note included in it, for the amount of EUR 467 131, and issuing credit for the same amount in favour of the applicant.