

Appeal brought on 31 December 2014 by Carlo de Nicola against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 11 November 2014 in Case F-55/08 RENV De Nicola v EIB

(Case T-848/14 P)

(2015/C 073/56)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Appellant: Carlo de Nicola (Strassen, Luxembourg) (represented by: L. Isola, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: European Investment Bank

Form of order sought by the appellant

The appellant claims that the Court should: uphold the present appeal and, reversing the judgment under appeal in part, delete the reference to Article 270 TFEU, set aside points 2 and 3 of the operative part, and set aside paragraphs 16 to 19, 22, 37, 41, 42, 45, 47 to 49, 51, and 53 to 66 of that judgment; refer the case to a different Chamber, sitting in a different formation, of the Civil Service Tribunal so that, following the adoption of the requested measures of inquiry, a fresh decision may be made regarding the paragraphs set aside; make any measure of inquiry, direct and/or otherwise, which may be necessary with regard to the EIB's defence and the production of any other documents held to be useful for refuting the arguments raised therein; order the EIB to pay the costs.

Grounds of appeal and main arguments

The present appeal is brought against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 11 November 2014 in Case F-55/08 RENV *De Nicola v EIB*.

The appellant raises the following grounds in support of his appeal.

1. Failure to give a ruling on the request for deletion of the EIB's observations and documents;
2. Failure to give a ruling on the exclusion of the president of the formation of the court;
3. Incorrect interpretation of the judgment in Case T-37/10 P;
4. Failure to provide a statement of reasons or provision of an incorrect statement of reasons with regard to the psychological harassment; the appellant asks the Court to order the defendant to cease that harassment;
5. Need for the Appeals Committee to give its ruling on the merits as regards the 2006 Staff Report;
6. Existence of an interest in the ruling on the annulment of the promotions of 2007, so as to prevent them from becoming definitive.