

3. Third plea in law, alleging the distortion of an essential matter in the case file, the CST having considered that the jury did not explain how its decision was different from that of the previous jury, even though the Commission had clearly set out that reasoning, both in its written submissions and at the hearing.

Action brought on 27 March 2015 — Hamcho and Hamcho International v Council

(Case T-153/15)

(2015/C 190/25)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicants: Mohamed Hamcho (Damascus, Syria) and Hamcho International (Damascus) (represented by: A. Boesch, D. Amaudruz and M. Ponsard, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- Order the production of the file in Case T-43/12;
- Reserve the applicants the right to reply and, on this occasion, to produce new documents and to call witnesses;
- Annul, in so far as these measures concern the applicants:
 - Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2015/108 of 26 January 2015;
 - Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) No 2015/117 of 26 January 2015;
- Order the Council to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants rely on two pleas in law which are in essence identical or similar to those raised in Case T-653/11 *Jaber v Council* ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2012, C 58, p. 12.

Action brought on 27 March 2015 — Jaber v Council

(Case T-154/15)

(2015/C 190/26)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Aiman Jaber (Lattakia, Syria) (represented by: A. Boesch, D. Amaudruz and M. Ponsard, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Order the production of the file in Case T-653/11;
- Reserve the applicant the right to reply and, on this occasion, to produce new documents and to call witnesses;