

— order OHIM to pay the costs.

Plea in law

— Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Appeal brought on 5 June 2015 by CW against the judgment of the Civil Service Tribunal of 26 March 2015 in Case F-124/13 CW v Parliament

(Case T-309/15 P)

(2015/C 270/46)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: CW (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by: C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: European Parliament

Form of order sought by the appellant

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- declare the appeal admissible;
- set aside the judgment under appeal;
- annul the contested decision and the decision rejecting the complaint;
- award damages; and
- order the European Parliament to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the appeal, the appellant relies on two pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging that the Civil Service Tribunal distorted evidence and erred in law in finding that, in the decision rejecting the complaint, the appointing authority sought to endorse the substance of the decision refusing assistance.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Civil Service Tribunal distorted evidence and erred in law in considering that the Parliament did not make a manifest error of assessment in its choice of measures and methods for applying Article 24 of the Staff Regulations.

Action brought on 9 June 2015 — Market Watch v OHIM — Glaxo Group (MITOCHRON)

(Case T-312/15)

(2015/C 270/47)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Market Watch Franchise & Consulting, Inc. (Freeport, Bahamas) (represented by: J. Korab, lawyer)

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