

*Defendant:* European Commission (represented by: T. Maxian Rusche and R. Sauer, acting as Agents, and by C. von Donat and G. Quardt, lawyers)

**Re:**

Application to annul in part Commission decision C (2013) 4424 final of 18 December 2013 to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU regarding measures implemented by the Federal Republic of Germany in favour of renewable electricity and of energy-intensive users (State aid SA.33995 (2013/C) (ex 2013/NN)).

**Operative part of the order**

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the present action.*
2. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the application for intervention submitted by the EFTA Surveillance Authority.*
3. *Advansa GmbH, Akzo Nobel Industrial Chemicals GmbH, Aurubis AG, Cabb GmbH, CBW Chemie GmbH Bitterfeld-Wolfen, CFB Chemische Fabrik Brunsbüttel GmbH & Co. KG, Clariant Produkte (Deutschland) GmbH, Dow Olefinverbund GmbH, Dow Deutschland Anlagengesellschaft mbH, Dralon GmbH, Ems-Chemie (Neumünster) GmbH & Co. KG, Hahl Filaments GmbH, ISP Marl GmbH, Messer Produktionsgesellschaft mbH Siegen, Messer Produktionsgesellschaft mbH Salzgitter, Nabaltec AG, Siltronic AG, Trevira GmbH, Wacker Chemie AG and Westfalen Industriegase GmbH shall bear their own costs and those incurred by the European Commission.*
4. *The EFTA Surveillance Authority shall bear its own costs.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 223, 14.7.2014.

---

**Order of the General Court of 9 June 2015 — Vinnolit v Commission**

(Case T-318/14) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(State aid — Measures adopted by Germany in favour of electricity generated from renewable energy sources and of energy-intensive undertakings — Decision to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU — Adoption of the final decision after the action was brought — No need to adjudicate)*

(2015/C 294/82)

Language of the case: German

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Vinnolit GmbH & Co. KG (Ismaning, Germany) (represented by: M. Geipel, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission (represented by: T. Maxian Rusche and R. Sauer, acting as Agents, and by H. Wollmann, lawyer)

**Re:**

Application to annul in part Commission decision C (2013) 4424 final of 18 December 2013 to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU regarding measures implemented by the Federal Republic of Germany in favour of renewable electricity and of energy-intensive users (State aid SA.33995 (2013/C) (ex 2013/NN)).

**Operative part of the order**

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the present action.*
2. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the application for intervention submitted by the EFTA Surveillance Authority.*
3. *Vinnolit GmbH & Co. KG shall bear its own costs and those incurred by the European Commission.*
4. *The EFTA Surveillance Authority shall bear its own costs.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 223, 14.7.2014.

---

**Action brought on 1 April 2015 — Brinkmann (Steel Trading) a.o. v Commission and ECB****(Case T-161/15)**

(2015/C 294/83)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

*Applicants:* Brinkmann (Steel Trading) Ltd (London, United Kingdom); Dalmar investments Ltd (Tortola, British Virgin Islands); Darlows Consultants Ltd (Nassau, Bahamas); Forestborne Ltd (Tortola); International Corporate Management Company SA (Luxembourg, Luxembourg); Kraxis Investments Ltd (Nicosia, Cyprus); Magnamox Management Ltd (Nicosia); Megamatic Technologies Ltd (Nicosia); Windward Yachting Ltd (Sliema, Malta); Chupit Ltd (Nicosia); Coburg Investments (Overseas) Ltd (Nicosia); First Trade International Ltd (Tortola); Fitinvest Ltd (Limassol, Cyprus); Halman Consultants (Overseas) Ltd (Tortola); Lintan Investments Ltd (Lanarca, Cyprus); Minnesota Trading Ltd (Nicosia); Protoconsult Ltd (Nicosia); Transcoal Trading Ltd (Nicosia); and Veft Management Ltd (Nicosia) (represented by: R. Nowinski, Barrister)

*Defendant:* European Commission and European Central Bank

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- order the European Union to make good the damage suffered by the Applicants as a result of the adoption and application of the Memorandum of Understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality in the amounts as stated in the application or such amount as the Court finds to be due to the Applicants;
- order the European Union to legal costs incurred in the bringing of this Application.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicants rely on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging a violation of Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 21(2) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in that the Commission and the ECB acted unlawfully in that they discriminated against Cyprus, and thereby, directly discriminated against depositors in Cyprus banks;
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission and the ECB acted unlawfully in that they violated the depositors' right to protection of property as guaranteed under the Charter of Fundamental Rights; and