

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: G. Schneider and D. Botis, acting as Agents)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM intervening before the General Court: Vinotasia GmbH (Coblenz, Germany) (represented by: M. Gail, lawyer)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 14 January 2010 (Case R 1054/2008-4) concerning opposition proceedings between Vinotasia GmbH and Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to rule on the action.*
2. *Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG and Vinotasia GmbH shall bear their own costs and each pay half of those incurred by the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM).*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 134, 22.5.2015.

Order of the General Court of 29 October 2015 — Hipp v OHIM — Nestlé Nutrition (Praebiotik)
(Case T-315/14) ⁽¹⁾
(Community trade mark — Application for revocation — Withdrawal of the registration — No need to adjudicate)
(2015/C 429/31)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Hipp & Co. (Sachseln, Switzerland) (represented by: M. Kinkeldey, A. Wagner and B. Brandstätter, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: D. Walicka, acting as Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM intervening before the General Court: Nestlé Nutrition GmbH (Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany) (represented by: A. Schulz and C. Onken, lawyers)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 26 February 2014 (Cases R 1171/2012-4 and R 1326/2012-4) concerning revocation proceedings between Nestlé Nutrition GmbH and Hipp & Co.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate in the action.*
2. *Hipp & Co. and Nestlé Nutrition GmbH shall each bear their own costs and half of the costs incurred by the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM).*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 212, 7.7.2014.

Order of the General Court of 27 October 2015 — Belgium v Commission

(Case T-721/14) ⁽¹⁾

(Action for annulment — Online gambling services — Protection of consumers and players and prevention of minors from gambling online — Commission Recommendation — Act not subject to review — Inadmissibility)

(2015/C 429/32)

Language of the case: Dutch

Parties

Applicant: Kingdom of Belgium (represented by: L. Van den Broeck and M. Jacobs, acting as Agents, and P. Vlaemminck and B. Van Vooren, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: H. Tserepa-Lacombe and F. Wilman, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application for annulment of Commission Recommendation 2014/478/EU of 14 July 2014 on principles for the protection of consumers and players of online gambling services and for the prevention of minors from gambling online (OJ 2014 L 214, p. 38).

Operative part of the order

1. *The action is dismissed as inadmissible.*
2. *There is no need to adjudicate on the applications for leave to intervene made by the Hellenic Republic and the Portuguese Republic.*
3. *The Kingdom of Belgium shall bear its own costs and pay those incurred by the European Commission.*
4. *The Kingdom of Belgium, the Hellenic Republic, the Portuguese Republic and the European Commission shall each bear their own costs of the applications for leave to intervene.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 431, 1.12.2014.