

- In that regard, the applicant considers that the procedure carried out by OLAF is vitiated on a number of grounds, given that the inter-partes procedure was not properly conducted in relation to Mr Panzeri, there was no final investigation report and the whole OLAF investigation procedure took place in clear breach of Article 6(5) of Regulation No 1073/1999 since it was opened on 23 November 2009 and only concluded (presumably) in July 2012. Furthermore, OLAF could not have been competent, given the trivial nature of the behaviour attributed to the applicant, with the result that the principle of proportionality has been breached.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 55 TEU, Article 20 TFEU and Article 24(4) TFEU and infringement of the essential procedural requirements laid down in Article 7(1) of Decision 2005/684/EC of the European Parliament (adopting the Statute for Members of the European Parliament).
- The applicant submits that letter No 312998 of 27 July 2012 of the Secretary General of the European Parliament, which contains the only claims actually made against the applicant, was written in English. This is a breach of several provisions of the European Treaties and the Statute for Members of the European Parliament, which are intended to ensure that every citizen of the European Union, including the Members of the European Parliament, has the right to communicate, orally or in writing, with all the institutions of the European Union in his own mother tongue.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the essential procedural requirements laid down in Articles 62 and 68 of the Decision of the Bureau of the European Parliament of 19 May and 9 July 2008; infringement of the essential procedural requirements laid down in Article 14(2) of the Rules on Payment of Expenses and Allowances to Members of the European Parliament (PEAM); non-existence of the decision and complete failure to give reasons.
- In that regard, it should be noted in that the Secretary-General failed to issue (or at least to communicate to Mr Panzeri) the final decision on the basis of which the payment order contested in the present case was issued. This clearly points to a complete failure to give reasons or even to the fact that there was no final decision. The prerequisites for the application of Article 14(2) of the PEAM rules are not met.

Order of the General Court of 25 November 2015 — Missir Mamachi di Lusignano and Others v Commission

(Case T-494/11) ⁽¹⁾

(2016/C 027/94)

Language of the case: Italian

The President of the Third Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ C 331, 12.11.2011.

Order of the General Court of 11 November 2015 — salesforce.com v OHIM (MARKETINGCLOUD)

(Case T-387/14) ⁽¹⁾

(2016/C 027/95)

Language of the case: English

The President of the Second Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 261, 11.8.2014.
