

- Second part, alleging that the EWS decision is unlawful in that it infringes the principle of legal certainty as regards the conditions relating to Warning ‘W3b’;
 - Third part, alleging that the EWS decision is unlawful in that it stems from infringements of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, of the principle of sound administration, of the rights of the defence and of the fundamental right to be heard, and from a failure to comply with the duty to provide a statement of reasons;
 - Fourth part, relied on in the alternative, alleging that the Commission infringed the EWS decision, failed to comply with the duty to provide a statement of reasons enshrined in Article 41 of the Charter and with the duty of diligence, and infringed the principle of proportionality;
 - Fifth part, alleging that the Commission’s reason for refusing to give its agreement is irregular, in so far as it disregards the tender specifications.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the applicant has suffered damage and that there is a causal link between the Commission’s wrongful conduct and that damage.

Order of the General Court of 6 June 2016 — Miejskie Przedsiębiorstwo Energetyki Ciepłej v ECHA

(Case T-560/12) ⁽¹⁾

(2016/C 270/72)

Language of the case: Polish

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 79, 16.3.2013.

Order of the General Court of 1 June 2016 — Laboratoire Nuxe v EUIPO — NYX, Los Angeles (NYX)

(Case T-537/14) ⁽¹⁾

(2016/C 270/73)

Language of the case: English

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 329, 22.9.2014.

Order of the General Court of 31 May 2016 — Laboratorios Thea v EUIPO — Sebapharma (Sebacur)

(Case T-84/15) ⁽¹⁾

(2016/C 270/74)

Language of the case: English

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 118, 13.4.2015.
