

GENERAL COURT

Order of the General Court of 18 July 2016 — Bank Mellat v Council

(Case T-72/12) ⁽¹⁾

(Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures against Iran with the aim of preventing nuclear proliferation — Freezing of funds — Annulment of the contested acts — No need to adjudicate)

(2016/C 343/51)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Bank Mellat (Tehran (Iran)) (represented by: S. Zaiwalla, P. Reddy, F. Zaiwalla, Z. Burbeza, Solicitors, M. Brindle QC, and R. Blakeley, Barrister)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: M. Bishop and I. Rodios, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application pursuant to Article 263 TFEU seeking annulment of Council Decision 2011/783/CFSP of 1 December 2011 amending Decision 2010/413/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2011 L 319, p. 71), Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1245/2011 of 1 December 2011 implementing Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 on restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2011 L 319, p. 11), and Council Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 of 23 March 2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 (OJ 2012 L 88, p. 1), in so far as the applicant's name was maintained on the list of persons and entities to whom those restrictive measures apply.

Operative part of the order

1. There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the action.
2. There is no need to adjudicate on the application to intervene made by Provincial Investment Companies Association, Saba Tamin Investment Company, Common Investment Fund (Pars Fund), Shirin Asal Food Industrial Group, Sorbon Industrial Production Group and Individual Stock Association.
3. Bank Mellat, the Council of the European Union, Provincial Investment Companies Association, Saba Tamin Investment Company, Common Investment Fund (Pars Fund), Shirin Asal Food Industrial Group, Sorbon Industrial Production Group and Individual Stock Association shall each bear their own costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 109, 14.4.2012.

Action brought on 8 July 2016 — Portigon v SRB

(Case T-365/16)

(2016/C 343/52)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Portigon AG (Düsseldorf, Germany) (represented by: D. Bliesener and V. Jungkind, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board (SRB)