2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of sound administration, of the obligation to state reasons and of the duty to have regard for the interests of officials.

Action brought on 15 September 2016 — Camerin v Parliament

(Case T-647/16)

(2016/C 410/32)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Laure Camerin (Etterbeek, Belgium) (represented by: M. Casado García-Hirschfeld, lawyer)

Defendant: European Parliament

Form of order sought

- Declare the application admissible;
- Annul the contested decision;
- Annul, if necessary, the rejection decision;
- Order the defendant to pay all the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action brought against the decision taken on 1 December 2015 by the Secretary General of the S&D Group in the European Parliament, refusing to extend the applicant's service beyond the age of 65 years until 31 December 2016 (the contested decision), the applicant relies on a single plea in law, divided into two parts.

- First part, alleging infringement of Article 52 of the Staff Regulations of Officials, a manifest error of assessment and infringement of the principle of sound administration.
- Second part, alleging infringement of the sixth paragraph of Article 1 of Annex II to the Staff Regulations of Officials.

Action brought on 14 September 2016 — Crocs v EUIPO — Gifi Diffusion (Footwear) (Case T-651/16)

(2016/C 410/33)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Crocs, Inc. (Niwot, Colorado, United States) (represented by: J. Guise, D. Knight, L. Cassidy, H. Seymour, Solicitors, M. Berger, N. Hadjadj Cazier, H. Haouideg, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Gifi Diffusion (Villeneuve-sur-Lot, France)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the design at issue: Applicant

Design at issue: Community design 'Footwear' — Community design No 257 001-0001

Contested decision: Decision of the Third Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 06/06/2016 in Case R 853/2014-3