

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul EIGE's implicit decision of 26 August 2016, rejecting the applicant's request dated 26 April 2016 for a second renewal of his contract of employment;
- annul also, in so far as necessary, EIGE's decision of 20 January 2017, notified to the applicant on 23 January 2017, rejecting the applicant's complaint lodged on 3 October 2016 against EIGE's implicit decision;
- compensate the applicant for the material and moral prejudice suffered;
- reimburse all the costs incurred in the present appeal.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging violation of the duty to state reasons and accordingly of the principle of good administration.
 - The defendant failed to provide the applicant with a reasoned decision on the substance of the request and subsequent complaint. This total lack of statement of reasons infringes the duty to state reasons and the principle of good administration.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 8 of the Conditions of Employment of other servants of the EU and of EIGE Decision No 82 of 28 July 2014 on contract renewal/non-renewal procedure applicable to temporary and contract agents ('Decision 82').
 - The defendant failed properly to exercise the discretionary powers granted to it under the above provisions and did not carry out a full or detailed examination of all the relevant facts of the case.
3. Third plea in law, alleging procedural irregularities including the violation of the internal procedural rules set out in Decision 82, the breach of the rights of defence, the right to be heard, the principle of good administration and the duty of care.
 - The defendant not only failed to follow the procedure provided for by Decision 82 but also failed to hear the applicant's views effectively in any other way. It thus failed, before taking the decision of 26 August 2016, to obtain relevant information from the applicant as to his interests and did not allow the applicant to properly prepare his defence.

Action brought on 10 May 2017 — Michela Curto v Parliament

(Case T-275/17)

(2017/C 239/62)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Michela Curto (Genoa, Italy) (represented by: L. Levi and C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyers)

Defendant: European Parliament

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision of 30 June 2016, rejecting the applicant's request for assistance, and, so far as necessary, the decision rejecting the complaint;
- order the defendant to award the applicant an amount of EUR 10 000, or any other amount which the Court will deem appropriate, as compensation for the non-material harm suffered, together with interest at the legal rate until payment in full has been made;

— order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on two pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging manifest error of assessment

— The applicant maintains that the defendant erred in holding that the disputed conduct was not improper and further erred in finding that it did not have the effect of undermining the applicant's personality, dignity or physical or psychological integrity.

2. Second plea in law, alleging the breach of Article 24 of the Staff Regulations and the duty to provide assistance

— The applicant argues, *inter alia*, that the defendant failed to deal with the request for assistance seriously and expeditiously, as prescribed by the applicable case-law.

Action brought on 15 May 2017 — Keolis CIF and Others v Commission

(Case T-289/17)

(2017/C 239/63)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicants: Keolis CIF (Le Mesnil-Amelot, France), Keolis Val d'Oise (Bernes-sur-Oise, France), Keolis Seine Sénart (Draveil, France), Keolis Seine Val de Marne (Athis-Mons, France), Keolis Seine Esonne (Ormoy, France), Keolis Vélizy (Versailles, France), Keolis Yvelines (Versailles) and Keolis Versailles (Versailles) (represented by: D. Epaud and R. Sermier, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

— Principally, annul in part the decision of the European Commission of 2 February 2017 concerning the aid schemes SA.26763 2014/C (ex 2012/NN) implemented by France in favour of bus transport undertakings in the Île de France region insofar as it declares, in Article 1 thereof, that the aid scheme has been 'unlawfully' implemented, although the aid scheme at issue was already in existence;

— In the alternative, annul in part the decision of the European Commission of 2 February 2017 concerning the aid schemes SA.26763 2014/C (ex 2012/NN) implemented by France in favour of bus transport undertakings in the Île de France region insofar as it declares, in Article 1 thereof, that the aid scheme has been 'unlawfully' implemented, with respect to the period before 25 November 1998;

— Order the Commission to pay all the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on two pleas in law.

1. First and primary plea in law, alleging that the regional aid scheme was not unlawfully implemented, since it was not subject to any obligation of prior notification. The regional aid scheme is, in fact, an existing aid scheme, within the meaning of Article 108(1) TFEU and the provisions of Article 1(b) and Chapter VI of Council Regulation (EU) 2015/1589 of 13 July 2015 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (OJ 2015 L 248, p. 9; 'Regulation No 2015/1589'). Under the rules applicable to existing aid schemes, their implementation is not unlawful since the Commission may merely lay down, if necessary, appropriate measures to enable them to develop or be closed in the future.