

**Action brought on 6 July 2017 — Leino-Sandberg v Parliament****(Case T-421/17)**

(2017/C 293/47)

*Language of the case: English***Parties***Applicant:* Päivi Leino-Sandberg (Helsinki, Finland) (represented by: O. Brouwer and S. Schubert, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Parliament**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the Parliament's decision of 3 April 2017 refusing the applicant access to its decision of 8 July 2015 adopted in response to a confirmatory application made by a third party under Regulation 1049/2001;
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

**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 error of law, manifest error of assessment and lack of reasoning in the application of the exception relating to the protection of court proceedings, contained in Article 4(2), second indent, of the Transparency Regulation.
  - It is argued that the requested document is a final administrative document, not protected by confidentiality or any other non-disclosure exception. Furthermore, even if such an exception were to apply in the present case, it is argued that the defendant has manifestly misinterpreted or misapplied it by failing to show how the disclosure of the requested document would undermine the protection of court proceedings.
2. Second plea in law, alleging error of law, manifest error of assessment and lack of reasoning in the application of the overriding public interest test as required by Article 4(2), second indent, of the Transparency Regulation.
3. Third plea in law, as a subsidiary ground, error of law, manifest error of assessment and lack of reasoning in the application of Article 4(6) of the Transparency Regulation.

---

**Action brought on 10 July 2017 — UF v EPSO****(Case T-422/17)**

(2017/C 293/48)

*Language of the case: Lithuanian***Parties***Applicant:* UF (represented by: L. Gudaitė, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO)**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul the defendant's decision of 4 April 2017 to eliminate the applicant from the Lithuanian-language lawyer-linguist competition EPSO/AD/335/16;