EN

# Judgment of the General Court of 4 May 2018 — Bernard Krone Holding v EUIPO (Mega Liner)

(Case T-187/17)  $(^{1})$ 

(EU trade mark — Application for EU word mark Mega Liner — Absolute grounds for refusal — Descriptive character — No distinctive character — Article 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 (now Article 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001) — Obligation to state reasons — Article 75, first sentence, of Regulation No 207/2009 (now Article 94(1) of Regulation 2017/1001))

(2018/C 221/24)

Language of the case: German

# Parties

Applicant: Bernard Krone Holding SE & Co. KG (Spelle, Germany) (represented by: T. Weeg and K. Lüken, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: M. Fischer and W. Schramek, acting as Agents)

# Re:

Action brought against the decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 9 January 2017 (Case R 442/2016-1) concerning an application for registration of the word mark Mega Liner as an EU trade mark.

# Operative part of the order

The Court:

- 1. Annuls paragraph 2 of the operative part of the decision of the First Board of Appeal of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) of 9 January 2017 (Case R 442/2016–1);
- 2. Orders EUIPO to bear its own costs and to pay those incurred by Bernard Krone Holding SE & Co. KG in the proceedings before the General Court.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 161, 22.5.2017.

Judgment of the General Court of 4 May 2018 — Bernard Krone Holding v EUIPO (Coil Liner)

(Case T-188/17) (<sup>1</sup>)

(EU trade mark — Application for EU word mark Coil Liner — Absolute grounds for refusal — Descriptive character — No distinctive character — Article 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EC) No 207/ 2009 (now Article 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001) — Obligation to state reasons — Article 75, first sentence, of Regulation No 207/2009 (now Article 94(1) of Regulation 2017/1001))

(2018/C 221/25)

Language of the case: German

#### Parties

Applicant: Bernard Krone Holding SE & Co. KG (Spelle, Germany) (represented by: T. Weeg and K. Lüken, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: M. Fischer and W. Schramek, acting as Agents)