

2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested measures breach the principle of equal treatment and misuse of powers.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the contested measures are disproportionate, encroach upon the Union's legislative competences and breach the applicant's fundamental rights.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2022, L 67, p. 103.

⁽²⁾ OJ 2022, L 67, p. 1.

Action brought on 12 May 2022 — Mostovdrev v Council

(Case T-259/22)

(2022/C 257/49)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: AAT Mostovdrev (Mosty, Belarus) (represented by: N. Tuominen and L. Engelen, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Council Decision (CFSP) 2022/356 of 2 March 2022 amending Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Belarus ⁽¹⁾, and Council Regulation (EU) 2022/355 of 2 March 2022 amending Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 ⁽²⁾, in their entirety insofar as they affect the applicant; and
- order the Council to pay the costs occasioned by these proceedings.

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 that the contested measures contravene the duty to give reasons, infringe the right to a fair hearing and infringe the right to effective judicial protection.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested measures breach the principle of equal treatment and misuse of powers.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the contested measures are disproportionate, encroach upon the Union's legislative competences and breach the applicant's fundamental rights.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2022, L 67, p. 103.

⁽²⁾ OJ 2022, L 67, p. 1.

**Action brought on 13 May 2022 — mBank v EUIPO — European Merchant Bank
(EMBank European Merchant Bank)**

(Case T-261/22)

(2022/C 257/50)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: mBank S.A. (Warsaw, Poland) (represented by: E. Skrzydło-Tefelska and M. Stępkowski, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: European Merchant Bank UAB (Vilnius, Lithuania)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the trade mark at issue: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: European Union figurative mark EMBANK European Merchant Bank — European Union trade mark No 18 048 966

Procedure before EUIPO: Cancellation proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 22 February 2022 in Case R 1845/2020-5

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- alter the contested decision and uphold the application for a declaration of invalidity in its entirety;
- order EUIPO and the intervener to bear their own costs and to pay those incurred by the applicant, including those incurred in the proceedings before EUIPO.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Articles 8(1)(b) and 60(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.
- Infringement of Article 95(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council in conjunction with Article 27(4) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/625.

Action brought on 13 May 2022 — CCCME and Others v Commission

(Case T-263/22)

(2022/C 257/51)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Machinery and Electronic Products (CCCME) (Beijing, China) and 8 others (represented by: R. Antonini, E. Monard and B. Maniatis, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/191 of 16 February 2022 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain iron or steel fasteners originating in the People's Republic of China ⁽¹⁾, in so far as it relates to the CCCME, the individual companies, and the members concerned; and
- order the Commission to bear the costs of these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the Commission violated Article 2(6a)(a) of the basic Regulation and the principle of good administration in its determination of the normal value.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission failed to ensure a fair comparison in its dumping determination in violation of Article 2(10) of the basic Regulation.