

- The applicant argues in this respect that the case-law relating to merger cases is also inapplicable by analogy here. While, in those cases, it is understandable that the information continues to be sensitive after the Commission's decision, that is not the case as regards a single loan, the conditions of which the Commission considers to be incompatible with the TFEU.
3. Third plea in law, put forward in the alternative, alleging that, even if the confidentiality grounds raised by the Commission were well-founded in this case, there is an overriding public interest which justifies granting access to the documents requested, namely ensuring that the applicant is adequately able to exercise the rights of defence laid down in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
 4. Fourth plea in law, put forward in the alternative, alleging the infringement of Article 4(6) of Regulation No 1049/2001, in that, ultimately, the Commission is required to offer at least partial access to the requested information.

Action brought on 28 February 2017 — Scor v Commission

(Case T-135/17)

(2017/C 144/69)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Scor SE (Paris, France) (represented by: N. Baverez, N. Autet, M. Béas and G. Marson, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul point '(i) an unlimited guarantee granted to the Caisse Centrale de Réassurance (CCR) for its business of reinsuring the risks of natural disasters in France' of State aid Decision SA.37649 (2013/CP); SA.45860 (2016/PN); SA.45860 (2016/N) — France of 26 September 2016, C(2016) 5995 final;
- order the Commission to pay all of the costs, in accordance with Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, based on the contention that the contested decision rests on an incorrect legal basis for the purpose of assessing the compatibility of the guarantee granted to the Caisse Centrale de Réassurance.
2. Second plea in law, alleging several failures to state reasons which vitiate the contested decision.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 107(3)(c) TFEU. This plea is divided into two parts:
 - first part, alleging errors of law relating to the application of the proportionality test;
 - second part, alleging that the guarantee is disproportionate in nature.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the applicant's procedural rights.