

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by a manifest error of assessment of fact and of law as regards the conclusion that the financing of the airlines concerned distorts or threatens to distort competition and affects trade between Member States.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by a manifest error of assessment of fact and of law as regards the conclusion that the alleged aid that the Commission found was given to the applicant could not be approved as compatible with the internal market under one of the exemptions laid down in Article 107(3) TFEU.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by a manifest error of assessment of fact and of law insofar as the Commission breached the principle of legitimate expectations, as the applicant had a legitimate expectation that its arrangements with the airport operators did not involve State aid.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging that the contested decision is vitiated by insufficient reasoning as regards both: (a) the conclusion that the airport operators acted as mere 'intermediaries' of the region of Sardinia and that therefore the funding they provided to the applicant involved State resources and was imputable to the State; and (b) the application of the market economy operator principle with a view to establishing that the applicant received an undue advantage.

⁽¹⁾ Commission Decision (EU) 2017/1861 of 29 July 2016 on State aid SA33983 (2013/C) (ex 2012/NN) (ex 2011/N) — Italy — Compensation to Sardinian airports for public service obligations (SGEI) (OJ 2017 L 268, p. 1).

**Action brought on 15 January 2018 — Crédit mutuel Arkéa v EUIPO — Confédération nationale du
Crédit mutuel (Crédit Mutuel)**

(Case T-13/18)

(2018/C 094/40)

Language in which the application was lodged: French

Parties

Applicant: Crédit mutuel Arkéa (Le Relecq Kerhuon, France) (represented by: A. Casalonga, F. Codevelle and C. Bercial Arias, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Confédération nationale du Crédit mutuel (Paris, France)

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 word mark 'Crédit Mutuel' — European Union trade mark No 9 943 135

Procedure before EUIPO: Invalidity proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 8 November 2017 in Case R 1724/2016-5

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision in so far as it concedes that the European Union trade mark No 9 943 135 'Crédit Mutuel' has a distinctive character through use for certain goods in Classes 9, 35 and 36;

- annul the contested decision in so far as it recognises the distinctive character of the European Union trade mark No 9 943 135 ‘Crédit Mutuel’ for certain goods in Classes 9, 16, 36, 38, 42 and 45;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 52(1)(a), read in combination with Article 7(1)(b) and (c) and 7(3), of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 17 January 2018 — Lillelam v EUIPO — Pfaff (LITTLE LAMB)**(Case T-18/18)**

(2018/C 094/41)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English***Parties**

Applicant: Lillelam A/S (Oslo, Norway) (represented by: N. Köster, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Nick Pfaff (Ammanford, United Kingdom)

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: EU word mark ‘LITTLE LAMB’ — EU trade mark No 8 121 675

Procedure before EUIPO: Proceedings for a declaration of invalidity

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 7 November 2017 in Case R 536/2017-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- revoke the EU Trademark No 8 121 675 ‘LITTLE LAMB’ for at least ‘Clothing’ and ‘Accessories for Clothing’
- order EUIPO to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 58(1)(a) and Article 18(1) of Regulation No 2017/1001.

Action brought on 19 January 2018 — Nova Brands v EUIPO — Natamil (Natamil)**(Case T-23/18)**

(2018/C 094/42)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English***Parties**

Applicant: Nova Brands SA (Luxembourg, Luxembourg) (represented by: V. Wellens, lawyer)