

- the content of the contested decisions, in particular as this relates to the State aid schemes' financing mechanisms and the State aid schemes' compatibility with EU law other than the State aid provisions.

---

**Action brought on 17 April 2018 — SKS Import Export v Commission**

**(Case T-239/18)**

(2018/C 231/36)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Société Kammama Saber (S.K.S) Import Export (Sousse Jawhara, Tunisia) (represented by: H. Chelly, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the application admissible and well-founded;

and accordingly:

- partially annul Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/212 of 13 December 2017 in so far as it adds Tunisia to the list of third countries which present strategic deficiencies in their regimes on anti-money-laundering and countering terrorist financing;
- order the Commission to pay all 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 lack of competence on the part of the Commission and infringement of essential procedural requirements in so far as the Commission exceeded its powers under the terms of the Association Agreement between Tunisia and the European Union, pursuant to which the Commission should have submitted the question to the Association Council so the latter could resolve the dispute or, alternatively, allow the parties to take the necessary measures to protect their interests.
2. Second plea in law, alleging manifest error of assessment as regards, first, the evaluation of Tunisia by the European Union and, secondly, the evaluation of Tunisia by the Financial Action Task Force. In that regard, the applicant considers that the Commission failed to take appropriate measures to manage the increased risk to the economic development process in Tunisia resulting from the contested delegated regulation.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the EU Treaties, in particular Article 216(2) TFEU, according to which international agreements are binding on the institutions.

---

**Action brought on 18 April 2018 — Bruno v Commission**

**(Case T-241/18)**

(2018/C 231/37)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Luigi Bruno (Woluwé-Saint-Pierre, Belgium) (represented by: N. de Montigny, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

Declare and rule that

- the Authority Empowered to Conclude Contracts (AECC) of 4 July 2017 is annulled;
- in so far as necessary, the express decision rejecting the claim dated 18 January 2018 is annulled;
- the defendant shall pay the costs.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging an error of law committed by the European Commission in the application of Article 11(1) and 12(1) of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations in so far as, by its decision, the Commission rejected the applicant's application for grant of the leaving allowance provided for in Article 12(2) of that annex by, on the contrary, restricting him to application of article 11(1) of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations, which, however, does not apply to his situation.
2. Second plea in law, raising a plea of illegality, in so far as the abovementioned provisions of the Staff Regulations infringe the principle of equal treatment and of non-discrimination because of a legislative lacuna.

---

## **Action brought on 18 April 2018 — VV v Commission**

**(Case T-242/18)**

(2018/C 231/38)

*Language of the case: French*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* VV (represented by: F. Moyse, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

- Annul the decision of 19 June 2017 and, in so far as necessary, the rejection of the applicant's claim of 18 January 2018;
- Order the defendant to pay the costs.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

By the present action, the applicant seeks the annulment of the decision of the selection board of Open Competition EPSO/AD/322/16 — Administrators in the field of audit (AD 5/AD 7) (OJ 2016 C 171A, p. 1) not to admit her to that competition since she does not hold a university diploma attesting to completed studies of at least 3 years in the fields set out in the notice of that competition.

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

1. First plea in law, alleging an insufficient statement of reasons of the contested decision.