

Action brought on 22 April 2018 — European Anglers Alliance v Council**(Case T-252/18)**

(2018/C 240/55)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* European Anglers Alliance (Offenbach am Main, Germany) (represented by: L.-B. Buchman, lawyer)*Defendant:* Council of the European Union**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- confirm that the European Anglers Alliance has a legal interest in bringing the present proceedings;
- annul the provisions of Article 9(4) and (5) of Council Regulation (EU) 2018/120 of 23 January 2018 fixing for 2018 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in Union waters and, for Union fishing vessels, in certain non-Union waters and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/127 (OJ 2018 L 27, p. 1), on the grounds that:
 - in the light of the objective that they pursue, those provisions give rise to unjustified discrimination between citizens of the European Union and infringe the principle of equality;
 - the Council of the European Union exceeded the bounds of its discretion by failing to take account of any objective data regarding the effects of harvests from marine recreational fishing on sea bass stocks;
 - they infringe the principle of proportionality and fail to comply with Article 17 of the Common Fisheries Policy in so far as the economic and sociological importance of marine recreational fishing has clearly not been taken into account.

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 infringement of the principle of equal treatment in so far as, in the light of the objective pursued, the contested provisions of Regulation (EU) 2018/120 give rise to unjustified discrimination between European citizens, as well as between recreational fishermen and industrial fishing.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Council exceeded the bounds of its discretion.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality.

Action brought on 23 April 2018 — VY v Commission**(Case T-253/18)**

(2018/C 240/56)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* VY (represented by: J.-N. Louis, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision appointing [*confidential*] ⁽¹⁾ to the post of Head of Unit of the Delegation of the European Union to Japan and the decision rejecting the applicant's candidature;
- order the Commission to pay 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 infringement of the vacancy notice.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and of Article 1d of the Staff Regulations.

⁽¹⁾ Confidential information omitted.

Action brought on 25 April 2018 — Makhlouf v Commission and ECB**(Case T-260/18)**

(2018/C 240/57)

*Language of the case: French***Parties**

Applicant: Rami Makhlouf (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendants: European Commission and European Central Bank

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should

- declare the applicant's action admissible and well founded;
- consequently, order the European Union, the defendants, to pay compensation to the applicant in respect of all of the harm suffered, in the sum of EUR 6 900 000, plus interest;
- order the defendants to pay all of the costs of the action.

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 infringement, on the part of the Commission, of Article 17(1) TEU and of Article 13(3) and (4) of the ESM Treaty in so far as it failed to ensure that the memorandum of understanding of 26 April 2013 was compatible with EU law;