

Action brought on 17 May 2018 — Buck v EUIPO — Unger Holding (BUCK)**(Case T-311/18)**

(2018/C 240/65)

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

Applicant: Društvo za proizvodnju inženjering i usluge Buck d.o.o. (Belgrade, Serbia) (represented by: I. Lázaro Betancor, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Unger Holding GmbH (Herne, Germany)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Applicant of the trade mark at issue: Applicant

Trade mark at issue: International registration designating the European Union in respect of the figurative mark BUCK in colours white and red — International registration designating the European Union No 1 218 386

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 7 March 2018 in Case R 1024/2017-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 47(2) of Regulation No 2017/1001;
- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 2017/1001.

Action brought on 14 May 2018 — Dentsply De Trey v EUIPO — IDS (AQUAPRINT)**(Case T-312/18)**

(2018/C 240/66)

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

Applicant: Dentsply De Trey GmbH (Konstanz, Germany) (represented by: S. Clark, Solicitor)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: IDS SpA (Savona, Italy)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

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

Trade mark at issue: EU word mark AQUAPRINT — Application for registration No 12 272 407

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 26 February 2018 in Case R 1438/2017-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision except in so far as the Board of Appeal determined that the goods are identical/similar and that the relevant public is specialized in the dental field;
- order, pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, EUIPO and the intervener, if any, to pay the costs incurred by Dentsply in the present proceedings;
- alter the decision also with regard to the order for costs and order, pursuant to Article 134(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, EUIPO that the unsuccessful intervener to pay the costs incurred by the Board of Appeal and the Opposition Division.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 2017/1001;
- Infringement of Article 8(4) of Regulation No 2017/1001.

Action brought on 15 May 2018 — Hashem and Assi v SRB

(Case T-314/18)

(2018/C 240/67)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Hashem Asad Mohammad Hashem (Amman, Jordan) and Souhair H. B. Assi (Amman) (represented by: R. Vallina Hoset, A. Sellés Marco, C. Iglesias Megías and A. Lois Perreau de Pinninck, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- Declare that the Single Resolution Board has incurred non-contractual liability and order it to repair the harm suffered by the applicants as a result of both its actions and omissions which resulted in the applicants losing in full their investments in subordinated bonds of the BANCO POPULAR ESPAÑOL, S.A.;
- Order the Board to pay to the applicants, as compensation for the harm suffered by them, an amount for reimbursement of the investments made of EUR 5 571 434,73 in Banco Popular shares or, in the alternative, in relation to the latter, EUR 2 341 142,51;