

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 that the Council has made errors of assessment in considering that the criterion for listing the applicant in Article 1(1) of the Decision and Article 2(1) of the Regulation was satisfied.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that Article 1(1) of the Decision and Article 2(1) of the Regulation are illegal because (a) they lack a valid legal basis and/or (b) they breach the principle of proportionality.
3. Third plea in law, alleging the violation of the applicant's rights under Article 6, read with Articles 2 and 3, TEU and Articles 47 and 48 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union by the Council's assumption that the judicial proceedings in Egypt complied with fundamental human rights

Action brought on 5 June 2018 — Hauzenberger v EUIPO (TurboPerformance)**(Case T-349/18)**

(2018/C 259/67)

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

Applicant: Andreas Hauzenberger (Sinzing, Germany) (represented by: B. Bittner, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Mark at issue: EU figurative mark with the word elements 'TurboPerformance' — Application for registration No 16 053 431

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 5 April 2018 in Case R 2206/2017-4

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 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 5 June 2018 — Euronet Consulting v Commission**(Case T-350/18)**

(2018/C 259/68)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

Applicant: Euronet Consulting EEIG (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by: P. Peeters and R. van Cleemput, lawyers)