

2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination which vitiate the contested decision in the present case, owing to the lack of stability of the selection board and reliance on back-up assessors who were not given any specific assessor training.

---

**Action brought on 23 October 2018 — Geske v EUIPO (revolutionary air pulse technology)**

**(Case T-634/18)**

(2019/C 4/46)

*Language of the case: German*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* André Geske (Lübbecke, Germany) (represented by: R. Albrecht, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Mark at issue:* Application for EU word mark revolutionary air pulse technology — Application for registration No 17 025 231

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 5 September 2018 in Case R 2721/2017-2

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs, including those incurred in the appeal proceedings before EUIPO.

**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 29 October 2018 — Intercontact Budapest v CdT**

**(Case T-640/18)**

(2019/C 4/47)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Intercontact Budapest Fordító és Pénzügyi Tanácsadó Kft (Intercontact Budapest Kft) (Budapest, Hungary) (represented by: É. Subasicz, lawyer)

*Defendant:* Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT)

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- Primarily, declare whether the evaluation points awarded to the various tenderers are realistic on the basis of a comparison of the tenders submitted, and whether they comply with the principles of equal treatment, non-discrimination, proportionality and transparency;