C/2025/4980

22.9.2025

Action brought on 10 July 2025 – Lipp v Council

(Case T-460/25)

(C/2025/4980)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Alina Lipp (St. Petersburg, Russia) (represented by: V. Wester, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

— firstly, Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/965 of 20 May 2025 implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2642 concerning restrictive measures in view of Russia's destabilising [1] activities be annulled in so far as the name of Ms Alina Lipp has been included in the list of natural persons in Annex I to Regulation (EU) 2024/2642 under section 'A. Natural persons', serial number 23;

— secondly, order the Council of the European Union to pay its own costs and those incurred by the applicant.

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 that the applicant has not engaged in any activities that could undermine the fundamental values or security of the European Union and its Member States. Rather, she carries out her work as an independent war correspondent in accordance with journalistic principles in a responsible manner and contributes to the formation of public opinion. Her reporting on the situation of the Russian-speaking population in conflict areas is objective, without spreading disinformation or questioning the legitimacy of the Ukrainian government. The applicant makes permissible use of her right to freedom of expression and freedom of the press, which is guaranteed by the Basic Law, the European Charter of Fundamental Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights. The journalistic processing and publication of information from third countries is also expressly covered by the scope of protection of these fundamental rights. Against this background, the assumption that the applicant is manipulating information or supporting Russian propaganda is legally untenable.

2. Second plea in law, alleging that the principle of proportionality under EU law requires that interference with fundamental rights is only permissible if it is appropriate, necessary and proportionate in its effect. In the case of the applicant, it is not apparent that the restrictive measures imposed on her – such as entry bans or account freezes – meet those requirements. There is no concrete, reliable evidence that her journalistic activities pose a real threat to the security or order of the EU or that they involve targeted disinformation in the sense of Russian war propaganda. Rather, her reporting is nuanced, non-violent and aimed at presenting different perspectives on the Ukraine conflict. The measures would significantly interfere with fundamental rights such as freedom of expression, freedom of economic activity and freedom of movement and were therefore disproportionate. Since no time-limit was provided for and the Council had not presented sufficient evidence, the sanctions were unlawful and incompatible with the standard of protection under EU law.

[1] OJ L 2025/965.