



**Action brought on 16 October 2025 – ExxonMobil Producing Netherlands and Mobil Erdgas-Erdöl  
v Commission**

**(Case T-714/25)**

(C/2025/6637)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

**Applicants:** ExxonMobil Producing Netherlands BV (Rotterdam, Netherlands), Mobil Erdgas-Erdöl GmbH (Hamburg, Germany) (represented by: A. Pliego Selie, M. Lawton, U. Scholz and H. Weßling, lawyers)

**Defendant:** European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul pursuant to Article 263 TFEU the Commission Decision (EU) 2025/1479 of 22 May 2025 (the 'Contested Decision') (¹); and/or
- annul pursuant to Article 263 TFEU the Contested Decision insofar as it lists EMPN and MEEG as obligated entities subject to the contribution obligations as set out in Annex 1; and/or
- annul pursuant to Article 263 TFEU the Contested Decision insofar as it lists EMPN as an obligated entity subject to the contribution obligations as set out in Annex 1; and/or
- annul pursuant to Article 263 TFEU the Contested Decision insofar as it lists MEEG as an obligated entity subject to the contribution obligations as set out in Annex 1; and/or
- declare Article 23 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1735 of 13 June 2024 (the Net Zero Industry Act or NZIA) (²) and/or the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1477 of 21 May 2025 (the Threshold Act) (³) inapplicable, in whole or in part, pursuant to Article 277 TFEU;
- order the Commission to pay EMPN and MEEG's costs pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, including the costs relating to any intervening parties.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging that Article 23 NZIA was adopted in violation of the principles of conferral and subsidiarity, and in any event lacks a valid legal basis under Article 114 TFEU.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that Article 23 NZIA is inconsistent with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (the Charter) and general principles of EU law, in particular the principle of proportionality of Article 5(4) TEU, and the Contested Decision is unlawful insofar as it is adopted pursuant to Article 23 NZIA.

(¹) Commission Decision (EU) 2025/1479 of 22 May 2025 specifying the pro rata contributions to the Union CO2 injection capacity objective by 2030 from entities holding an authorisation as defined in Article 1, point 3, of Directive 94/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 2025/1479).

(²) Regulation (EU) 2024/1735 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on establishing a framework of measures for strengthening Europe's net-zero technology manufacturing ecosystem and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 (OJ L 2024/1735).

(³) Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1477 of 21 May 2025 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2024/1735 of the European Parliament and of the Council by specifying the rules on the identification of authorised oil and gas producers who are required to contribute to the objective of reaching the Union target for available CO2 injection capacity by 2030, on the calculation of their respective contributions, and on their reporting obligations (OJ L 2025/1477).

---

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Contested Decision is unlawful because it is inconsistent with the Charter and general principles of EU law.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the Threshold Act is unlawful because it is inconsistent with the Charter and general principles of EU law.

---