



Action brought on 11 February 2026 – Rangecourt v ECB

(Case T-101/26)

(C/2026/1784)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Rangecourt SA (Luxembourg, Luxembourg) (represented by: O. Behrends, lawyer)

Defendant: European Central Bank

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the ECB's decision dated 1 December 2025 with respect to the applicant's request for access to document void pursuant to Article 264 TFEU; and
- order the defendant to bear the applicant's costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to provide a complete list of documents.
2. Second plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to provide reasons for the redactions in the eighteen partially disclosed documents.
3. Third plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to adhere to the relevant deadlines.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging the erroneous mischaracterisation by the ECB of the applicant's request as imprecise.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to disclose to the applicant that the number of documents was the issue and the subsequent failure to seek an informal solution with the applicant.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to process point 1 of the request.
7. Seventh plea in law, alleging the failure by the ECB to provide detailed reasons in advance of the expiry of the 20-working day deadline.
8. Eighth plea in law, alleging the erroneous refusal by the ECB to grant the Applicant access to three broad categories of documents and other documents.