

3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007, ⁽³⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004. ⁽⁴⁾
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging serious infringement of Articles 168 and 169 TFEU and Articles 3, 35 and 38 of the EU Charter.

-
- ⁽¹⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 507/2006 of 29 March 2006 on the conditional marketing authorisation for medicinal products for human use falling within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ 2006 L 92, p. 6).
- ⁽²⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ 2001 L 311, p. 67).
- ⁽³⁾ Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on advanced therapy medicinal products and amending Directive 2001/83/EC and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 (OJ 2007 L 324, p. 121).
- ⁽⁴⁾ Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ 2004 L 136, p. 1).

Action brought on 16 February 2021 — Synesis v Council

(Case T-97/21)

(2021/C 148/30)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Synesis OOO (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: G. Lansky and A. Egger, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- pursuant to Article 263 TFEU, annul Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2020/2130 of 17 December 2020 implementing Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus (OJ 2020 L 426 I, p. 14) and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/2129 of 17 December 2020 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus (OJ 2020 L 426 I, p. 1), in so far as they concern the applicant;
- pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Council to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the argument that the contested measures are unlawful in so far as they concern the applicant, the applicant relies on a single plea in law, alleging that the Council committed a manifest error of assessment and in particular infringed its examination obligations. In the applicant's view, the Council failed to provide any concrete evidence to justify the validity of the applicant's inclusion on the list in the contested measures.

Action brought on 22 February 2021 — Maternus v EUIPO — adp Gauselmann (WILD)

(Case T-116/21)

(2021/C 148/31)

Language in which the application was lodged: German

Parties

Applicant: Maternus GmbH (Munich, Germany) (represented by: M. Zoebisch and R. Drozd, lawyers)