

- in relation to the ongoing proceedings before the General Court of the European Union;
- in relation also to all the proceedings brought before all of the national courts.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants submit that the extra-contractual liability of the European Union is incurred by a serious breach of Article 40(2) TFEU, insofar as Article 28 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999 of 17 May 1999 on the common organisation of the market in wine ⁽¹⁾, as implemented by Commission Regulation No 1623/2000 ⁽²⁾ and maintained by Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 ⁽³⁾, prohibits producers of wine obtained from dual-purpose vine varieties from themselves distilling spirits from quantities of wine with a designation of origin produced in excess of the quantity normally produced.

The applicants have been systematically prosecuted and convicted by the national authorities for having failed to deliver the quantities produced in excess of the normal quantity and not exported as wine to third countries for State compulsory distillation into alcohol by approved distillers.

The applicants submit, inter alia, that this is a breach of perfectly clear and unambiguous provisions in respect of which the institutions of the European Union did not have any discretion. They allege a breach of the principles of non-discrimination, legal certainty, proportionality, estoppel, the presumption of innocence, proper administration, care and the right to property, as well as wrongful interference with the freedom to produce industrial goods and put them on the market and the wrongful extension of the application of a regulation with the purpose of stabilising the market and guaranteeing a certain revenue for producers to cases where there are no applications for funding from those producers.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1999 L 179, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 1623/2000 of 25 July 2000 laying down detailed rules for implementing Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999 on the common organisation of the market in wine with regard to market mechanisms (OJ 2000 L 194, p. 45).

⁽³⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 of 29 April 2008 on the common organisation of the market in wine, amending Regulations (EC) No 1493/1999, (EC) No 1782/2003, (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 3/2008 and repealing Regulations (EEC) No 2392/86 and (EC) No 1493/1999 (OJ 2008 L 148, p. 1).

Order of the General Court of 8 April 2011 — Bakkers v Council and Commission

(Case T-146/97) ⁽¹⁾

(2011/C 173/31)

Language of the case: Dutch

The President of the Eighth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 199, 28.6.1997.

Order of the General Court of 11 April 2011 — Quantum v OHIM — Quantum (Q Quantum CORPORATION)

(Case T-31/08) ⁽¹⁾

(2011/C 173/32)

Language of the case: Greek

The President of the Fifth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 92, 12.4.2008.

Order of the General Court of 15 April 2011 — Amor v OHIM — Jablonex Group (AMORIKE)

(Case T-371/10) ⁽¹⁾

(2011/C 173/33)

Language of the case: English

The President of the First Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 288, 23.10.2010.