

of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union or can that distinction be justified on the grounds that the two categories of workers have a different employment status?

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Simvoulio tis Epikratias (Greece) lodged on 13 July 2011 — Panellinios Sindesmos Viomikhanion Metapiisis Kapnou v Ipourgos Ikonomias kai Ikonomikon and Ipourgos Agrotikis Anaptixis kai Trofimon

(Case C-373/11)

(2011/C 269/78)

Language of the case: Greek

Referring court

Simvoulio tis Epikratias

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Panellinios Sindesmos Viomikhanion Metapiisis Kapnou

Defendants: Ipourgos Ikonomias kai Ikonomikon and Ipourgos Agrotikis Anaptixis kai Trofimon

Question referred

Is Article 69 of Regulation No 1782/2003, under which the Member States are permitted to set different retention percentages, up to the limit of 10 % of the component of national ceilings referred to in Article 41, for the making of an additional payment to producers, while observing the criteria set out in the third paragraph of Article 69, compatible, in permitting this differentiation as regards the retention percentage, with Articles 2 EC, 32 EC and 34 EC and with the objectives of ensuring a stable income for producers and maintaining rural areas?

Appeal brought on 21 June 2011 by Longevity Health Products, Inc. against the order of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 15 April 2011 in Case T-95/11: Longevity Health Products v Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)

(Case C-378/11 P)

(2011/C 269/79)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Longevity Health Products, Inc. (represented by: J. Korab, Rechtsanwalt)

Other party to the proceedings: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Admit the complaint filed by the company Longevity Health Products, Inc.;
- Annul the decision of the General Court of April 15, 2011, T-95/11;
- Order the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The applicant submits that the contested order should be annulled on the following grounds:

- The reasoning of the General Court is defective;
- The General Court did not consider the arguments advanced by the holder of the trade mark.

Order of the President of the Court of 1 July 2011 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Centrale Raad van Beroep (Netherlands)) — G.A.P. Peeters-van Maasdijk v Raad van Bestuur van het Uitvoeringsinstituut werknemersverzekeringen

(Case C-455/10) ⁽¹⁾

(2011/C 269/80)

Language of the case: Dutch

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 328, 4.12.2010.

Order of the President of the Court of 6 July 2011 — European Commission v Republic of Estonia

(Case C-16/11) ⁽¹⁾

(2011/C 269/81)

Language of the case: Estonian

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 63, 26.2.2011.