

Interveners in support of the defendant: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (represented initially by E. Jenkinson, I. Rao and F. Penlington and subsequently by E. Jenkinson, I. Rao and C. Murrell, acting as Agents, and D. Beard QC, and by the Council of the European Union (represented by M. Bishop and R. Szostak, acting as Agents)

Re:

ACTION for the annulment of Commission Regulation (EC) No 77/2009 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 314/2004 concerning certain restrictive measures in respect of Zimbabwe (OJ 2009 L 23, p. 5), as amended by Commission Regulation (EU) No 173/2010 of 25 February 2010 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 314/2004 concerning certain restrictive measures in respect of Zimbabwe (OJ 2010 L 51, p. 13) in so far as it concerns the applicants.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no need to adjudicate on this action.*
2. *The European Commission shall bear, in addition to its own costs, those incurred by John Arnold Bredenkamp, Alpha International (PVT) Ltd, Breco (Asia Pacific) Ltd, Breco (Eastern Europe) Ltd, Breco (South Africa) Ltd, Breco (UK) Ltd, Breco Group, Breco International, Breco Nominees Ltd, Breco Services Ltd, Corybantes Ltd, Echo Delta Holdings, Masters International Ltd, Piedmont (UK) Ltd, Raceview Enterprises, Scottlee Holdings (PVT) Ltd, Scottlee Resorts Ltd, Timpani Exports Ltd and Tremalt Ltd.*
3. *The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Council of the European Union shall each bear their own costs.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 141, 20.6.2009.

Order of the General Court of 6 September 2012 — Nickel Institute v Commission

(Case T-180/10) ⁽¹⁾

(Access to documents — Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 — Classification, packaging and labelling of certain nickel carbonate compounds as dangerous substances — Directives 2008/58/EC and 2009/2/EC — 30th and 31st adaptations to technical progress of Directive 67/548/EEC — Partial refusal of access — Action for annulment — No need to adjudicate)

(2012/C 331/45)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Nickel Institute (Toronto, Canada) (represented by: initially, K. Nordlander, lawyer, and H. Pearson, Solicitor, and, subsequently, K. Nordlander)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: P. Oliver and P. Costa de Oliveira, acting as Agents)

Interveners in support of the applicant: Republic of Finland (represented by: J. Heliskoski and M. Pere, acting as Agents) and Kingdom of Sweden (represented by: A. Falk, K. Petkovska, C. Meyer-Seitz and S. Johannesson, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application for annulment of the decision of the European Commission of 8 February 2010 (reference SG.E3/HP/psi — Ares(2010)65824) concerning the refusal to grant Nickel Institute full access to certain internal documents, in particular to opinions of the Commission's Legal Service, drawn up in the context of two consecutive procedures which resulted in the classification of, inter alia, certain nickel carbonate compounds in Annex I to Council Directive 67/548/EEC of 27 June 1967 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances (O), English Special Edition 1967, p. 234).

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the action.*
2. *The European Commission shall bear its own costs as well as half of the costs incurred by Nickel Institute.*
3. *Nickel Institute shall bear half of its own costs.*
4. *The Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden shall bear their own respective costs.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 161, 19.6.2010.

Order of the General Court of 6 September 2012 — Rautenbach v Council and Commission

(Case T-222/11) ⁽¹⁾

(Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures adopted having regard to the situation in Zimbabwe — Withdrawal from the list of persons concerned — Action for annulment — No need to adjudicate)

(2012/C 331/46)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Muller Conrad Rautenbach (Harare, Zimbabwe) (represented by: S. Smith QC, M. Lester, Barrister, and W. Osmond, Solicitor)

Defendants: Council of the European Union (represented by: B. Driessen and J. Herrmann, acting as Agents) and European Commission (represented by E. Paasivirta, M. Konstantinidis and T. Scharf, acting as Agents)

Re:

ACTION for the annulment of Council Decision 2011/101/CFSP of 15 February 2011 concerning restrictive measures against Zimbabwe (OJ 2011 L 42, p. 6), and of Commission Regulation (EU) No 174/2011 of 23 February 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 314/2004 concerning certain restrictive measures in respect of Zimbabwe (OJ 2011 L 49, p. 23), in so far as they concern the applicant.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no need to adjudicate on this action.*
2. *The Council of the European Union shall bear, in addition to its own costs, those incurred by Muller Conrad Rautenbach.*
3. *The European Commission shall bear its own costs.*

(¹) OJ C 186, 25.6.2011.

Order of the General Court of 5 September 2012 — Farage v Parliament and Buzek

(Case T-564/11) (¹)

(Law governing the institutions — Decision of the President of the Parliament imposing on a Member of the Parliament the penalty of forfeiture of entitlement to the daily subsistence allowance for a period of 10 days — Decision of the Committee on Legal Affairs of the Parliament declaring inadmissible the Member's request for defence of his Parliamentary immunity — Manifest lack of jurisdiction of the General Court — Manifest inadmissibility)

(2012/C 331/47)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Nigel Paul Farage (Brussels (Belgium)) (represented by: P. Bennett, solicitor)

Defendants: European Parliament (represented by: N. Lorenz and D. Moore, acting as Agents) and Jerzy Buzek (Brussels (Belgium))

Re:

ACTION for annulment, first, of the decision of the President of the Parliament of 2 March 2010 imposing on the applicant the penalty of forfeiture of entitlement to the daily subsistence allowance for a period of 10 days, secondly, of the decision of the Bureau of the Parliament of 24 March 2010 confirming

the above decision of the President of the Parliament, thirdly, of the decision of the Committee on Legal Affairs of the Parliament declaring inadmissible the applicant's request for defence of immunity and, fourthly, of an unspecified decision of the Parliament.

Operative part of the order

1. *The action is dismissed.*
2. *Nigel Paul Farage is to bear his own costs and to pay those of the European Parliament.*

(¹) OJ C 25, 28.1.2012.

Order of the General Court of 4 September 2012 — Mische v Parliament

(Case T-642/11 P) (¹)

(Appeals — Civil service — Officials — Appointment — Classification in grade — Competition published before the entry into force of the new Staff Regulations of Officials — Distortion of the facts — Appeal manifestly unfounded)

(2012/C 331/48)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Harald Mische (Brussels, Belgium) (represented by: R. Holland, J. Mische and M. Velardo, lawyers)

Other parties to the proceedings: European Parliament (represented by: S. Seyr and S. Alves, Agents); and Council of the European Union (represented by: A. Jensen and J. Herrmann, Agents)

Re:

Appeal against the judgment of the European Union Civil Service Tribunal (Second Chamber) of 29 September 2011 in Case F-93/05 *Mische v Parliament* [2011] ECR-SC I-A-1-0000 and II-A-1-0000 seeking to have that judgment set aside.

Operative part of the order

1. *The appeal is dismissed.*
2. *Mr Harald Mische shall bear his own costs and those incurred by the European Parliament in the present proceedings.*
3. *The Council of the European Union shall bear its own costs.*

(¹) OJ C 49, 18.2.2012.