

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the defendant committed manifest errors of assessment in that it held in the contested measures that the applicant is in some way associated with and sponsoring the Lukashenko regime, or in some way participating in violations of international electoral standards or crackdown on civil society and democratic opposition, or in the importation into Belarus of equipment which might be used for internal repression.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the defendant infringed fundamental the right to property provided for in Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Article 1 of the Protocol No 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in an unjustified and disproportionate manner without compelling evidence.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that the defendant infringes the principle of proportionality in that it imposed a disproportionate restriction on the fundamental rights of the applicant without providing adequate procedural guarantees and compelling evidence.

Action brought on 12 August 2011 — Peftiev v Council

(Case T-441/11)

(2011/C 290/24)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Vladimir Peftiev (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: V. Vaitkute Pavan, A. Smaliukas and E. Matulionyte, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

- Annul Council Regulation (EU) No 588/2011 of 20 June 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures against President Lukashenko and certain officials of Belarus (OJ 2011 L 161, p. 1), to the extent that it concerns the applicant;
- Annul Council Decision 2011/357/CFSP of 20 June 2011 amending Decision 2010/639/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against certain officials of Belarus (OJ 2011 L 161, p. 25), to the extent that it concerns the applicant; and
- Order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the defendant breached the obligation to provide adequate reasoning for inclusion of

the applicant in the lists of the persons to whom restrictive measures apply.

2. Second plea in law, alleging that the defendant infringed the right of defence and the right to a fair hearing provided for in Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as:
 - at no time it provided for the communication of detailed reasons for the inclusion of the applicant in the lists of persons subject to the restrictive measures; and
 - it did not provide the applicant with the possibility to effectively exercise his rights of defence, in particular the right to be heard and the right to the benefit of a procedure allowing him to effectively request his removal from the lists of persons covered by the restrictive measures.

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the defendant committed manifest errors of assessment in that it held that the applicant is a person associated with President Lukashenko and his family, that he is chief economic advisor of President Lukashenko, that he is a key financial sponsor of the Lukashenko regime and that BelTechExport is a company chaired by the applicant and is the largest export/import company of defence products in Belarus.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the defendant infringed fundamental the right to property provided for in Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Article 1 of the Protocol No 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in an unjustified and disproportionate manner without compelling evidence.

5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that the defendant infringes the principle of proportionality in that it imposed a disproportionate restriction on the fundamental rights of the applicant without providing adequate procedural guarantees and compelling evidence.

Action brought on 5 August 2011 — Evropaïki Dynamiki v Commission

(Case T-442/11)

(2011/C 290/25)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Evropaïki Dynamiki — Proigmena Systemata Tilepikoinonion Pliroforikis kai Tilematikis AE (Athens, Greece) (represented by: N. Korogiannakis and M. Dermitzakis, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission