*Pleas in law:* The applicant submits that OHIM and the Board erred as a matter of law in concluding that the marks are legally similar and in concluding ipso facto that there is a likelihood of confusion on the part of the relevant public.

# Action brought on 5 June 2012 — Uralita v Commission

(Case T-250/12)

(2012/C 243/46)

Language of the case: English

#### **Parties**

Applicant: Uralita, SA (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: K. Struckmann, lawyer and G. Forwood, Barrister)

Defendant: European Commission

### Form of order sought

- Annul Article 1(2) of the Decision of the European Commission C(2012) 1965 of 27 March 2012 amending Decision C(2008)2626 of 11 June 2008 relating to a proceeding under Article 81 of the EC Treaty (now Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union) and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement (Case COMP/38.695 — SODIUM CHLORATE), in so far as it imposes a fine of EUR 4 231 000 on the applicant;
- Article 2 of the Commission's decision C(2012) 1965 of 27
  March 2012 Case COMP/38.695 Sodium Chlorate;
  and
- Order the defendant to pay the costs of the proceedings.

#### Pleas in law and main arguments

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

- First plea in law, alleging that the decision to impose a fine after the expiry of the limitation period contained in Article 25(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 (¹), and to retain the interest accrued on this sum, was unlawful.
- 2. Second plea in law, alleging, in the alternative, that it was unlawful for the Commission to withhold the amount of the fine imposed by Decision C(2012) 1965 of 27 March 2012, including interest, before the fine became due.

### Action brought on 13 June 2012 — Diadikasia Symvouloi Epicheiriseon v Commission

(Case T-261/12)

(2012/C 243/47)

Language of the case: English

#### **Parties**

Applicant: Diadikasia Symvouloi Epicheiriseon AE (Chalandri, Greece) (represented by: A. Krystallidis, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

## Form of order sought

- Repair the damages caused to the applicant by the unlawful decision of the EU Delegation to Serbia of 23 March 2012 to cancel the award of the contract 'Strengthening the institutional capacity of the Commission for protection of Competition (CPC) in the Republic of Serbia' (OJ 2011 S 147) which was awarded to the applicant, as leader of the consortium for the project above;
- Order that the costs of and occasioned by these proceedings be borne by the defendant.

### 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 acted unlawfully by accusing the applicant of having an unfair advantage in relation to the other tenderers, since this conflict of interest that the applicant is being accused of concerns a totally independent third company, *i.e.* European profiles SA and not the applicant.
- 2. Second plea in law, alleging that the defendant violated its obligation to provide a clear and grounded decision of cancellation of the award, in violation of Article 18 of the European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour, in that it failed to justify the reason for which the applicant was given an unfair advantage in relation to the other tenderers.
- 3. Third plea in law, alleging that the defendant violated its right to be heard by failing to invite the applicant to express its opinion on what may be the matter constituting conflict of interest, in violation of article 16 of the European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour.
- 4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the defendant violated its obligation to give the applicant the access to the documents which would prove the alleged illegal link and the unfair advantage to DIADIKASIA Consortium, according to Article 42 of EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 of 16 December 2002 on the implementation of the rules on competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty (OJ 2003 L 1, p. 1)