

**Re:**

Application for annulment of Commission Decision 2013/199/EU of 25 July 2012 on State aid Case SA.29064 (11/C, ex 11/NN) — Differentiated air travel tax rates implemented by Ireland (OJ 2013 L 119, p. 30).

**Operative part of the judgment**

*The Court:*

1. *Annuls Article 4 of Commission Decision 2013/199/EU of 25 July 2012 on State aid Case SA.29064 (11/C, ex 11/NN) — Differentiated air travel tax rates implemented by Ireland, in so far as it orders the recovery of the aid from the beneficiaries for an amount which is set at EUR 8 per passenger in recital 70 of that decision;*
2. *Dismisses the action as to the remainder;*
3. *Orders the European Commission to pay its own costs, as well as half of the costs incurred by Ryanair Ltd;*
4. *Orders Ryanair to pay half of its own costs;*
5. *Orders Aer Lingus Ltd and Ireland to bear their own costs.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 26, 26.1.2013.

---

**Judgment of the General Court of 5 February 2015 — Türkiye Garanti Bankasi AS v OHIM — Card & Finance Consulting (bonus & more)**

(Case T-33/13) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Community trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for Community figurative mark bonus & more — Earlier international figurative mark bonus net — Relative ground for refusal — Likelihood of confusion — Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009)*

(2015/C 096/17)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Türkiye Garanti Bankasi AS (Istanbul, Turkey) (represented by: J. Güell Serra, lawyer)

*Defendant:* Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: initially by A. Pohlmann, then by A. Schifko, acting as Agents)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM:* Card & Finance Consulting GmbH (Nuremberg, Germany)

**Re:**

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 12 November 2012 (Case R-1890/2011-4), relating to opposition proceedings between Türkiye Garanti Bankasi AS and Card & Finance Consulting GmbH.

**Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

1. Annuls the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) of 12 November 2012 (Case R 1890/2011-4).
2. Orders OHIM to bear its own costs and to pay those incurred by Türkiye Garanti Bankasi AS.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 86, 23.3.2013.

---

**Judgment of the General Court of 5 February 2015 — Red Bull v OHIM — Sun Mark (BULLDOG)**

(Case T-78/13) <sup>(1)</sup>

**(Community trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for Community word mark BULLDOG — Earlier international and national word marks BULL and RED BULL — Relative grounds for refusal — Likelihood of confusion — Identical nature of the goods — Similarity of the signs — Conceptual similarity — Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 — Article 8(5) of Regulation No 207/2009)**

(2015/C 096/18)

Language of the case: English

**Parties**

**Applicant:** Red Bull GmbH (Fuschl am See, Austria) (represented: initially by A. Renck, T. Heitmann, lawyers, and I. Fowler, Solicitor, and subsequently by A. Renck and I. Fowler)

**Defendant:** Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented initially by: F. Mattina, subsequently by P. Bullock and A. Schifko, acting as Agents, subsequently by D. Walicka and finally by M. Schifko)

**Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM:** Sun Mark Ltd (Middlesex, United Kingdom)

**Re:**

Action brought against the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of OHIM of 16 November 2012 (Case R 107/2012-2), relating to opposition proceedings between Red Bull GmbH and Sun Mark Ltd.

**Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

1. Annuls the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) of 16 November 2012 (Case R 107/2012-2), relating to opposition proceedings between Red Bull GmbH and Sun Mark Ltd;
2. Declares inadmissible Red Bull's form of order requesting that Sun Mark be ordered to pay the costs
3. Orders OHIM to pay the costs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 108, 13.4.2013.