EN

- 2. There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the present actions.
- 3. Versalis SpA and the European Commission shall each bear their own costs.

(¹) OJ C 227, 28.7.2012.

Order of the General Court of 10 March 2014 — Spirlea v Commission

(Case T-518/12) (¹)

(Action for annulment — Public health — Decision to bring an end to an EU pilot procedure — Closure of the file on a complaint — Failure to bring an action for failure to fulfil obligations — Inadmissibility)

(2014/C 135/48)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicants: Darius Nicolai Spirlea (Capezzano Pianore, Italy); and Mihaela Spirlea (Capezzano Pianore) (represented by: V. Foerster and T. Pahl, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: A. Sipos and G. Wilms, Agents)

Intervener in support of the defendant: Kingdom of Spain (represented initially by S. Centeno Huerta, and subsequently by J. García-Valdecasas Dorrego, lawyers)

Re:

APPLICATION for annulment of the Commission decision to bring an end to EU pilot procedure No 2070/11/SNCO, as referred to in the letter of 27 September 2012, sent to the applicants under reference SANCO/A2/AM/kva (2012) 1245353.

Operative part of the order

- 1. The application is dismissed as inadmissible.
- 2. Darius Nicolai Spirlea and Mihaela Spirlea are ordered to bear their own costs and to pay those incurred by the European Commission.
- 3. The Kingdom of Spain is ordered to bear its own costs.

(¹) OJ C 32, 2.2.2013.

Order of the General Court of 20 February 2014 — Jannatian v Council

(Case T-187/13) (¹)

(Action for annulment — Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures against Iran — List of persons and entities to which those restrictive measures apply — Period within which an action must be brought — Action brought out of time — Inadmissibility)

(2014/C 135/49)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Mahmoud Jannatian (Tehran, Iran) (represented by: E. Rosenfeld and S. Monnerville, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: F. Naert and M. Bishop, acting as Agents)

EN

Re:

Application for annulment, in so far as they concern the applicant, of: (i) Council Common Position 2008/479/CFSP of 23 June 2008 amending Common Position 2007/140/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2008 L 163, p. 43); (ii) Council Decision 2008/475/EC of 23 June 2008 implementing Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 423/2007 concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2008 L 163, p. 29); (iii) Council Common Position 2008/652/CFSP of 7 August 2008 amending Common Position 2007/140/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2008 L 213, p. 58); (iv) Council Decision 2009/840/CFSP of 17 November 2009 implementing Common Position 2007/140/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ 2009 L 303, p. 64); (v) Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/ 2009 of 17 November 2009 implementing Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 423/2007 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Decision 2008/475/EC (OJ 2009 L 303, p. 31); (vi) Council Decision 2010/413/CFSP of 26 July 2010 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Common Position 2007/140/CFSP (OJ 2010 L 195, p. 39); (vii) Council Decision 2010/644/CFSP of 25 October 2010 amending Decision 2010/413 (OJ 2010 L 281, p. 81); (viii) Council Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 of 25 October 2010 on restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EC) No 423/2007 (OJ 2010 L 281, p. 1); and (ix) Council Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 of 23 March 2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 of 25 October 2010 on restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 of 23 March 2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 of 23 March 2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 (OJ 2012 L 88, p. 1).

Operative part of the order

1. The action is dismissed as being inadmissible.

2. Mr Mahmoud Jannatian shall bear his own costs and pay those incurred by the Council of the European Union.

(¹) OJ C 171, 15.6.2013.

Order of the President of the General Court of 13 February 2014 — Luxembourg Pamol (Cyprus) and Luxembourg Industries v Commission

(Case T-578/13 R)

(Application for interim measures — Procedure for placing plant protection products on the market — Publication of documents relating to the inclusion of an active substance — Rejection of the request for confidential treatment of certain information — Application for suspension of operation of a measure — Admissibility — Urgency — Prima facie case — Weighing up of the interests involved)

(2014/C 135/50)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: Luxembourg Pamol (Cyprus) Ltd (Nicosia, Cyprus); and Luxembourg Industries Ltd (Tel-Aviv, Israel) (represented by: C. Mereu and K. Van Maldegem, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: G. von Rintelen and P. Ondrůšek, Agents)

Re:

Application for suspension of operation of the Commission's decision communicated to the applicants by letter of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) of 8 October 2013 rejecting the request for confidential treatment of certain information contained in the peer review report and final addendum thereto concerning the inclusion of the active substance potassium phosphonates submitted by the applicants pursuant to Article 14 of Council Directive 91/414/EEC of 15 July 1991 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market (OJ 1991 L 230, p. 1) and Commission Regulation (EU) No 188/2011 of 25 February 2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Directive 91/414 as regards the procedure for the assessment of active substances which were not on the market 2 years after the date of notification of that Directive (OJ 2011 L 53, p. 1)