

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the First Board of Appeal of OHIM of 22 November 2011 (Case R 64/2011-1), relating to opposition proceedings between Chrysal International BV and Chrysamed Vertrieb GmbH

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the action.*
2. *Chrysamed Vertrieb GmbH shall pay the costs.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 98, 31.3.2012.

Order of the General Court of 3 February 2014 — Imax v OHIM — Himax Technologies (IMAX)
(Case T-198/13) ⁽¹⁾

(Community trade mark — Opposition — Withdrawal of the opposition — No need to adjudicate)
(2014/C 142/45)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Imax Corporation (Mississauga, Canada) (represented by: V. von Bomhard, lawyer, and K. Hughes, solicitor)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: L. Rampini, Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM: Himax Technologies, Inc. (Hsinhua, Taiwan)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 23 January 2013 (Case R 740/2012-5), relating to opposition proceedings between Himax Technologies, Inc. and Imax Corporation.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no further need to adjudicate on the action.*
2. *The parties shall bear their own costs.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 171, 15.6.13.

Action brought on 27 January 2014 — BR IP Holder v OHIM — Greyleg Investments (HOKEY POKEY)

(Case T-62/14)

(2014/C 142/46)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: BR IP Holder LLC (Canton, United States) (represented by: F. Traub, lawyer, and C. Rohsler, Solicitor)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)