

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM, intervening before the General Court: MIP Metro Group Intellectual Property GmbH & Co. KG (Düsseldorf, Germany) (represented by: J.-C. Plate and R. Kaase, lawyers)

**Re:**

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 6 October 2014 (Case R 842/2013-4) relating to opposition proceedings between MIP Metro Group Intellectual Property GmbH & Co. KG and Tayto Group Ltd.

**Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

1. Dismisses the action;
2. Orders Tayto Group Ltd to pay the costs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 56, 16.2.2015.

---

**Order of the General Court of 15 February 2016 — Ezz and Others v Counsel**

(Case T-279/13) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Action for annulment — Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures taken in view of the situation in Egypt — Measures taken against persons responsible for misappropriation of State funds and against associated persons and entities — Freezing of funds — Inclusion of the applicants on the list of persons targeted — Legal basis — Failure to fulfil the criteria for listing — Error of law — Error of fact — Right to property — Damage to reputation — Rights of the defence — Right to effective judicial protection — Obligation to state reasons — Amendment of the claims and pleas in law — Lis pendens — Action in part manifestly inadmissible and in part manifestly lacking any foundation in law)*

(2016/C 118/35)

Language of the case: English

**Parties**

*Applicants:* Ahmed Abdelaziz Ezz (Giza, Egypt), Abla Mohammed Fawzi Ali Ahmed Salama (Cairo, Egypt), Khadiga Ahmed Ahmed Kamel Yassin (Giza) and Shahinaz Abdel Azizabdel Wahab Al Naggar (Giza) (represented by: J. Binns, Solicitor, J. Lewis, QC, B. Kennelly, J. Pobjoy, Barristers, S. Rowe and J.-F. Bellis, lawyers)

*Defendant:* Counsel of the European Union (represented by: I. Gurov and M. Bishop, acting as Agents)

**Re:**

Application for annulment, first, of Council Decision 2011/172/CFSP of 21 March 2011 concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Egypt (OJ 2011 L 76, p. 63), as amended by Council Decision 2013/144/CFSP of 21 March 2013 (OJ 2013 L 82, p. 54), and, second, of Council Regulation (EU) No 270/2011 of 21 March 2011 'renewed by decision of the Council notified to the applicants by letter dated 22 March 2013' concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Egypt (OJ 2011 L 76, p. 4), in so far as those acts concern the applicants.

**Operative part of the order**

1. *The action is dismissed.*
2. *Ahmed Abdelaziz Ezz, Abla Mohammed Fawzi Ali Ahmed Salama, Khadiga Ahmed Ahmed Kamel Yassin and Shahinaz Abdel Azizabdel Wahab Al Naggat shall bear their own costs and, in addition, pay the costs incurred by the Council of the European Union.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 207, 20.7.2013.

---

**Order of the General Court of 9 February 2016 — DEI v Commission****(Case T-639/14) <sup>(1)</sup>****(State aid — Complaints — Rejection decisions — Commission's preliminary assessment — Final decision — Repeal of the contested act — No need to adjudicate)**

(2016/C 118/36)

*Language of the case: Greek***Parties**

*Applicant:* Dimosia Epicheirisi Ilektrismou (DEI) (Athens, Greece) (represented by: E. Bourtzalas, D. Waelbroeck, A. Oikonomou, C. Synodinos and E. Salaka, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission (represented by: A. Bouchagiar and É. Gippini Fournier, acting as Agents)

**Re:**

Application for annulment of Commission letter COMP/E3/ON/AB/ark\*2014/61460 of 21 June 2014 in which the Commission rejected the applicant's complaints concerning State aid.

**Operative part of the order**

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate in the present action.*
2. *There is no longer any need to rule on the application for leave to intervene made by Alouminion tis Ellados AE.*
3. *Each party shall bear its own costs.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 395, 10.11.2014.

---

**Action brought on 26 January 2016 — Republic of Lithuania v Commission****(Case T-34/16)**

(2016/C 118/37)

*Language of the case: Lithuanian***Parties**

*Applicant:* Republic of Lithuania (represented by: D. Kriauciūnas, R. Krasuckaitė and T. Orlickas, acting as Agents)

*Defendant:* European Commission