

2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of essential procedural requirements, since the Parliament did not give the applicant the opportunity to state its views on the discrepancies noted.

3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the rule of law, in so far as:

- contributions in kind are a lawful method of financing;
- the applicant has been discriminated against in terms of its budget as against other European political parties;
- the right of an individual to be heard prior to the enactment of a measure adversely affecting him has not been observed.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging misuse of powers, since the Parliament used financial constraints in order to restrict the means of action of a political party whose ideals are not shared by some of the Parliament's members.

---

**Action brought on 16 December 2013 — AENM v Parliament**

(Case T-679/13)

(2014/C 85/36)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Alliance of European National Movements (AENM) (Matzenheim, France) (represented by: J.-P. Le Moigne, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Parliament

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the European Parliament of 7 October 2013, partially repeated by the decision of 14 October 2013, and which fixed the definitive allowance granted by the European Parliament to the Alliance of European National Movements in respect of 2012 at EUR 186 292,12 and consequently decided that the Alliance of European National Movements must reimburse EUR 45 476,00 having regard to the fact that EUR 231 412,80 has already been allocated to the applicant association;

- order the European Parliament to pay all the costs and to pay on that basis a sum of EUR 20 000,00 to the Alliance of European National Movements.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law which are essentially identical or similar to those it relies on in Case T-678/13 *AENM v Parliament*.

---

**Action brought on 20 December 2013 — Bilbaina de Alquitranes and Others v Commission**

(Case T-689/13)

(2014/C 85/37)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicants:* Bilbaina de Alquitranes, SA (Luchana-Baracaldo, Vizcaya, Spain); Deza, a.s. (Valašské Meziříčí, Czech Republic); Industrial Química del Nalón, SA (Oviedo, Spain); Koppers Denmark A/S (Nyborg, Denmark); Koppers UK Ltd (Scunthorpe, United Kingdom); Koppers Netherlands BV (Uithoorn, Netherlands); Rütgers basic aromatics GmbH (Castrop-Rauxel, Germany); Rütgers Belgium NV (Zelzate, Belgium); Rütgers Poland Sp. z o.o. (Kędzierzyn-Koźle, Poland); Bawtry Carbon International Ltd (Doncaster, United Kingdom); Grupo Ferroatlántica, SA (Madrid, Spain); SGL Carbon GmbH (Meitingen, Germany); SGL Carbon GmbH (Bad Goisern am Hallstättersee, Austria); SGL Carbon (Passy, France); SGL Carbon, SA (La Coruña, Spain); SGL Carbon Polska S.A. (Racibórz, Poland); and ThyssenKrupp Steel Europe AG (Duisburg, Germany) (represented by: K. Van Maldegem and C. Mereu, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- Declare the Application admissible and well-founded;
- Annul the Contested Act as far as it classifies CTPHT as H400 and H410;
- Order the Commission to pay the costs and expenses of these proceedings.