

**Action brought on 7 February 2014 — Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines and Others v Council****(Case T-87/14)**

(2014/C 129/37)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

*Applicants:* Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines (Tehran, Iran); Hafize Darya Shipping Lines (HDSL) (Tehran); Khazar Shipping Lines (Anzali Free Zone, Iran); IRISL Europe GmbH (Hamburg, Germany); IRISL Marine Services and Engineering Co. (Qeshm Island, Iran); Irano Misr Shipping Co. (Tehran); Safiran Payam Darya Shipping Lines (SAPID) (Tehran); Shipping Computer Services Co. (Tehran); Soroush Sarzamin Asatir Ship Management (Tehran); South Way Shipping Agency Co. Ltd (Tehran); et Valfajr 8th Shipping Line Co. (Tehran) (represented by: F. Randolph, QC, M. Lester, Barrister, and M. Taher, Solicitor)

*Defendant:* Council of the European Union

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- Annul Council Decision 2013/685/CFSP of 26 November 2013 amending Decision 2010/413/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ L 316, p. 46) and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1203/2013 of 26 November 2013 implementing Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ L 316, p. 1), in so far as they apply to the applicants;
- Declare the inapplicability as regards Council Decision 2013/497/CFSP of 10 October 2013 amending Decision 2010/413/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ L 272, p. 46) and Council Regulation (EU) No 971/2013 of 10 October 2013 amending Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran (OJ L 272, p. 1);
- Order the Council to pay the applicants' costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

The applicants rely on the 'objection of illegality' in seeking to have the October Measures declared unlawful in that: they lack a proper legal basis; violate the applicants' legitimate expectations, and the principles of finality, legal certainty, *non bis in idem*, and *res judicata*; they discriminate against IRISL and violate its fundamental rights without justification or proportion; breach the applicants' rights of defence; and are an abuse of the Council's powers.

The applicants rely on the following grounds for the annulment of the Contested Measures.

1. First plea in law, alleging that there is no proper legal basis for the Contested Measures.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Council has erred manifestly in its decisions to include each of the applicants.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Council has breached the applicants' rights of defence.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the Contested Measures breach the applicants' legitimate expectations, and the principles of finality, legal certainty, *res judicata*, *non bis in idem*, and non-discrimination.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that the Contested Measures violate, without justification or proportion, the applicants' fundamental rights, in particular their right to reputation and to respect for their property.