

**Order of the Court (Seventh Chamber) of 17 December 2015 — Moreda-Riviere Trefilerías, SA (C-53/15 P), Trefilerías Quijano SA, (C-54/15 P), Trenzas y Cables de Acero PSC SL, (C-55/15 P), Global Steel Wire SA (C-56/15 P) v European Commission**

**(Joined Cases C-53/15 P to C-56/15 P) <sup>(1)</sup>**

***(Appeals — Competition — European prestressing steel market — Commission decision adjusting the amount of the fines imposed on certain undertakings and fixing a new period for the payment of those fines — Other undertakings whose fines remained unchanged having no interest in bringing proceedings — Article 181 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court — Appeal manifestly unfounded)***

(2016/C 078/03)

Language of the case: Spanish

**Parties**

Appellants: Moreda-Riviere Trefilerías, SA (C-53/15 P), Trefilerías Quijano SA, (C-54/15 P), Trenzas y Cables de Acero PSC SL, (C-55/15 P), Global Steel Wire SA (C-56/15 P) (represented by: F. González Díaz and A. Tresandi Blanco, abogados)

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission (represented by: C. Urraca Caviedes and F. Castillo de la Torre, acting as Agents)

**Operative part of the order**

The Court hereby orders:

1. The appeals are dismissed.
2. Moreda-Riviere Trefilerías SA, Trefilerías Quijano SA, Trenzas y Cables de Acero PSC SL and Global Steel Wire SA shall pay the costs of the proceedings in cases C-53/15 P, C-54/15 P, C-55/15 P and C-56/15 P respectively.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 118, 13.4.2015

---

**Order of the Court (Seventh Chamber) of 10 December 2015 — Naftiran Intertrade Co. (NICO) Sàrl v Council of the European Union**

**(Case C-153/15 P) <sup>(1)</sup>**

***(Appeal — Article 181 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Restrictive measures taken against Iran — List of persons and entities subject to the freezing of funds and economic resources — Inclusion of the appellant's name — Admissibility — Period allowed for commencing proceedings — Point from which time starts to run — Manifest inadmissibility)***

(2016/C 078/04)

Language of the case: English

**Parties**

Appellant: Naftiran Intertrade Co. (NICO) Sàrl (represented by: J. Grayston, Solicitor, P. Gjørtler, advokat, G. Pandey and D. Rovetta, avocats, and M. Gambardella, avvocato)

Other party to the proceedings: Council of the European Union (represented by: M. Bishop and I. Rodios, acting as Agents)

**Operative part of the order**

1. *The appeal is dismissed.*
2. *Naftiran Intertrade Co. (NICO) Sàrl shall bear its own costs and shall pay those incurred by the Council of the European Union.*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 190, 8.6.2015.

---

**Appeal brought on 4 December 2015 by Verein zur Wahrung von Einsatz und Nutzung von Chromtrioxid und anderen Chrom-VI-verbindungen in der Oberflächentechnik eV (VECCO), Adolf Krämer GmbH & Co. KG, AgO Argentum GmbH, and other parties against the judgment of the General Court (Fifth Chamber) delivered on 25 September 2015 in Case T-360/13: Verein zur Wahrung von Einsatz und Nutzung von Chromtrioxid und anderen Chrom-VI-verbindungen in der Oberflächentechnik eV e.a. v European Commission**

**(Case C-651/15 P)**

(2016/C 078/05)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Appellants:* Verein zur Wahrung von Einsatz und Nutzung von Chromtrioxid und anderen Chrom-VI-verbindungen in der Oberflächentechnik eV (VECCO), Adolf Krämer GmbH & Co. KG, AgO Argentum GmbH, and other parties (represented by: C. Mereu, avocat, J. Beck, solicitor)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Commission, European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), Assogalvanica, Ecometal, Comité européen des traitements de surfaces (CETS), and other parties

**Form of order sought**

The appellants claims that the Court should:

- Declare the Appeal admissible and well-founded;
- Set aside the General Court's Judgment in Case T-360/13;
- Rule on the substance of the Appellant's Application for Annulment or refer the case back to the General Court for a decision on the substance of the Application for Annulment.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the appeal, the Appellant put forward the following arguments:

First ground of appeal — The General Court made an error in law when holding that Directive 98/24<sup>(1)</sup> and Directive 2004/37<sup>(2)</sup> are not specific EU legislation within the meaning of Article 58(2) REACH<sup>(3)</sup> that impose minimum requirements that properly control the risk to human health of the use of chromium trioxide in the surface coating and galvanising industries: