

GENERAL COURT

Judgment of the General Court of 13 June 2017 — Ball Beverage Packaging Europe v EUIPO — Crown Hellas Can (Cans)

(Case T-9/15) ⁽¹⁾

(Community design — Invalidity proceedings — Registered Community design representing three cans — Earlier design — Ground for invalidity — Individual character — Different overall impression — Article 6 and Article 25(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 6/2002 — Group of articles constituting a single unit — Scope of the description of the registered Community design — Obligation to state reasons — Replacement of a party to the proceedings)

(2017/C 249/34)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Ball Beverage Packaging Europe Ltd (Luton, United Kingdom), authorised to replace Ball Europe GmbH (represented by: A. Renck, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: S. Hanne, acting as Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of EUIPO, intervener before the General Court: Crown Hellas Can SA (Athens, Greece) (represented by: N. Coulson and J. Koepp, Solicitors)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Third Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 8 September 2014 (Case R 1408/2012-3), relating to invalidity proceedings between Crown Hellas Can and Ball Europe.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Grants Ball Beverage Packaging Europe Ltd leave to substitute itself for Ball Europe GmbH as applicant.
2. Dismisses the action.
3. Orders Ball Beverage Packaging Europe to pay the costs, including the costs necessarily incurred by Crown Hellas Can SA for the purposes of the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO).

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 89, 16.3.2015.

Judgment of the General Court of 15 June 2017 — Kiselev v Council

(Case T-262/15) ⁽¹⁾

(Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening Ukraine — Freezing of funds — Restrictions on entry into the territories of the Member States — Natural person actively supporting or implementing actions undermining or threatening Ukraine — Obligation to state reasons — Manifest error of assessment — Freedom of expression — Proportionality — Rights of defence)

(2017/C 249/35)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Dmitrii Konstantinovich Kiselev (Korolev, Russia) (represented by: J. Linneker, Solicitor, T. Otty, Barrister, and B. Kennelly QC)