# Judgment of the General Court of 7 July 2016 — Fruit of the Loom v EUIPO — Takko (FRUIT)

(Case T-431/15) (1)

(EU trade mark — Revocation proceedings — EU word mark FRUIT — Genuine use of a mark — Article 15 and Article 51(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 — External use of the mark)

(2016/C 305/45)

Language of the case: English

#### **Parties**

Applicant: Fruit of the Loom, Inc. (Bowling Green, Kentucky, United States) (represented by: S. Malynicz QC, and V. Marsland, Solicitor)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: D. Gája, Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of EUIPO, intervening before the General Court: Takko Holding GmbH (Telgte, Germany)

#### Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 12 May 2015 (case R 1641/2014-2) relating to revocation proceedings between Takko Holding and Fruit of the Loom

## Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Annuls the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) of 12 May 2015 (Case R 1641/2014-2);
- 2. Orders EUIPO to bear its own costs and to pay those of Fruit of the Loom, Inc.

(1) OJ C 320, 28.9.2015.

## Judgment of the General Court of 6 July 2016 — LM v Commission

(Case T-560/15 P) (1)

(Appeal — Civil service — Officials — Survivor's pension — Articles 18 and 27 of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations — Article 25 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights — Right of the divorced spouse of the deceased official — Maintenance paid by the deceased official)

(2016/C 305/46)

Language of the case: Italian

## **Parties**

Appellant: LM (Ispra, Italy) (represented by: L. Ribolzi, lawyer)

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission (represented by: G. Gattinara and F. Simonetti, acting as Agents, and by A. Dal Ferro, lawyer)

#### Re:

Appeal brought against the order of the European Union Civil Service Tribunal [confidential], and asking for annulment of that order.

## Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1) Dismisses the appeal;
- 2) Orders LM to pay the costs.
- (1) OJ C 414, 14.12.2015.

### Order of the General Court of 10 June 2016 — Klymenko v Council

(Case T-494/14) (1)

(Action for annulment — Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures adopted in view of the situation in Ukraine — Freezing of funds — List of persons, entities and bodies covered by the freezing of funds and economic resources — Inclusion of the applicant's name — Period allowed for commencing proceedings — Admissibility — Proof that inclusion on the list is justified — Manifestly well-founded action)

(2016/C 305/47)

Language of the case: English

#### **Parties**

Applicant: Oleksandr Klymenko (Kyiv, Ukraine) (represented by: M. Shaw QC, and I. Quirk, Barrister)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: A. Vitro and J.-P. Hix, Agents)

#### Re:

Application for annulment of Council Implementing Decision 2014/216/CFSP of 14 April 2014 implementing Decision 2014/119/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine (OJ 2014 L 111, p. 91) and of Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 381/2014 of 14 April 2014 implementing Regulation (EU) No 208/2014 concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine (OJ 2014 L 111, p. 33), in so far as they relate to the applicant.

#### Operative part of the order

- 1. Council Implementing Decision 2014/216/CFSP of 14 April 2014 implementing Decision 2014/119/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine, and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 381/2014 of 14 April 2014 implementing Regulation (EU) No 208/2014 concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine are annulled in so far as they relate to Mr Oleksandr Klymenko.
- 2. The Council of the European Union shall bear its own costs and pay those incurred by Mr Klymenko.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 292, 1.9.2014.