

- 
- In its reasoning, the Board of Appeal overlooked the fact that it imputed to the contested mark a meaning which, in any case, it did not have in 2009, on account of the fact that the designation showed no connection in particular to the registered goods and services;
  - The mark at issue therefore has a distinctive character and is not descriptive of the registered goods and services.

---

**Order of the General Court of 10 June 2016 — British Telecommunications v Commission**

**(Case T-456/12) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2016/C 314/47)

*Language of the case: English*

The President of the Fourth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 379, 8.12.2012.

---

**Order of the General Court of 10 June 2016 — Virgin Media v Commission**

**(Case T-460/12) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2016/C 314/48)

*Language of the case: English*

The President of the Fourth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 379, 8.12.2012.

---

**Order of the General Court of 16 June 2016 — Golparvar v Council**

**(Case T-176/15) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2016/C 314/49)

*Language of the case: English*

The President of the Seventh Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 221, 6.7.2015.

---