

Action brought on 29 December 2014 — Spokey v OHIM — Leder Jaeger (SPOKEY)**(Case T-846/14)**

(2015/C 065/70)

*Language in which the application was lodged: Polish***Parties***Applicant:* Spokey sp. z o.o. (Katowice, Poland) (represented by: B. Matusiewicz-Kulig, lawyer)*Defendant:* Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Leder Jaeger GmbH (Siegen, Germany)**Details of the proceedings before OHIM***Proprietor of the trade mark at issue:* The applicant*Trade mark at issue:* Community figurative mark containing the word element 'SPOKEY' — Community trade mark No 6 777 312*Procedure before OHIM:* Proceedings for a declaration of invalidity*Contested decision:* Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 29 October 2014 in Case R 525/2014-4**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- if necessary, amend the contested decision insofar as it refers to specific goods within Class 18;
- order OHIM to pay the costs.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Articles 8(1)(b), 75 and 76 of Regulation No 207/2009;
- Infringement of rule 50 of Commission Regulation No 2868/95.

Action brought on 2 January 2015 — Ipatau v Council**(Case T-2/15)**

(2015/C 065/71)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Vadzim Ipatau (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: M. Michalaukas, lawyer)*Defendant:* Council of the European Union**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul Council Decision 2014/750/CFSP of 30 October 2014 amending Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;

- annul Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1159/2014 of 30 October 2014 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus, in so far as it concerns the applicant;
- order the Council to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law which are essentially identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-693/13 *Mikhalchanka v Council* ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2014 C 93, p. 25.

Action brought on 6 January 2015 — K-Swiss v OHIM (Parallel stripes on a shoe)

(Case T-3/15)

(2015/C 065/72)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: K-Swiss, Inc. (Westlake Village, California, United States) (represented by: R. Niebel, and M. Hecht, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)

Details of the proceedings before OHIM

Trade mark at issue: International registration designating the European Union in respect of the figurative mark (Representation of five parallel stripes placed on the side of a sport shoe) — International registration No 932 758

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of OHIM of 30 October 2014 in Case R 1093/2014-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the contested decision;
- Order OHIM to pay the costs.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Articles 7(1)(b) and 76 of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 8 January 2015 — Beiersdorf v OHIM (Q10)

(Case T-4/15)

(2015/C 065/73)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Beiersdorf AG (Hamburg, Germany) (represented by: A. Renck and J. Fuhrmann, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)