

In their view, the existence of conduct contrary to the above provision and, accordingly, the infringement of the principle of effective judicial protection are demonstrated sufficiently clearly by the judgments of the Court in Cases C-58/12 P *Groupe Gascogne v Commission* and C-50/12 P *Kendrion NV v Commission*. It should be noted in that regard that both companies were subject to the same decision imposing penalties as Kendrion and Groupe Gascogne. Like both those companies, they brought an action against the decision imposing penalties and, in proceedings before the General Court which are very similar, if not virtually identical, to those in respect of which the Court of Justice gave judgment in the two cases cited above, were faced with a failure on the part of the General Court to observe a reasonable time for adjudication.

Action brought on 28 January 2015 — CRM v Commission

(Case T-43/15)

(2015/C 089/52)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Applicant: CRM Srl (Modena, Italy) (represented by: G. Forte, C. Marinuzzi and A. Franchi, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1174/2014 of 24 October 2014 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications (Piadina Romagnola/Piada Romagnola (PGI)), published in the Official Journal of the European Union of 4 November 2014 (Volume L 316);
- order the Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The present action is brought against the registration of the protected geographical indication 'Piadina Romagnola/Piada Romagnola' with regard to the fact that the reputation enjoyed by handcrafted Piadina has been extended to cover Piadina produced on an industrial scale.

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement and incorrect application of Article 7(1)(f)(ii) and Article 8(1)(c)(ii) of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs (OJ 2012 L 343, p. 1).
 - The applicant claims, in that regard, that there is no evidence in the case which justifies the link to the geographical origin, and
 - that the reputation enjoyed by handcrafted Piadina has been extended to cover Piadina produced on an industrial scale.

2. Second plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment and a failure to conduct a proper preliminary investigation.
 - In that regard, the applicant argues that there has been a manifest error of assessment of the application for registration with regard to compliance with the requirements for publishing the application for registration of a geographical indication in relation to Piadina Romagnola, and
 - that there has been a failure to conduct a proper preliminary investigation, owing to a failure to assess the annulment, by the judicial authorities of a Member State, of the national rules on which the contested regulation is based.
 - The applicant also alleges infringement of the principle of sound administration.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights and of Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, on the ground of breach of the right to effective judicial protection.

Order of the General Court of 27 January 2015 — Hamas v Council

(Case T-702/14) ⁽¹⁾

(2015/C 089/53)

Language of the case: French

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 395, 10.11.2014.
