

2. The European Commission shall bear its own costs and pay those incurred by TMG Landelijke Media BV and Mr Menzo Willems.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 190, 8.6.2015.

Order of the General Court of 11 January 2016 — Oase v OHIM — Compo France (AlGo)
(Case T-300/15) ⁽¹⁾
(Community trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Withdrawal of the opposition — No need to adjudicate)
(2016/C 098/59)
Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Oase GmbH (Hörstel, Germany) (represented by: T. Weeg, lawyer)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: H. Kunz, acting as Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM, intervener before the General Court: Compo France SAS (Roche-Lez-Beaupré, France) (represented by: J. Meyer, lawyer)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the First Board of Appeal of OHIM of 11 February 2015 (Case R 1409/2013-1) concerning opposition proceedings between Compo France SAS and Oase GmbH.

Operative part of the order

1. There is no longer any need to adjudicate in the action.
2. Oase GmbH shall bear its own costs and shall pay the costs incurred by the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM). Compo France SAS shall bear its own costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 262, 10.8.2015.

Action brought on 15 December 2015 — Blaž Jamnik and Blaž v Parliament
(Case T-726/15)
(2016/C 098/60)
Language of the case: Slovenian

Parties

Applicants: Jožica Blaž Jamnik (Ljubljana, Slovenia) and Brina Blaž (Ljubljana) (represented by: D. Mihevc, lawyer)

Defendant: European Parliament

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

— declare that the selection of the tenderer in the procedure INLO.AO-2013-051-LUX-UGIMBI-06 is unlawful;

- annul the selection of the tenderer;
- select the applicants as the best tenderer;
- in the alternative, award the applicants damages amounting to EUR 3 852 384,60 in the event that they are not selected as the best tenderer in the procedure INLO.AO-2013-051-LUX-UGIMBI-06;
- reimburse the applicants' costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants rely on two pleas in law.

1. First plea in law: infringement of Article 113 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 ⁽¹⁾

According to the applicants, the selection of the best tenderer was made in breach of Article 113 of the regulation in question, since the predetermined criteria set out in the tender specifications were not taken into consideration.

2. Second plea in law: the selection procedure was conducted unlawfully

In that regard, the applicants assert that none of the plans, graphic documentation and statistical calculations which they appended to their tender was examined, since they were not forwarded by the office in Ljubljana for the decision in Luxembourg.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union and repealing Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 (OJ 2012 L 298, p. 1).

Appeal brought on 18 December 2015 by DI against the order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 15 October 2015 in Case F-113/13 DI v EASO

(Case T-730/15 P)

(2016/C 098/61)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: DI (Bucharest, Romania) (represented by: I. Vlaic and G. Iliescu, lawyers)

Other party to the proceedings: European Asylum Support Office (EASO)

Form of order sought by the appellant

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- annul in its entirety the order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 15 October 2015 in case F-113/13;
- admit the current appeal;
- annul the EASO decision to dismiss the appellant, and consequently to oblige EASO to annul all legal effects of the said decision and to re-do the factual status accordingly;
- oblige the EASO to pay the appellant the amount of EUR 90 000 as material damages, and the amount of EUR 500 000 as moral damages; and
- oblige EASO to pay all costs of the appellant related to the legal representation in front of the Civil Service Tribunal concerning the case F-113/13, and related to the present appeal.