

Order of the General Court of 15 January 2018 — ArcelorMittal Belval & Differdange and ThyssenKrupp Steel Europe v ECHA

(Case T-762/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Access to documents — Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 — Documents held by the ECHA — Request relating to documents and to the identity of an initial requestor of access to information of a registrant of substances under Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 — Partial refusal of access — Withdrawal of the decision refusing access — No need to adjudicate)

(2018/C 094/34)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: ArcelorMittal Belval & Differdange SA (Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg) and ThyssenKrupp Steel Europe AG (Duisburg, Germany) (represented by: H. Scheidmann and M. Kottmann, lawyers)

Defendant: European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) (represented: initially by M. Heikkilä, C. Buchanan and E. Maurage, and subsequently by M. Heikkilä, C. Buchanan and W. Broere, acting as Agents, and by G. Gilmore, Barrister)

Re:

Application based on Article 263 TFEU and seeking annulment of Decision ATD/52/2016 of the ECHA of 26 September 2016, notified to the applicants on 28 September 2016, which granted partial access to the requested documents regarding an earlier application for access to documents held by the ECHA.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the action.*
2. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the application for leave to intervene made by the European Medicines Agency (EMA).*
3. *The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) shall, in addition to bearing its own costs, pay those incurred by ArcelorMittal Belval & Differdange SA and ThyssenKrupp Steel Europe AG.*
4. *The EMA shall bear its own costs relating to the application for leave to intervene.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 14, 16.1.2017.

Order of the General Court of 22 January 2018 — Cristalfarma v EUIPO – Novartis (ILLUMINA)

(Case T-157/17) ⁽¹⁾

(EU trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for EU word mark ILLUMINA — Revocation of the contested decision — Action rendered devoid of purpose — No need to adjudicate)

(2018/C 094/35)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Cristalfarma Srl (Milan, Italy) (represented by: R. Almaraz Palmero, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: M. King and D. Gája, acting as Agents)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of EUIPO intervening before the General Court: Novartis AG (Basle, Switzerland)