

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Decision Ares(2015)5171539 of 18 November 2015 and Commission Decision Ares(2016) 220922 of 15 January 2016 in relation to the opposition procedures concerning the application for registration of 'ΧΑΛΛΟΥΜΙ' (HALLOUMI)/'HELLIM' (ΠΟΠ) (CY-PDO-0005-01243);
- declare the illegality of Articles 49, 50, 51 and 52 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012, and the inapplicability of those provisions in the case at hand, insofar as they do not provide for a system ensuring the respect of the fundamental rights of the Applicants;
- order the Commission to pay the costs of the action.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested Commission decisions are illegal insofar as they exclude the applicants from the procedure for the registration of Halloumi/Hellim as a protected designation of origin in the European Union.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested Commission decisions are illegal insofar as they breach the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that Articles 49, 50, 51 and 52 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 <sup>(1)</sup> are illegal and should be declared inapplicable insofar they do not provide for a system ensuring the respect of the fundamental rights of the applicants.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 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 L 343, p. 1)

---

## **Action brought on 8 February 2016 — Chanel v EUIPO — Li Jing Zhou and Golden Rose 999 (Representation of an ornament)**

**(Case T-57/16)**

(2016/C 118/40)

*Language in which the application was lodged: Spanish*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Chanel SAS (Neuilly-sur-Seine, France) (represented by: C. Sueiras Villalobos, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other parties to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Li Jing Zhou (Fuenlabrada, Spain) and Golden Rose 999 Srl (Rome, Italy)

### **Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Proprietor of the design at issue:* Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

*Design at issue:* Community design representation of an ornament — Community Design No 1 689 027-0001

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Third Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 18 November 2015 in Case R 2346/2014-3

#### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- declare the contested design invalid;
- order EUIPO, and any other parties or interveners liable to appear in the present proceedings in support of the contested decision, to pay the costs.

#### **Pleas in law**

- Infringement of Articles 5 and 6 of Regulation No 6/2002.

---

**Action brought on 15 February 2016 — Puma v EUIPO — Doosan Infracore (PUMA)**

**(Case T-62/16)**

(2016/C 118/41)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English*

#### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Puma SE (Herzogenaurach, Germany) (represented by: P. González-Bueno Catalán de Ocón, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Doosan Infracore Co. Ltd (Incheon, South Korea)

#### **Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Applicant of the trade mark at issue:* Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

*Trade mark at issue:* figurative mark containing the word element 'PUMA' — EU trade mark application No 11 376 209

*Procedure before EUIPO:* Opposition proceedings

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 4 December 2015 in Case R 1052/2015-4

#### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO and Doosan Infracore Co. Ltd. to pay the costs of the proceedings.

#### **Plea in law**

- Infringement of Article 8(5) of Regulation No 207/2009.
-