

- order the European Union Intellectual Property Office to assent to the action for annulment brought by the company DOGG LABEL;
- declare invalid the Community trade mark 'JAPRAG' No 8 820 301 for all the goods in Classes 18 and 25, on the basis of Article 53(1)(a) of the EU trade mark regulation in conjunction with Article 8(1)(b) of that regulation.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 53(1)(a) of Regulation No 207/2009;
- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 31 July 2016 — Syriatel Mobile Telecom v Council
(Case T-411/16)
(2016/C 364/15)
Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Syriatel Mobile Telecom (Joint Stock Company) (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the applicant's application admissible and well-founded;
- as a consequence, annul Decision (CFSP) 2016/850 of 27 May 2016 and the subsequent measures implementing it, in so far as they relate to the applicant;
- order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the rights of the defence and of the right to effective judicial protection, provided for in Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ('ECHR'), in Article 215 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('TFEU') and in Articles 41 and 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons, in so far as the Council's reasoning does not meet the obligation on the institutions of the European Union laid down in Article 6 of the ECHR, Article 296 TFEU and Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

3. Third plea in law, alleging manifest error of assessment which the Council committed with regard to the applicant's involvement in the financing of the Syrian regime.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the contested measures restrict the applicant's fundamental rights in an unjustified and disproportionate manner, in particular its right to property, provided for in Article 1 of the First Additional Protocol to the ECHR and Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and its right to respect for its good name and reputation, provided for in Articles 8 and 10 of the ECHR.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the Council's Guidelines of 2 December 2005 on implementation and evaluation of restrictive measures (sanctions) in the framework of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (Council document 15114/05 of 2 December 2005).

Action brought on 31 July 2016 — Bena Properties v Council

(Case T-412/16)

(2016/C 364/16)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Bena Properties Co. SA (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the applicant's application admissible and well-founded;
- as a consequence, annul Decision (CFSP) 2016/850 of 27 May 2016 and the subsequent measures implementing it, in so far as they relate to the applicant;
- order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of its action, the applicant raises five pleas in law which are, in essence, identical or similar to those raised in Case T-411/16, *Syriatel Mobile Telecom v Council*.

Action brought on 31 July 2016 — Cham v Council

(Case T-413/16)

(2016/C 364/17)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Cham Holding (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union