

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