

**Form of order sought by the appellant**

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- declare the present appeal admissible;
- set aside the judgment of the European Union Civil Service Tribunal of 21 July 2016, *HD v Parliament* (F-136/15);
- grant the appellant's claim for annulment made at first instance;
- order the Parliament to pay the costs of both instances.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the appeal, the appellant relies on two grounds.

1. First ground of appeal, alleging distortion of the facts and evidence, manifest error of assessment and infringement of Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data (OJ 2001, L 8, p. 1).
2. Second ground of appeal, alleging a failure to state reasons for the judgment under appeal.

---

**Action brought on 20 September 2016 — Vincent Villeneuve v Commission**

(Case T-671/16)

(2016/C 419/69)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Vincent Villeneuve (Montpellier, France) (represented by: C. Mourato, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the selection board for Open Competition EPSO/AD/303/15 (AD 7) of 5 November 2015 concerning the applicant;
- order the defendant to pay the costs of the present proceedings pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons, in that the contested decision does not explain the reasons why the applicant does not have sufficient professional experience in the field of the competition for his application to be admitted to the next stage of that competition.
2. Second plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment by the selection board, in that the verification of the minimum professional experience in the field of the competition which the selection board was initially required to conduct could not relate to the applicant's suitability for the vacancy and to the selection criteria set out in that regard given that the verification stage for the admission criteria takes place during the final stages of the competition.

3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Articles 27 and 29(1) of the Staff Regulations, Article 5 of Annex III to the Staff Regulations and paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 of the General rules governing open competitions and also procedural defects and a consequent manifest error of assessment.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of equal treatment of candidates with regard to the selection based on qualifications.

---

**Action brought on 22 September 2016 — Seigneur v ECB**

(Case T-674/16)

(2016/C 419/70)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Olivier Seigneur (Frankfurt am Main, Germany) (represented by: M. Vandebussche and L. Levi, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Central Bank

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

— declare the application admissible and well founded;

accordingly:

- annul the decision of the Chief Service Officer (CSO), adopted on 29 February 2016 under the authority of the management board and notified to staff on 11 March 2016, to exclude the applicant from the additional salary increase (ASI) exercise for the year 2016;
- annul the decision rejecting the special appeal dated 5 July 2016 and received on 13 July 2016;
- order the payment of compensation for the non-material damage sustained by the applicant consisting in the loss of a chance of obtaining an ASI in 2016 evaluated at EUR 52 920;
- order the payment of compensation for non-material damage assessed on an ex aequo et bono basis at EUR 15 000;
- order the defendant to pay all the costs.

**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 infringement of the principle of non-discrimination, Articles 12 and 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 51 of the conditions of employment of ECB staff, the right to career and promotion prospects as well as the principle of legal certainty.
  2. Second plea in law, alleging the inability of the Chief Services Officer to decide not to follow the procedure set out in Circular No 1/2011 of 14 February 2011 concerning additional salary increases in respect of the applicant.
  3. Third plea in law, alleging lack of consultation of the Staff Committee.
-