

**Appeal brought on 11 April 2017 by International Management Group (IMG) against the judgment of the General Court delivered on 2 February 2017 in Case T-381/15, IMG v Commission**

**(Case C-184/17 P)**

(2017/C 168/38)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* International Management Group (represented by: L. Levi, lawyer)

*Other party to the proceedings:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- Set aside the judgment of the General Court of 2 February 2017 in Case T-381/15;
- Consequently, grant the appellant the benefit of its forms of order sought at first instance as reviewed, and therefore:
  - annul the Commission's decision of 8 May 2015 denying IMG the status of an international organisation under the Financial Regulation,
  - order the defendant to pay compensation for the material and non-material harm estimated at EUR 28 million and EUR 1 respectively,
  - order the defendant to pay all the costs.
- Order the defendant to pay all the costs of the two proceedings.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of its appeal, the appellant relies on five pleas in law, alleging:

- the first plea in law: infringement of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, practical provisions for the implementation of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court and the rights of the defence; infringement of the defendant's duty to state reasons; infringement of the first court's obligation to state reasons and the distortion of the case;
- the second plea in law: infringement of the 2012 Financial Regulation and the Delegated Financial Regulation, a manifest error of assessment, infringement of the first court's obligation to state reasons, and distortion of the case;
- the third plea in law, infringement of the rights of the defence; infringement of the first court's obligation to state reasons, and distortion of the case;
- the fourth plea in law, infringement of the principle of proportionality; infringement of the first court's obligation to state reasons, and distortion of the case;
- the fifth plea in law, infringement of the principle of legal certainty; infringement by the first court of its obligation to state reasons, and infringement of Article 61 of the 2012 Financial Regulation.

Furthermore, the appellant disputes the decision of the General Court to reject its claim for damages as there were no errors.

Finally, the appellant criticises the decision of the General Court to declare an opinion from the Commission's Legal Service to be inadmissible and not to include it in the file.

---