

Judgment of the General Court of 6 June 2018 — Arbuzov v Council(Case T-258/17) ⁽¹⁾

(Common foreign and security policy — Restrictive measures taken in view of the situation in Ukraine — Freezing of funds — List of persons, entities and bodies subject to the freezing of funds and economic resources — Maintenance of the applicant's name on the list — Obligation to state reasons — Manifest error of assessment)

(2018/C 249/34)

Language of the case: Czech

Parties

Applicant: Sergej Arbuzov (Kiev, Ukraine) (represented by: M. Mleziva, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: R. Pekař and J.-P. Hix, acting as Agents)

Re:

APPLICATION pursuant to Article 263 TFEU seeking annulment of Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/381 of 3 March 2017 amending Decision 2014/119/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine (JO 2017 L 58, p. 34), in so far as the applicant's name was included or maintained in the list of persons, entities and bodies subject to those restrictive measures.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Annuls Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/381 of 3 March 2017 amending Decision 2014/119/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Ukraine in so far as Sergej Arbuzov's name was maintained in the list of persons, entities and bodies subject to those restrictive measures;
2. Orders the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 213, 3.7.2017.

Judgment of the General Court of 6 June 2018 — Uponsor Innovation v EUIPO — Swep International (SMATRIX)(Case T-264/17) ⁽¹⁾

(EU trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for the EU word mark SMATRIX — Prior EU figurative mark AsyMatrix — Relative ground for refusal — Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 (now Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001) — Article 76 of Regulation No 207/2009 (now Article 95 of Regulation 2017/1001) — Extent of the examination to be carried out by the Board of Appeal — Failure to assess an item of evidence produced before the Opposition Division)

(2018/C 249/35)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Uponsor Innovation AB (Borås, Sweden) (represented by: A. Kylhammar, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: J. Ivanauskas, acting as Agent)