

- as regards the application for compensation, the applicant argues that the decisions caused her non-pecuniary harm which cannot be remedied by the annulment of the contested decisions.
2. Second plea in law, concerning the decision of 26 April 2017, alleging [infringement] of Article 41 of the Charter committed by the defendant and breach of its obligation to state reasons and duty of care, in that it claims that the decision against which the applicant brought a claim has been annulled and the decision taken to open an enquiry, and in that it deduces therefrom that there is no need to grant her claim for compensation. The applicant is also of the view that she has shown that she has suffered separate harm which cannot be remedied by annulment of the contested decision. In her submission, the defendant therefore should not only have annulled the decision challenged by the claim but should also have made good that harm.

Action brought on 18 July 2017 — Eurosupport — Fineurop support v EIGE

(Case T-450/17)

(2017/C 357/20)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Eurosupport — Fineurop support Srl (Milano, Italy) (represented by: M. Velardo, lawyer)

Defendant: European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- set aside the contested decision of 8 May 2017 rejecting the applicant's tender in procedure EIGE/2017/OPER/04 'Female Genital Mutilation: Estimating Girls at Risk' and the subsequent decisions which assessed the bid of another tenderer as successful and which awarded the contract to that tenderer;
- order the defendant to pay damages suffered by the applicant with interest of 8 % or, in the alternative, compensation with interest of 8 %;
- order the defendant to pay the costs of these proceedings.

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 equal treatment, the principle of transparency, the principle to act with a certain care and the duty to respect confidentiality, and further alleging manifest error of appraisal.
2. Second plea in law, alleging inconsistency in the grounds of the evaluation decisions and infringement of the principle of proportionality in the assessment of the applicant's tender.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to good administration.

Action brought on 1 August 2017 — Portugal v Commission

(Case T-474/17)

(2017/C 357/21)

Language of the case: Portuguese

Parties

Applicant: Portuguese Republic (represented by: L. Inez Fernandes, M. Figueiredo, P. Estêvão, and J. Saraiva de Almeida, acting as Agents)