

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants rely, in essence, on a single plea in law, alleging that the contested acts are vaguely reasoned and significantly vitiated by manifest errors of assessment. According to the applicants, the restrictive measures adopted by the Council against them are unfounded in both fact and law. Moreover, the Council committed several irregularities, each capable of justifying the annulment of the contested acts.

Action brought on 24 August 2017 — Primart v EUIPO — Bolton Cile España (PRIMART Marek Łukasiewicz)

(Case T-584/17)

(2017/C 374/63)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Przedsiębiorstwo Produkcyjno-Handlowe ‘Primart’ Marek Łukasiewicz (Wołomin, Poland) (represented by: J. Skołodą, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Bolton Cile España, SA (Madrid, Spain)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Applicant of the trade mark at issue: Applicant

Trade mark at issue: EU word figurative mark in colours red, white and dark blue, containing the word elements ‘Primart Marek Łukasiewicz’ — Application for registration No 13 682 299

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 22 June 2017 in Case R 1933/2016-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO and the intervener to pay the costs of the proceedings, including the costs incurred before the Board of Appeal.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 2 August 2017 — Serra Noguera and Others v SRB

(Case T-592/17)

(2017/C 374/64)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Juan Carlos Serra Noguera (Sant Jordi de ses Salines, Spain) and 56 other applicants (represented by: R. García-Bragado Acín, lawyer)