

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Applicant of the trade mark at issue: Applicant

Trade mark at issue: EU word mark 'TURBO-K' — Application for registration No 13 458 039

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 14 July 2017 in Case R 2135/2016-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision and reject the objections to the registration of the mark in their entirety;
- order the payment of the costs incurred by the applicant in connection with this appeal.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 8(4) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 29 September 2017 — Aplicacions de Servei Monsan and Others v SRB

(Case T-675/17)

(2017/C 424/69)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Aplicacions de Servei Monsan, SLU (Mollet del Vallés, Spain) and 79 other applicants (represented by: M. Romero Rey and I. Salama Salama, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- On the basis of Article 263 TFEU, annul Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 of the Single Resolution Board (SRB) of 7 June 2017 adopting a resolution scheme in respect of the Banco Popular Español, S.A.;
- In accordance with the second subparagraph of Article 340 TFEU and Article 41(3) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, order SRB to pay to the applicants compensation for the harm suffered, in the following amounts:
 - i. Shareholders: the net financial value per Banco Popular share, which will be quantified precisely by means of further work on our expert report set out in Annex A.5, once we have been given the provisional and definitive valuations carried out by 'independent experts' as required under Article 20 of Regulation (EU) 806/2014 (findings of the expert report, Annex A.5.1, page 106);
 - ii. Holders of Tier 1 capital instruments: the amount corresponding to the nominal value of the bonds, at the date of resolution, and corresponding default interest as of that date up to the date on which the corresponding reimbursement is made (expert report, Annex A.5.2, page 105);

iii. Holders of Tier 2 capital instruments: the amount corresponding to the nominal value of the bonds, at the date of resolution, and corresponding default interest as of that date up to the date on which the corresponding reimbursement is made (expert report, Annex A.5.3, page 12);

— In accordance with Articles 133 and 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs of these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are similar to those put forward in Cases T-478/17, *Mutualidad de la Abogacía and Hermandad Nacional de Arquitectos Superiores y Químicos v Single Resolution Board*, T-481/17, *Fundación Tatiana Pérez de Guzmán el Bueno and SFL v Single Resolution Board*, T-482/17, *Comercial Vascongada Recalde v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-483/17, *García Suárez and Others v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-484/17, *Fidesban and Others v Single Resolution Board*, T-497/17, *Sánchez del Valle and Calatrava Real State 2015 v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, and T-498/17, *Pablo Álvarez de Linera Granda v Commission and Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 3 October 2017 — Minera Catalano Aragonesa and Luengo Martínez v Commission and SRB

(Case T-678/17)

(2017/C 424/70)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Minera Catalano Aragonesa, SA (Ariñotieruel, Spain) and Ángel Luengo Martínez (Zaragoza, Spain) (represented by: R. Montejo Pérez, F. Ferrara and F. Banti, lawyers)

Defendants: European Commission and Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

— Annul the decisions of 7 June 2017 of the Single Resolution Board (No SRB/EES/2017/08) and of the European Commission (No 1246);

— Order the Single Resolution Board and the European Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are similar to those put forward in Cases T-478/17, *Mutualidad de la Abogacía and Hermandad Nacional de Arquitectos Superiores y Químicos v Single Resolution Board*, T-481/17, *Fundación Tatiana Pérez de Guzmán el Bueno and SFL v Single Resolution Board*, T-482/17, *Comercial Vascongada Recalde v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-483/17, *García Suárez and Others v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-484/17, *Fidesban and Others v Single Resolution Board*, T-497/17, *Sánchez del Valle and Calatrava Real State 2015 v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, and T-498/17, *Pablo Álvarez de Linera Granda v Commission and Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 3 October 2017 — Grupo Villar Mir v SRB

(Case T-679/17)

(2017/C 424/71)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Grupo Villar Mir, SA (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: M. Romero Rey and I. Salama Salama, lawyers)