

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 16 April 2018 (Case R 815/2017-4), relating to opposition proceedings between Laboratorios Indas and Intas Pharmaceuticals.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. *Dismisses the action;*
2. *Orders Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd to pay the costs.*

(¹) OJ C 294, 20.8.2018.

Judgment of the General Court of 24 October 2019 — CdT v EUIPO

(Case T-417/18) (¹)

(Action for annulment — Institutional law — Obligation to award the translation services required for EUIPO's functioning to the CdT — Termination of the arrangement between the CdT and EUIPO — Publication of a call for tenders for translation services — Plea of inadmissibility — No interest in bringing proceedings — No need to adjudicate in part — Partial inadmissibility)

(2019/C 432/49)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT) (represented by: J. Rikkert and M Garnier, acting as Agents)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: N. Bambara and D. Hanf, acting as Agents)

Re:

In the first place, an application based on Article 263 TFEU seeking annulment, first, of EUIPO's letter of 26 April 2018, inasmuch as it gives notice of EUIPO's intention not to extend beyond 31 December 2018 the arrangement concluded in 2016 with the CdT concerning translation services required for EUIPO's functioning, secondly, of EUIPO's letter of 26 April 2018, inasmuch as it informs the CdT of its intention to take the necessary precautionary steps to ensure the continuity of the translation services beyond 31 December 2018, in particular by publishing calls for tenders and, thirdly, of EUIPO's decision to publish in the *Official Journal of the European Union* a call for tenders for translation services under reference 2018/S 114 — 258472; in the second place, an application for an order prohibiting EUIPO from signing contracts in connection with that call for tenders; and in the third place, an application for a declaration that the publication of a call for tenders for translation services by an agency or any other body or office of the European Union is unlawful, where a founding regulation stipulates that translation services are to be provided by the CdT.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Declares that there is no longer any need to adjudicate on the application for annulment of the decision to terminate the arrangement concluded on 13 December 2016 between the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT) and the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO);
2. Dismisses the action as to the remainder;
3. Orders EUIPO to bear its own costs and to pay half of the costs of the CdT, including those relating to the interim proceedings in Case T-417/18 R.

(¹) OJ C 341, 24.9.2018.

Judgment of the General Court of 16 October 2019 — Palo v Commission

(Case T-432/18) (¹)

(Civil service — Members of the temporary staff — Pensions — Pension scheme — Severance grant — Article 12(2) of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations — Principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination — Legitimate expectations — Principle of good administration — Duty of care)

(2019/C 432/50)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Peeter Palo (Tallinn, Estonia) (represented by: L. Levi and A. Blot, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: B. Mongin and D. Milanowska, Agents)

Re:

Application based on Article 270 TFEU seeking, first, annulment of the Commission's decision of 5 October 2017 not to pay the applicant the severance grant provided for in Article 12(2) of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union, in the version resulting from Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1023/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union (OJ 2013 L 287, p. 15), and annulment of the Commission's decision of 10 April 2018 rejecting the applicant's complaint against that decision and, secondly, compensation for the material and non-material damage allegedly suffered by the applicant following those decisions.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Dismisses the action;
2. Orders Mr Peeter Palo to pay the costs.

(¹) OJ C 319, 10.9.2018.