

**Judgment of the General Court of 8 July 2020 — CA Consumer Finance v ECB**(Case T-578/18) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Economic and monetary policy — Prudential supervision of credit institutions — Article 18(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 — Administrative pecuniary penalty imposed by the ECB on a credit institution — First subparagraph of Article 26(3) of Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 — Continued breach of capital requirements — Negligent breach — Rights of defence — Amount of the penalty — Obligation to state reasons)*

(2020/C 329/31)

Language of the case: French

**Parties**

*Applicant:* CA Consumer Finance (Massy, France) (represented by: A. Champsaur and A. Delors, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Central Bank (represented by: C. Hernández Saseto, A. Pizzolla and D. Segoin, acting as Agents)

**Re:**

Application under Article 263 TFEU for annulment of Decision ECB/SSM/2018-FRCAG-77 of the ECB of 16 July 2018, taken pursuant to Article 18(1) of Council Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013 conferring specific tasks on the ECB concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions (OJ 2013 L 287, p. 63) and imposing on the applicant an administrative pecuniary penalty of EUR 200 000 for continued breach of the capital requirements laid down in Article 26(3) of Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 (OJ 2013 L 176, p. 1, and corrigenda OJ 2013 L 208, p. 68, and OJ 2013 L 321, p. 6).

**Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

1. Annuls Decision ECB/SSM/2018-FRCAG-77 of the European Central Bank (ECB) of 16 July 2018 in so far as it imposes on CA Consumer Finance an administrative pecuniary penalty of EUR 200 000;
2. Dismisses the action as to the remainder;
3. Orders CA Consumer Finance to bear its own costs;
4. Orders the ECB to bear its own costs.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 436, 3.12.2018.

**Judgment of the General Court of 8 July 2020 — Dinamo v EUIPO (Favorit)**(Case T-729/19) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(EU trade mark — Application for EU word mark Favorit — Absolute ground for refusal — No distinctive character — Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001)*

(2020/C 329/32)

Language of the case: German

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Dinamo GmbH (Basel, Switzerland) (represented by: C. Weil, lawyer)