

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the commitments do not expressly and clearly prohibit the parties from choosing inappropriate sites in discharging their obligation to provide access to new entrants, and the commitments provide no protection against the parties exercising bias in selecting which sites to provide access to.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the commitments provide for an insufficient and unclear procedure for arranging access to relevant sites, resulting in new entrants being unable to make effective use of the sites offered under the commitments.

---

**Action brought on 5 November 2020 — Hansol Paper v Commission**

**(Case T-693/20)**

(2021/C 19/77)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Hansol Paper Co. Ltd (Seoul, South Korea) (represented by: B. Servais and V. Crochet, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1524 of 19 October 2020 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and definitively collecting the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain heavyweight thermal paper originating in the Republic of Korea in so far as it relates to the applicant;
- order the Commission and any intervener who may be allowed to support the Commission to bear the costs of the proceedings.

**Plea in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on one plea in law, alleging that the Commission's methodology for the determination of the undercutting and underselling margins of the applicant violates Articles 3(1), 3(2), 3(3), 3(6) and 9(4) of the Basic Regulation.

---

**Order of the General Court of 28 October 2020 — Grange Backup Power v Commission**

**(Case T-110/18) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2021/C 19/78)

*Language of the case: English*

The President of the First Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 166, 14.5.2018.

---