



Reports of Cases

ORDER OF THE GENERAL COURT (Ninth Chamber)

15 March 2022 *

(Rectification)

In Cases T-351/18 and T-584/18 REC,

Ukrselhosprom PCF LLC, established in Solone (Ukraine),

and

Versobank AS, established in Tallinn (Estonia),

represented by O. Behrends, lawyer,

applicants,

v

European Central Bank (ECB), represented by C. Hernández Saseta and G. Marafioti, acting as Agents, and B. Schneider, lawyer,

defendant,

supported by

European Commission, represented by A. Steiblytė D. Triantafyllou, and A. Nijenhuis, acting as Agents,

intervener,

THE GENERAL COURT (Ninth Chamber),

composed of M.J. Costeira, President (Rapporteur), M. Kancheva and T. Perišin, Judges,

Registrar: E. Coulon,

makes the following

* Language of the case: English.

Order

- 1 On 6 October 2021, the General Court delivered a judgment in *Ukrseľhosfrom PCF and Versobank v ECB* (T-351/18 and T-584/18, EU:T:2021:669).
- 2 In accordance with Article 164(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, it is necessary to rectify, in the version in the language of the case, an obvious inaccuracy found in paragraph 219 of that judgment.

On those grounds,

THE GENERAL COURT (Ninth Chamber)

hereby orders:

Paragraph 219 of the judgment, in the version in the language of the case, is to be read as

‘Thirdly, it should be noted, as observed by the ECB, that the FSA’s findings regarding breaches, which have not been properly challenged by the second applicant, had to be treated by the ECB as established facts and as not requiring, for that reason, a review by the ECB. Thus, the ECB rightly confined itself to verifying whether those breaches did indeed constitute grounds justifying the withdrawal of authorisation. That examination was carried out in paragraphs 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 of the decision of 17 July 2018.’

instead of as

‘Thirdly, it should be noted, as observed by the ECB, that the FSA’s findings regarding breaches, which have not been properly challenged by the second applicant, had to be treated by the ECB as established facts and as not requiring, for that reason, a review by the ECB. Thus, the Commission rightly confined itself to verifying whether those breaches did indeed constitute grounds justifying the withdrawal of authorisation. That examination was carried out in paragraphs 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 of the decision of 17 July 2018.’

Luxembourg, 15 March 2022.

E. Coulon
Registrar

M.J. Costeira
President