

Fifth, the appellant alleges that the General Court erred in law by interpreting the European Commission's obligation to state reasons in accordance with Article 296 TFEU in an overly extensive manner. Generally criticising several combined provisions of the delegated regulation, the General Court criticised the method of calculating contributions as opaque, despite recognising the confidential nature of competing institutions' data. According to the appellant, however, it should suffice that the method used, its purpose and scope are explained in the respective decision, with the result that persons who owe contributions can relate it to the relevant data which concern them. The appellant further alleges that the data of its numerous competitors are not relevant in that respect. According to the case-law, there are several examples where the confidential nature of competitors' data was protected without the regulations concerned being rejected. Finally, the General Court failed to apply its procedural rules concerning access to confidential information.

-
- (¹) European Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/63 of 21 October 2014 supplementing Directive 2014/59/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to ex ante contributions to resolution financing arrangements (OJ 2015 L 11, p. 44).
- (²) Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2014 establishing uniform rules and a uniform procedure for the resolution of credit institutions and certain investment firms in the framework of a Single Resolution Mechanism and a Single Resolution Fund and amending Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 (OJ 2014 L 225, p. 1).
- (³) Directive 2014/59/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms and amending Council Directive 82/891/EEC, and Directives 2001/24/EC, 2002/47/EC, 2004/25/EC, 2005/56/EC, 2007/36/EC, 2011/35/EU, 2012/30/EU and 2013/36/EU, and Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 648/2012, of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ 2014 L 173, p. 190).

**Order of the President of the Court of 5 October 2020 (request for a preliminary ruling from the
Verwaltungsgericht Köln — Germany) — Interseroh Dienstleistungs GmbH v Land
Nordrhein-Westfalen**

(Case C-353/19) (¹)

(2020/C 423/48)

Language of the case: German

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

(¹) OJ C 255, 29.7.2019.