

Appeal brought on 27 December 2018 by Linak A/S against the judgment of the General Court (Fifth Chamber) delivered on 18 October 2018 in Case T-367/17: Linak v EUIPO — ChangZhou Kaidi Electrical

(Case C-821/18 P)

(2019/C 255/23)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Linak A/S (represented by: V. von Bomhard, Rechtsanwältin, and J. Fuhrmann, Rechtsanwalt)

Other party to the proceedings: European Union Intellectual Property Office

By order of 19 June 2019 the Court of Justice (Tenth Chamber) held that the appeal was inadmissible.

Appeal brought on 27 December 2018 by Aldo Supermarkets against the judgment of the General Court (Eighth Chamber) delivered on 25 October 2018 in Case T-359/17: Aldo Supermarkets v EUIPO — Aldi Einkauf

(Case C-822/18 P)

(2019/C 255/24)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Aldo Supermarkets (represented by: M. Thewes, avocat)

Other parties to the proceedings: European Union Intellectual Property Office, Aldi Einkauf GmbH & Co. OHG

By order of 4 June 2019 the Court of Justice (Sixth Chamber) held that the appeal was inadmissible.

Appeal brought on 15 April 2019 by Boudewijn Schokker against the order of the General Court (Eighth Chamber) delivered on 8 February 2019 in Case T-817/17 Schokker v EASA

(Case C-310/19 P)

(2019/C 255/25)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: Boudewijn Schokker (represented by: T. Martin and S. Orlandi, avocats)

Other party to the proceedings: European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)

Form of order sought

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- set aside the order of 8 February 2019 in Case T-817/17, *Schokker v EASA*;
- refer the case back to the General Court; and
- reserve the costs.

Grounds of appeal and main arguments

The appellant claims, first, that the General Court erred in law by dismissing the action on a ground that it had raised if its own motion and erroneously categorised as ‘manifest’. When it did so, the General Court infringed Article 126 of its Rules of Procedure and the appellant’s rights of defence.

The appellant submits, second, that the General Court erred in law by concluding that a verification of the grounds for the withdrawal of the offer of employment at issue was irrelevant, as an offer of employment can, in any case, be withdrawn at any moment without being subject to any conditions.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Finanzgericht Hamburg (Germany) lodged on 19 April 2019 — eurocylinder systems AG v Hauptzollamt Hamburg

(Case C-324/19)

(2019/C 255/26)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Finanzgericht Hamburg

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: eurocylinder systems AG

Defendant: Hauptzollamt Hamburg

Question referred

Is Council Regulation (EC) No 926/2009 of 24 September 2009 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain seamless pipes and tubes of iron or steel originating in the People’s Republic of China ⁽¹⁾ valid?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2009, L 262, p. 19.
