



## Reports of Cases

### Order of the Court (Chamber determining whether appeals may proceed) of 7 October 2019 — L'Oréal v EUIPO

(Case C-588/19 P)

(Appeal — EU trade mark — Determination as to whether appeals should be allowed to proceed — Article 170b of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Request failing to demonstrate a significant issue with respect to the unity, consistency or development of EU law — Appeal not allowed to proceed)

1. *Appeal — Scheme for prior determination as to whether appeals should be allowed to proceed — Significant issue with respect to the unity, consistency or development of EU law — Inadequate or contradictory grounds — Request that the appeal be allowed to proceed failing to show the significance of the issue — Appeal not allowed to proceed*

*(Statute of the Court of Justice, Art. 58a; Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice, Art. 170b)*

*(see paras 10-12)*

2. *Appeal — Scheme for prior determination as to whether appeals should be allowed to proceed — Significant issue with respect to the unity, consistency or development of EU law — Request that the appeal be allowed to proceed failing to show the significance of the issue — Appeal not allowed to proceed*

*(Statute of the Court of Justice, Art. 58a; Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice, Art. 170b)*

*(see paras 13, 14, 18)*

3. *Appeal — Scheme for prior determination as to whether appeals should be allowed to proceed — Significant issue with respect to the unity, consistency or development of EU law — Incompatibility with the Court's case-law — Request that the appeal be allowed to proceed failing to show the significance of the issue — Appeal not allowed to proceed*

*(Statute of the Court of Justice, Art. 58a; Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice, Art. 170b)*

*(see paras 15-17)*

**Operative part**

1. The appeal is not allowed to proceed.
2. L'Oréal shall bear its own costs.