

- the decision of the Board of Directors of 11 December 2018 (Annex 3 to PV/19/01);
 - the decision of the Management Committee of 30 January 2019 (MC-018-ADM-20190130);
 - the note from the Personnel Directorate of 18 January 2019 (CS-PERS/HRPLC/DIR/2019-001/ABGS);
- order the defendant to pay all of the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants rely respectively, on the one hand, with regard to the decision of the Board of Directors of 18 July 2017, on two pleas in law and, on the other hand, with regard to the decisions of the Management Committee of December 2018 and January 2019, on four pleas in law.

With regard to the decision of the Board of Directors of 18 July 2017:

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of legal certainty.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of the protection of legitimate expectations and of acquired rights.

With regard to the decisions of the Management Committee of December 2018 and January 2019:

1. First plea in law, alleging the lack of competence of the author of the contested act and infringement of Article 18 of the rules of procedure.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the procedural guarantees under Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the right of consultation of the College of staff representatives.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality.

As regards the claim for compensation, the applicants claim payment of the difference in remuneration due, that is 1.2% since 1 January 2019 (including the impact of that increase on financial advantages) plus interest for late payment.

Action brought on 27 May 2019 — BV v Commission

(Case T-320/19)

(2019/C 246/39)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: BV (represented by: S. Orlandi and T. Martin, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of 17 September 2018 by which the interest generated on the capital representing his transferred pension rights was not returned to him;
- in any event, order the Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging the lack of a legal basis and of reasoning of the contested decision.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 7(6) of the general provisions for the implementation of Article 11(2) of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations adopted by the Commission.
3. Third plea in law, alleging unjust enrichment in favour of the Union caused by the allocation to the budget of the European Union of the amount deducted in respect of the capital appreciation.

Action brought on 27 May 2019 — El-Qaddafi v Council

(Case T-322/19)

(2019/C 246/40)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Aisha Muammer Mohamed El-Qaddafi (Muscat, Oman) (represented by: S. Bafadhel, Barrister)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Council Decision 2017/497/CFSP of 21 March 2017 amending Decision 2015/1333 CFSP concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya, in so far as it maintains the applicant's name on the list in Annexes I and III to Council Decision 2015/1333/CFSP of 31 July 2015 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya;