

2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of essential procedural requirements.
 - First, the Bureau is alleged to have adopted its decision without complying with the rules imposed under Article 223 TFEU.
 - Secondly, insufficient reasons are stated for the Bureau's decision and it is thus in breach of the obligation to state reasons provided for in the second paragraph of Article 296 TFEU and in Article 41(2)(c) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of acquired rights and future entitlements and a failure to comply with the principle of legitimate expectations.
 - First, the Bureau's decision infringes the acquired rights and future entitlements resulting both from general principles of law and from the Statute, which expressly requires that those rights and entitlements be maintained 'in full' (Article 27).
 - Secondly, the Bureau's decision fails to comply with the principle of legitimate expectations.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging failure to comply with the principle of proportionality and with the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination.
 - First, the interferences with the applicant's rights are disproportionate in relation to the objectives pursued by the Bureau's decision.
 - Secondly, the Bureau's decision must be declared inapplicable on the grounds that it fails to comply with the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging failure to comply with the principle of legal certainty and as to a lack of transitional measures.
 - First, the Bureau's decision fails to comply with the principle of legal certainty inasmuch as it is unlawfully coupled with retroactive effects.
 - Secondly, the Bureau's decision fails to comply with the principle of legal certainty inasmuch as it failed to provide for transitional measures.

Action brought on 30 October 2019 — Dinamo v EUIPO (Favorit)

(Case T-729/19)

(2019/C 423/84)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Dinamo GmbH (Basel, Switzerland) (represented by: C. Weil, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: Application for the European Union word mark Favorit — Application for registration No 17 924 051

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 18 September 2019 in Case R 985/2019-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- uphold the appeal;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Order of the General Court of 26 September 2019 — VL and Others v Parliament

(Case T-183/18) ⁽¹⁾

(2019/C 423/85)

Language of the case: English

The President of the First Chamber, Extended Composition, has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 166, 14.5.2018.

Order of the General Court of 26 September 2019 — YP v Commission

(Case T-562/18) ⁽¹⁾

(2019/C 423/86)

Language of the case: French

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 399, 5.11.2018.
