- 3. Orders M/S. Indeutsch International and the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) to pay, in addition to their own costs, those incurred by 135 Kirkstall, Inc., formerly Crafts Americana Group, Inc., in relation to the cross-claim and the proceedings before the Board of Appeal;
- 4. Orders 135 Kirkstall, formerly Crafts Americana Group, to bear its own costs relating to the main action.

(1) OJ C 137, 27.4.2020.

# Judgment of the General Court of 13 October 2021 — JK v Commission

(Case T-219/20) (1)

(Civil service — Officials — Commission staff working for the EEAS — Request for assistance — Article 24 of the Staff Regulations — Implied decision rejecting the request — Decision rejecting the complaint — Article 90 of the Staff Regulations — Competent Appointing Authority — Principle of sound administration)

(2021/C 490/41)

Language of the case: French

#### **Parties**

Applicant: JK (represented by: N. de Montigny, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: T. Bohr and T. Lilamand, acting as Agents)

## Re:

Application under Article 270 TFEU seeking annulment of the Commission's implied decision of 5 June 2019 rejecting the applicant's request for assistance brought under Article 24 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and of its decision of 6 January 2020 rejecting the applicant's complaint

## Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Annuls the implied decision of the European Commission of 5 June 2019 rejecting JK's request for assistance brought under Article 24 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and its decision of 6 January 2020 rejecting the applicant's complaint;
- 2. Orders the Commission to bear, in addition to its own costs, those incurred by JK.

(1) OJ C 209, 22.6.2020.

Judgment of the General Court of 13 October 2021 — Sedus Stoll v EUIPO — Kappes (Sedus ergo+)

(Case T-429/20) (1)

(EU trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for EU word mark Sedus ergo+ — Earlier national word mark ERGOPLUS — Relative ground for refusal — No likelihood of confusion — Article 8 (1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 (now Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001))

(2021/C 490/42)

Language of the case: German

#### **Parties**

Applicant: Sedus Stoll AG (Dogern, Germany) (represented by: M. Goldmann and J. Thomsen, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: M. Fischer, D. Hanf and M. Eberl, acting as Agents)