

**Order of the President of the General Court of 15 April 2020 — Anglo Austrian AAB and Belegging-Maatschappij ‘Far-East’ v ECB**

(Case T-797/19 R-II)

**(Interim measures — Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 — Prudential supervision of credit institutions — Decision to withdraw authorisation as a credit institution — Further application — Article 160 of the Rules of Procedure)**

(2020/C 247/22)

Language of the case: German

**Parties**

*Applicants:* Anglo Austrian AAB AG, formerly Anglo Austrian AAB Bank AG (Vienna, Austria), Belegging-Maatschappij ‘Far-East’ BV (Velp, Netherlands) (represented by: M. Fischer, J. Willheim, M. Ketzer and O. H. Behrends, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Central Bank (represented by: C. Hernández Sasetta, E. Yoo and V. Hümpfner, agents)

**Re:**

Application based on Articles 278 and 279 TFEU seeking suspension of the implementation of the decision of 14 November 2019, ref: ECB-SSM-2019-AT-8, WHD-2019-0009, by which the European Central Bank withdrew the authorisation of Anglo Austrian AAB Bank AG as a credit institution from the date of notification of the decision.

**Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

1. Dismisses the application.
2. Reserves the costs.

---

**Order of the President of the General Court of 25 May 2020 — Isopix v Parliament**

(Case T-163/20 R and T-163/20 R II)

**(Application for interim relief — Public supply contracts — Provision of photography services — Application for suspension of operation of a measure — Partial manifest inadmissibility of the main action — Inadmissibility — Urgency — Prima facie case — Balancing of competing interests)**

(2020/C 247/23)

Language of the case: French

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Isopix SA (Ixelles, Belgium) (represented by: P. Van den Bulck and J. Fahner, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Parliament (represented by: K. Wójcik and E. Taneva, acting as Agents)

**Re:**

Applications under Articles 278 and 279 TFEU requesting, in Case T-163/20 R, suspension of the operation of the Parliament’s decision of 24 March 2020 informing the applicant that its tender for public contract COMM/DG/AWD/2019/854 had not been accepted and that the contract had been awarded to another tenderer; and that the General Court order the Parliament to produce the tender analysis report and, in Case T-163/20 R II, suspension of the operation of the Parliament’s decision of 17 April 2020 informing the applicant that its tender for public contract COMM/DG/AWD/2019/854 had been rejected on the ground that it did not fulfil the selection criteria relating to financial and economic standing.

**Operative part of the order**

1. Operation of the European Parliament's decision of 24 March 2020 informing Isopix SA that its tender for public contract COMM/DG/AWD/2019/854 had not been accepted and that the contract had been awarded to another tenderer is suspended.
2. The Parliament shall provide Isopix with a copy of the non-confidential version of the tender analysis report.
3. The application for interim relief in Case T-163/20 R II is dismissed as inadmissible.
4. The orders of 3 April 2020, *Isopix v Parliament* (T-163/20 R), and of 22 April 2020, *Isopix v Parliament* (T-163/20 R II) are rescinded.
5. Costs are reserved.

---

**Action brought on 17 April 2020 — FT and Others v Commission****(Case T-224/20)**

(2020/C 247/24)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicants:* FT and 22 other applicants (represented by: J.-N. Louis, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul the Commission's decision establishing the applicants' remuneration slip for the month of June 2019 inasmuch as it applies, for the first time, the new correction coefficients applicable to their remuneration, with retroactive effect as of 1 August 2018;
- order the Commission to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicants rely on two pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Articles 64 and 65 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union ('the Staff Regulations'), breach of the principle of equal treatment and a manifest error of assessment. The applicants submit, in that regard, that the Commission has failed to provide them with information enabling them to understand not only the reduction of the correction coefficient applied to their remuneration, but also the retroactive application which generates a particularly large debt.
  2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 85 of the Staff Regulations, of the principle of legal certainty and of the duty to have regard to the welfare of officials. The applicants submit that they that they could not have been aware of the exceptional reduction of the correction coefficient applied to their remuneration for the reference period with retroactive effect. In their opinion, as the conditions laid down by Article 85 of the Staff Regulations have not been met, the Commission cannot request repayment from them of several months' remuneration on the basis of the adjustment of the correction coefficient with retroactive effect.
-