

**Pleas in law**

- Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
  - Infringement of Article 16(1)(a) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/625;
  - Infringement of Article 94(1) of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
  - Infringement of Article 97(1) of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
  - Infringement of Article 95(1) of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
  - Infringement of the principle of non-arbitrariness.
- 

**Action brought on 14 January 2020 – LG Electronics v EUIPO – Staszewski (K7)****(Case T-21/20)**

(2020/C 68/71)

*Language of the case: English***Parties***Applicant:* LG Electronics, Inc. (Seoul, South Korea) (represented by: R. Schiffer, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Miłosz Staszewski (Wrocław, Poland)**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO***Applicant of the trade mark at issue:* Applicant before the General Court*Trade mark at issue:* Application for European Union word mark K7 – Application for registration No 14 641 849*Procedure before EUIPO:* Opposition proceedings*Contested decision:* Decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 31 October 2019 in Case R 401/2019-1**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

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

**Plea in law**

— Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

---

**Action brought on 13 January 2020 — IB v EUIPO**

(Case T-22/20)

(2020/C 68/72)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

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

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the revocation decision of the appointing authority of 14 March 2019;
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

- Grounds for annulment concerning the definitive closure of the invalidity procedure. The applicant alleges, in this regard, misuse of power, maladministration and breach of the duties of impartiality, objectivity and neutrality.
  - Grounds for annulment concerning the disciplinary measure imposed. The applicant alleges, in this regard, procedural irregularity, infringement of Article 22 of Annex IX to the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union, misuse of power, failure to respect the confidentiality of the OLAF report for the points of enquiry closed without further action, upholding the allegations despite closure without further action and breach of the presumption of innocence. The applicant also alleges infringement of Article 10 of Annex IX to the Staff Regulations, breach of the rights of defence, manifest error of assessment of the criteria set out in Article 10 of Annex IX to the Staff Regulations and failure to state reasons.
-