

Action brought on 17 January 2020 — IE v ECDC**(Case T-33/20)**

(2020/C 103/45)

*Language of the case: English***Parties***Applicant:* IE (represented by: L. Levi and A. Champetier, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the applicant's appraisal report for the year 2018;
- annul the decision of 7 October 2019, rejecting the applicant's complaint of 6 June 2019;
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging the breach by the defendant of Article 43 of the Staff Regulations and of Article 2.3 of ECDC Implementing Rule no 20 on appraisal of temporary agents of the ECDC.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the defendant committed manifest errors of assessment.
3. Third plea in law, alleging the defendant's breach of the duty of care.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging breach by the defendant of the applicant's right to be heard.

Action brought on 27 January 2020 — Chanel v EUIPO — Huawei Technologies (Representation of a circle containing two interlaced curves)**(Case T-44/20)**

(2020/C 103/46)

*Language in which the application was lodged: French***Parties***Applicant:* Chanel (Neuilly sur-Seine, France) (represented by: J. Passa, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd (Shenzhen, China)**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO***Applicant for the trade mark at issue:* Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal*Trade mark at issue:* Application for the EU figurative mark (Representation of a circle containing two interlaced curves) — Application for registration No 17 248 642

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 28 November 2019 in Case R 1041/2019-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision in so far as it considered that the signs at issue, in the position in which they appear in the application for registration, are not similar;
- annul the decision in so far as it refused as a matter of principle to compare those signs where the sign, covered by the application for registration at issue, was rotated 90 degrees compared to the direction in which it appeared in the application for registration;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of article 8(1)(b) and (5) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and the Council.

Action brought on 3 February 2020 — Enosi Mastichoparagogon Chiou v EUIPO (MASTIHACARE)

(Case T-60/20)

(2020/C 103/47)

Language of the case: Greek

Parties

Applicant: Enosi Mastichoparagogon Chiou (Chios, Greece) (represented by: A-E. Malami, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: Application for international registration designating the European Union of the word mark MASTIHACARE — Application for registration No 1388895;

Contested decision: Decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 25 November 2019 in Case R 692/2019-1

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- admit the present action;
- annul the contested decision;
- permit the registration under No 1388895 of the international trade mark 'MASTIHACARE' designating the EU, for all goods in Class 3;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs under Article 190(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court.