

Operative part of the order

1. The application for interim measures is dismissed.
2. Costs are reserved.

Action brought on 27 February 2020 — Philip Morris Products v EUIPO (SIENNA SELECTION)**(Case T-130/20)**

(2020/C 175/39)

*Language of the case: English***Parties***Applicant:* Philip Morris Products SA (Neuchâtel, Switzerland) (represented by: L. Alonso Domingo, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO***Trade mark at issue:* Application for European Union word mark SIENNA SELECTION — Application for registration No 17 954 903*Contested decision:* Decision of the fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 18 December 2019 in Case R 1675/2019-5**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to bear its own costs and pay those of the applicant.

Pleas in law

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

Action brought on 9 March 2020 — FC v EASO**(Case T-148/20)**

(2020/C 175/40)

*Language of the case: Greek***Parties***Applicant:* FC (represented by: B. Christianós, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Asylum Support Office (EASO)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision of EASO No EASO/ED/2019/509 of 18 December 2019 rejecting the complaint brought by the applicant on 5 September 2019 under Article 90(2) of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union ('the Staff Regulations'),
- annul the decision of EASO of 7 June 2019 rejecting the withdrawal, dated 23 May 2019, by the applicant of her resignation of 1 March 2019,
- order EASO to pay the applicant, together with interest, the amount corresponding to the remuneration she would have received while remaining in the post she occupied at EASO, that is, from 1 June 2019 until her resumption of her duties at EASO, or otherwise until the end of her contract with EASO or until her recruitment to another post with a corresponding remuneration, amounting to EUR 7 534,03 per month (until 15 July 2019) and EUR 7 777,25 per month (from 16 July 2019),
- order EASO to pay the applicant the total amount of EUR 250 000 by way of compensation for the non-material damage and damage to health which she has suffered to date, and
- order EASO to pay all the costs incurred by the applicant.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested Decision No EASO/ED/2019/509 is vitiated for the following reasons:
 - infringement of the applicant's right to sound administration (Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; 'the Charter'), in view of the principle of impartiality, the duty of care and the principle of objectivity as well as the presumption of innocence (first ground for annulment as regards the first plea in law),
 - infringement of the applicant's right to have her interests taken into account by the administration, as deriving from the right to sound administration (Article 41 of the Charter) and from the duty to have regard for the welfare of officials (Article 24 of the Staff Regulations) (second ground for annulment as regards the first plea in law),
 - those unlawful practices and omissions on the part of EASO being vitiated by manifest error of assessment, error of law and inadequate reasoning (third ground for annulment as regards the first plea in law).
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested Decision No EASO/ED/2019/509 is vitiated for the following reasons:
 - defects resulting from manifest error of assessment, error of law and inadequate reasoning with regard, in particular, to the submission of resignation under Article 47(b)(ii) of the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants and the possible withdrawal thereof (first ground for annulment as regards the second plea in law),
 - infringement of the applicant's right to sound administration (Article 41 of the Charter) and of the duty to have regard for the welfare of officials (Article 24 of the Staff Regulations, applicable by analogy), in particular having regard to her right to have her interests taken into account by the administration (second ground for annulment as regards the second plea in law).

Action brought on 24 March 2020 — Tartu Agro v Commission**(Case T-150/20)**

(2020/C 175/41)

*Language of the case: Estonian***Parties**

Applicant: AS Tartu Agro (represented by: T. Järviste, T. Kaurov, M. Peetsalu and M. A. R. Valberg, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission