

Action brought on 15 May 2020 — Arias Mosquera and Others v SRB**(Case T-303/20)**

(2020/C 247/42)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

Applicants: José María Arias Mosquera (Madrid, Spain) and 28 other applicants (represented by: P. Rubio Escobar, R. Ruíz de la Torre Esporrín, A. Menéndez Menéndez and B. Fernández García, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Decision SRB/EES/2020/52 of the Single Resolution Board of 17 March 2020 determining whether compensation needs to be granted to the shareholders and creditors in respect of Banco Popular Español S.A.
- order the defendant and the parties intervening in full or partial support of the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are those relied on in Case T-302/20, *Del Valle Ruiz and Others v Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 20 May 2020 — Molina Fernández v SRB**(Case T-304/20)**

(2020/C 247/43)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

Applicant: Laura Molina Fernández (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: S. Rodríguez Bajón and A. Gómez-Acebo Dennes, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should annul the contested decision.

Pleas in law and main arguments

This action is brought against Decision SRB/EES/2020/52 of the Single Resolution Board of 17 March 2020 determining whether compensation needs to be granted to the shareholders and creditors in respect of which the resolution actions concerning Banco Popular Español S.A. have been effected.

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

1. In the first place, the applicant submits that the Valuation 3 Report was not drawn up by a genuinely independent expert, as required by Article 20(16) to (18) of Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2014 establishing uniform rules and a uniform procedure for the resolution of credit institutions and certain investment firms in the framework of a Single Resolution Mechanism and a Single Resolution Fund and amending Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 (OJ 2014 L 225, p. 1).

2. In the second place, the applicant submits that the Valuation 3 Report is unlawful because the method of analysis used by Deloitte is incorrect, which led Deloitte to reach equally incorrect conclusions with seriously prejudicial effects on the applicant, who has unduly and unfairly been deprived of the compensation to which she is entitled.
3. In the third place, the basis of the Valuation 3 Report on Banco Popular's financial situation when it was put into resolution is incorrect.

Action brought on 26 May 2020 — Telefónica Germany v EUIPO — Google (LOOP)

(Case T-305/20)

(2020/C 247/44)

Language in which the application was lodged: German

Parties

Applicant: Telefónica Germany GmbH & Co. OHG (Munich, Germany) (represented by A. Fottner and M. Müller, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceeding before the Board of Appeal: Google LLC (Mountain View, California, United States)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the trade mark at issue: Applicant

Trade mark at issue: EU work mark LOOP — EU trade mark No 5 842 166

Procedure before EUIPO: Cancellation proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 24 March 2020 in Case R 281/2019-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- pay the costs arising from the court proceedings and the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of the defendant and of the other parties before the Board of Appeal, should such other parties join the litigation.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 59(1)(a) in conjunction with Article 7(1)(c) of Regulation) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
 - Infringement of Article 59(1)(a) in conjunction with Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
 - Infringement of Article 94(1) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Article 41(2)(a) and (c) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
-