

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- declare invalid, correcting the grounds as necessary, the European Union design of Easy Sanitary Solutions BV;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea(s) in law

- Infringement of Article 64 of Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002;
- Infringement of Article 63(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002;
- Infringement of Article 6 of Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002;
- Infringement of Article 5 of Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002.

**Action brought on 29 May 2020 — Electrodomesticos Taurus v EUIPO — Shenzhen Aukey
E-Business (AICOOK)**

(Case T-328/20)

(2020/C 240/43)

Language in which the application was lodged: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Electrodomesticos Taurus, SL (Oliana, Spain) (represented by: E. Manresa Medina, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Shenzhen Aukey E-Business 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 registration of the EU word mark AICOOK No 17 174 236

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 23 March 2020 in Case R 2212/2019-5

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- declare the use of the opposing trade mark to have been established in relation to 'Food processors' in Class 7;
- refuse registration of trade mark No 17 174 236 on account of its similarity to the opposing mark;
- and, subsidiarily, to avoid registration of that trade mark, declare that the use of the opposing trade mark has been established in relation to 'Food processors' in Class 7;

- order EUIPO's Opposition Division to adopt a decision in relation to opposition B 3006619 (MUE No 17 174 236 AICOOK) finding that the use of the opposing trade mark has been established in relation to 'Food processors' in Class 7.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 47(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 30 May 2020 — Hypo Vorarlberg Bank v SRB

(Case T-336/20)

(2020/C 240/44)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Hypo Vorarlberg Bank AG (Bregenz, Austria) (represented by: G. Eisenberger and A. Brenneis, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board (SRB)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the Single Resolution Board of 19 March 2020 on the calculation of the 2016 ex-ante contributions due by Banco Cooperativo Español S.A., Hypo Vorarlberg Bank AG (formerly: Vorarl-berger Landes- und Hypothekbank AG), and Portigon AG to the Single Resolution Fund (SRB/ES/2020/16), including the annexes thereto, and in any event in so far as that decision, including the annexes thereto, concerns the contribution to be paid by the applicant;
- order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on four pleas in law which are, in essence, identical or similar to those relied on in Case T-479/19; *Hypo Vorarlberg Bank v SRB*. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2019 C 305, p. 58.

Action brought on 2 June 2020 — Portigon v SRB

(Case T-339/20)

(2020/C 240/45)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Portigon AG (Düsseldorf, Germany) (represented by: D. Bliesener, V. Jungkind and F. Geber, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board (SRB)