

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

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

Pleas in law

- The Board of Appeal erred in law by failing to consider that the proof of use regarding sales, during the relevant period, in respect of the Spanish trade marks No 1795078 and No 2289074 — which required proof of use — is insufficient due to the lack or shortage of such proof and, consequently, by stating that there is a likelihood of confusion between the marks on the part of consumers.
- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 4 June 2020 — Robert Klingel v EUIPO (MEN+)**(Case T-345/20)**

(2020/C 247/63)

*Language of the case: German***Parties**

Applicant: Robert Klingel OHG (Pforzheim, Germany) (represented by M. Zick, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: Application for European Union trade mark 'MEN+' — Application No 17 985 949

Contested decision: Decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 27 March 2020 in Case R 1906/2019-1

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision, in so far as the applicant is adversely affected;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Art. 7(1)(b), in particular read in conjunction with Art. 95 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 5 June 2020 — Freistaat Bayern v EUIPO (GEWÜRZSOMMELIER)**(Case T-348/20)**

(2020/C 247/64)

*Language of the case: German***Parties**

Applicant: Freistaat Bayern (Germany) (represented by: J. Altmann, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)