

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO and eventually the intervener to bear the costs of these proceedings.

**Plea in law**

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

---

**Action brought on 13 June 2020 — EFFAS v EUIPO — CFA Institute**  
**(CEFA Certified European Financial Analyst)**

**(Case T-369/20)**

(2020/C 255/43)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* European Federation of Financial Analysts' Societies (EFFAS) (Frankfurt am Main, Germany) (represented by: S. Merico and G. Macías Bonilla, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* CFA Institute (Charlottesville, Virginia, United States)

**Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Applicant of the trade mark at issue:* Applicant before the General Court

*Trade mark at issue:* Application for European Union word mark CEFA Certified European Financial Analyst — Application for registration No 14 902 341

*Procedure before EUIPO:* Opposition proceedings

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 31 March 2020 in Case R 1082/2019-5

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

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

**Plea in law**

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

---

**Action brought on 11 June 2020 — KL v EIB**

**(Case T-370/20)**

(2020/C 255/44)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* KL (represented by L. Levi and A. Champetier, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Investment Bank

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- declare the present action admissible and well founded;

Consequently,

- annul the EIB's decisions of 8 February and 8 March 2019 declaring the applicant fit to work and absent without justification since 18 February 2019;
- in so far as is necessary, annul the decision of the President of the EIB of 16 March 2020 confirming the findings of the Conciliation Board and, therefore, the decisions of 8 February and 8 March 2019;

Accordingly,

- order the defendant to make retrospective payment of the invalidity pension in principle from 1 February 2019 onwards;
- order the defendant to pay default interest on the invalidity pension payable since 1 February 2019 until such time as payment has been made in full, the default interest rate being the interest rate applied by the European Central Bank plus two percentage points;
- order the EIB to pay compensation in respect of the non-material damage suffered by the applicant;
- order the EIB to pay the costs in their entirety.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea, alleging infringement of Articles 46-1 and 48-1 of the Staff Pension Scheme Regulations and of Article 11(1) and (3) of the administrative provisions, as well as manifest error of assessment.
2. Second plea, alleging infringement of the duty to have regard for the welfare of staff.

---

### **Action brought on 15 June 2020 — KM v Commission**

**(Case T-374/20)**

(2020/C 255/45)

*Language of the case: German*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* KM (represented by: M. Müller-Trawinski, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the defendant's decision of 7 October 2019 in the form of the decision of the 'Autorité Investie du Pouvoir de Nomination (AIPN)' No R/627/19 of 20 March 2020, whereby the defendant refuses to grant the applicant a survivor's pension, and order the defendant, having regard to the interpretation of the law given by the General Court, to decide anew and to grant the applicant a survivor's pension;