

**Action brought on 2 July 2020 — KR v Commission****(Case T-408/20)**

(2020/C 279/65)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* KR (represented by: S. Orlandi and T. Martin, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of 25 October 2019 to no longer regard the applicant's child as being his dependent child within the meaning of Article 2 of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations;
- order the Commission to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies on a single plea in law alleging that the Commission misconstrued, first, the concept of dependent child referred to in Article 2 of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and, second, revised Conclusion No 223/04 of 30 January 2013 of the Heads of Administration of the European Union.

---

**Action brought on 3 July 2020 — KS v Frontex****(Case T-409/20)**

(2020/C 279/66)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* KS (represented by: N. de Montigny, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Border and Coast Guard Agency**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the dismissal decision of 30 August 2019 and, in so far as necessary, the express decision rejecting the complaint dated 23 March 2020;
- annul the decision rejecting the request for assistance and compensation dated 13 February 2020;
- order the defendant to pay compensation for non-contractual liability, set at EUR 250 000;
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action against the decision to terminate his contract as a member of the contract staff, the applicant relies on six pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging a failure to state reasons and infringement of the right to be heard.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the status of 'informer' provided for in Articles 21a(3) and 22a(3) of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union ('the Staff Regulations').
3. Third plea in law, alleging abuse of process.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to a fair hearing, specifically the rights of the defence, the presumption of innocence, the duty of care and the duty of impartiality, neutrality and objectivity, alleging a failure to carry out an investigation in order to establish whether the grounds for the breach of trust were genuine and justified, and alleging inequality between agents.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging breach of the duty to provide assistance and the duty to have regard for the welfare of officials, the duty of sound administration and infringement of the principle of proportionality.

In support of the action against the decision rejecting his request for assistance, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging a failure to state reasons and infringement of the right to be heard.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the status of 'informer' provided for in Articles 21a(3) and 22a(3) of the Staff Regulations.
3. Third plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment.

In support of the action against the decision rejecting his claim for compensation, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging breach of Article 26 of the Staff Regulations and of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC (OJ 2018 L 295, p. 39).
2. Second plea in law, alleging breach of the duty to have regard for the welfare of officials and of sound administration in connection with any agent's well-being at work and working conditions.
3. Third plea in law, alleging breach of Articles 21a(3) and 22a(3) of the Staff Regulations, and breach of the duty to provide assistance, the duty to have regard for the welfare of officials and the duty of sound administration.

---

**Action brought on 3 July 2020 — Esteves Lopes Granja v EUIPO — Instituto dos Vinhos do Douro e do Porto (PORTWO GIN)**

**(Case T-417/20)**

(2020/C 279/67)

*Language in which the application was lodged: Portuguese*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Joaquim José Esteves Lopes Granja (Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal) (represented by: O. Santos Costa, lawyer)

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

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Instituto dos Vinhos do Douro e do Porto, IP (Peso da Régua, Portugal)