

— order the defendant to pay the applicant's costs.

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

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons

— The statement of reasons for including the applicant on the lists annexed to the contested measures does not meet the requirements of the second paragraph of Article 296 TFEU. It is vague and lacks detail. Reasons such as '*access to the Lukashenka family*' and '*procurement of lucrative contracts for his businesses*' as well as the ground that the applicant was supported by Mr Viktor Lukashenka are too general and vague. The claim that Bremino-Grupp OOO, in which the applicant in fact has a stake, received improper State support for the development of the '*Bremino-Orsha*' special economic zone or '*a number of financial and tax advantages*' is too imprecise to understand how the treatment of that economic zone differs from that of the other free economic zones existing in Belarus.

2. Second plea in law, alleging manifest errors of fact and assessment

— The defendant clearly proceeded on an incorrect factual basis. The applicant has never been an assistant of Mr Viktor Lukashenka. Neither the applicant nor the undertakings controlled by him have received any support from Mr Viktor Lukashenka. Bremino-Grupp OOO has never received any special advantage as a result of the alleged relations between its shareholders and the family of the Belarusian President. The applicant is also not the owner of Sohra Group OOO; he is only a minority shareholder. Moreover, Sohra Group OOO has not been granted any special distribution rights for Gulf and African States.

3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the applicant's rights of defence and his right to effective judicial protection

— The defendant failed to inform the applicant of the proposed listing and afforded him no opportunity to adduce evidence in order to rebut the allegations before the decision to impose restrictive measures against him was published.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the restrictive measures are disproportionate

— The contested measures constitute an unjustified and disproportionate interference with the applicant's fundamental rights, in particular his right to property, his right to pursue an economic activity and his right to respect for his reputation under Articles 16 and 17 of the Charter.

---

### **Action brought on 6 September 2021 — Bremino-Grupp v Council**

**(Case T-564/21)**

(2021/C 490/56)

*Language of the case: German*

#### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Bremino-Grupp OOO (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: A. Shmagin, lawyer)

*Defendant:* Council of the European Union

#### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

— annul Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2021/1002 of 21 June 2021 implementing Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Belarus (OJ 2021 L 219I, p. 70), and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2021/997 of 21 June 2021 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus (OJ 2021 L 219I, p. 3), in so far as those acts concern the applicant;

— order the defendant to pay the applicant's costs.

### Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons

- The statement of reasons for including the applicant on the lists annexed to the contested measures does not meet the requirements of the second paragraph of Article 296 TFEU. It is vague and insufficiently precise. First, it is not clear from the statement of reasons what State support the applicant supposedly received for the development of the Bremino-Orsha special economic zone. The statement of reasons relating to the grant of '*a number of financial and tax advantages and other benefits*' in favour of the applicant is also unclear since it is not possible to understand which advantages are meant. The claim that the shareholders of Bremino-Grupp OOO are '*the owners of Bremino-Orsha*' is simply false because it is legally impossible to be the owner of an economic zone. Furthermore, the allegation that all three of the applicant's shareholders belong to the '*inner circle of Lukashenka-related businessmen*' is too general and cannot constitute sufficient grounds for the imposition of sanctions.

2. Second plea in law, alleging manifest errors of assessment

- The defendant clearly proceeded on an incorrect factual basis and the assessment made was therefore wrong. The fact that the 'Bremino-Orsha' economic zone was established by presidential decree does not constitute an advantage for the applicant, since this procedure is provided for in Belarusian legislation when establishing economic zones. The tax advantages associated with the special economic zone are available to any investor. It is unclear how the defendant defines the specific inner circle of Lukashenka-related businessmen and on what basis it includes the applicant's shareholders in it. In addition, it is not clear from this reasoning how the applicant is concerned since it has not received any advantages in that regard. Nor has the applicant received any support from the President's son, Mr Viktor Lukashenka.

3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the applicant's rights of defence and its right to effective judicial protection

- The defendant failed to inform the applicant of the proposed inclusion in the lists at issue and afforded it no opportunity to defend itself and, if necessary, to adduce evidence in order to rebut the allegations before the decision to impose restrictive measures against it was published.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the restrictive measures are disproportionate

- The contested measures constitute an unjustified and disproportionate interference with the applicant's fundamental rights, in particular its right to property, its right to pursue an economic activity and its right to respect for its reputation under Articles 16 and 17 of the Charter.

---

### Action brought on 7 September 2021 — Steinbach International v Commission

(Case T-566/21)

(2021/C 490/57)

*Language of the case: German*

### Parties

*Applicant:* Steinbach International GmbH (Schwertberg, Austria) (represented by: J. Gesinn, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2021/957 of 31 May 2021 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature (OJ 2021 L 211, p. 48).

### Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law: by classifying the Mesh Lounge under heading 6306 90 00 of Part 2 of Annex I to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2658/87 of 23 July 1987 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff (OJ 1987 L 256, p. 1), the defendant changed the content of those tariff headings.