

Nor did there occur the signs referred to in paragraph 6 of the guidelines, since the losses did not increase, but decreased. The stock inventories are not growing but diminishing. The debt did not mount, but declined. And the interest charges did not rise, but significantly fell between 2002 and 2003.

The applicant also claims that the prohibition at issue from making payment of the aid of EUR 800 000, granted in 2003 within a programme of regional aid approved by the Commission, infringes the principle of protection of legitimate expectations.

On that point, it is asserted that the prohibition of actual payment of the aid has the same negative effect on the firm's balance sheet of profits and losses as a decision ordering repayment, with the sole difference that in the present case no interest payments are incurred.

The aid was approved by the Commission and Chupa Chups had no reason to believe that it was not eligible for that aid. If the regional aid had not existed, decisions on investment might have been different.

Order of the Court of First Instance (Fifth Chamber) of 6 September 2007 — easyJet v Commission

(Case T-300/04) ⁽¹⁾

(2007/C 247/67)

Language of the case: English

The President of the Court of First Instance (Fifth Chamber) has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 262, 23.10.2004.

Order of the Court of First Instance of 5 September 2007 — JAKO-O v OHIM — P.I. Fashion (JAKO-O)

(Case T-220/06) ⁽¹⁾

(2007/C 247/68)

Language of the case: English

The President of the Court of First Instance (First Chamber) has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 249, 14.10.2006.