

Order of the General Court of 9 June 2015 — Bayer MaterialScience v Commission(Case T-282/14) ⁽¹⁾

(State aid — Measures adopted by Germany in favour of electricity generated from renewable energy sources and of energy-intensive undertakings — Decision to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU — Adoption of the final decision after the action was brought — No need to adjudicate)

(2015/C 294/80)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Bayer MaterialScience AG (Leverkusen, Germany) (represented by: C. Arhold, L. Petersen, F.-A. Wesche, N. Wimmer and T. Woltering, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: T. Maxian Rusche and R. Sauer, acting as Agents, and by C. von Donat and G. Quardt, lawyers)

Re:

Application to annul in part Commission decision C (2013) 4424 final of 18 December 2013 to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU regarding measures implemented by the Federal Republic of Germany in favour of renewable electricity and of energy-intensive users (State aid SA.33995 (2013/C) (ex 2013/NN)).

Operative part of the order

1. There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the present action.
2. There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the application for intervention submitted by the EFTA Surveillance Authority.
3. Bayer MaterialScience AG shall bear its own costs and those incurred by the European Commission.
4. The EFTA Surveillance Authority shall bear its own costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 223, 14.7.2014.

Order of the General Court of 9 June 2015 — Advansa and Others v Commission(Case T-283/14) ⁽¹⁾

(State aid — Measures adopted by Germany in favour of electricity generated from renewable energy sources and of energy-intensive undertakings — Decision to open the procedure under Article 108(2) TFEU — Adoption of the final decision after the action was brought — No need to adjudicate)

(2015/C 294/81)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicants: Advansa GmbH (Hamm, Germany); Akzo Nobel Industrial Chemicals GmbH (Ibbenbüren, Germany); Aurubis AG (Hamburg, Germany); Cabb GmbH (Gersthofen, Germany); CBW Chemie GmbH Bitterfeld-Wolfen (Bitterfeld-Wolfen, Germany); CFB Chemische Fabrik Brunsbüttel GmbH & Co. KG (Brunsbüttel, Germany); Clariant Produkte (Deutschland) GmbH (Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany); Dow Olefinverbund GmbH (Schkopau, Germany); Dow Deutschland Anlagengesellschaft mbH (Stade, Germany); Dralon GmbH (Dormagen, Germany); Ems-Chemie (Neumünster) GmbH & Co. KG (Neumünster, Germany); Hahl Filaments GmbH (Munderkingen, Germany); ISP Marl GmbH (Marl, Germany); Messer Produktionsgesellschaft mbH Siegen (Sulzbach, Germany); Messer Produktionsgesellschaft mbH Salzgitter (Sulzbach); Nabaltec AG (Schwandorf, Germany); Siltronic AG (Munich, Germany); Trevira GmbH (Bobingen, Germany); Wacker Chemie AG (Munich); and Westfalen Industriegase GmbH (Münster, Germany) (represented by: C. Arhold, L. Petersen, F.-A. Wesche, N. Wimmer and T. Woltering, lawyers)