

Decision of the Examiner: Refusal of the application

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Dismissal of the appeal

Pleas in law: Breach of Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 14 August 2014 — Infocit v OHIM — DIN (DINKOOL)

(Case T-621/14)

(2014/C 351/33)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Infocit — Prestação de Serviços, Comércio Geral e Indústria, Lda (Luanda, Angola) (represented by: A. Oliveira, lawyer)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: DIN — Deutsches Institut für Normung eV (Berlin, Germany)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

— Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 4 June 2014 given in Case R 1312/2013-2.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Applicant for a Community trade mark: The applicant

Community trade mark concerned: The word mark 'DINKOOL' for goods in Classes 1-3, 5-7, 12, 16, 20 and 21 — Community trade mark application No 1 0465 946

Proprietor of the mark or sign cited in the opposition proceedings: The other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Mark or sign cited in opposition: International trade mark registration No 229 048 and earlier non-registered sign in Germany 'DIN'

Decision of the Opposition Division: Rejected the opposition in its entirety

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Annulled the contested decision and rejected the contested CTM application in its entirety

Pleas in law: Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) CTMR.

Action brought on 15 August 2014 — Lauritzen Holding v OHIM — IC Companys (IWEAR)

(Case T-622/14)

(2014/C 351/34)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Lauritzen Holding AS (Drøbak, Norway) (represented by: P. Walsh and S. Dunstan, Solicitors)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: IC Companys A/S (København, Denmark)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 2 June 2014 given in Case R 1935/2013-2.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Applicant for a Community trade mark: The applicant

Community trade mark concerned: The word mark 'IWEAR' for goods in Classes 18, 25 and 28 — Community trade mark application No 10 629 806

Proprietor of the mark or sign cited in the opposition proceedings: The other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Mark or sign cited in opposition: The earlier mark 'INWEAR' registered as CTM No 2 168 284

Decision of the Opposition Division: Partially upheld the opposition

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Dismissed the appeal

Pleas in law: Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) CTMR.

Action brought on 14 August 2014 — Loewe Technologies v OHIM — DNS International (SoundVision)

(Case T-623/14)

(2014/C 351/35)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Loewe Technologies GmbH (Kronach, Germany) (represented by: J. Pröll, lawyer)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: DNS International Ltd (Tortola, British Virgin Islands)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 12 June 2014 given in Case R 1625/2013-2.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Applicant for a Community trade mark: The other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Community trade mark concerned: The figurative mark in black and white containing the verbal elements 'SoundVision' for goods in Classes 9, 15 and 20 — Community trade mark application No 10 505 519

Proprietor of the mark or sign cited in the opposition proceedings: The applicant