

# GENERAL COURT

## Judgment of the General Court of 8 November 2018 — Dyson v Commission

(Case T-544/13 RENV) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Directive 2010/30/EU — Indication by labelling and standard product information of the consumption of energy and other resources by energy-related products — Commission delegated regulation supplementing the directive — Energy labelling of vacuum cleaners — Essential element of an enabling act)*

(2019/C 4/27)

Language of the case: English

### Parties

**Applicant:** Dyson Ltd (Malmesbury, United Kingdom) (represented by: F. Carlin, Barrister, E. Batchelor and M. Healy, Solicitors, and A. Patsa, lawyer)

**Defendant:** European Commission (represented by: L. Flynn, K. Herrmann and K. Talabér-Ritz, Agents)

### Re:

Application pursuant to Article 263 TFEU seeking the annulment of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 665/2013 of 3 May 2013 supplementing Directive 2010/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to energy labelling of vacuum cleaners (OJ 2013 L 192, p. 1).

### Operative part of the judgment

*The Court:*

1. Annuls Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 665/2013 of 3 May 2013 supplementing Directive 2010/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to energy labelling of vacuum cleaners;
2. Orders the European Commission to pay the costs, including those relating to the proceedings on appeal before the Court of Justice.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 344, 23.11.2013.

## Judgment of the General Court of 25 October 2018 — KF v SatCen

(Case T-286/15) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Actions for annulment and for compensation — SatCen staff — Members of the contract staff — Jurisdiction of the EU judiciary — Common foreign and security policy — Article 24 TEU — Articles 263, 268, 270 and 275 TFEU — Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights — Equal treatment — Decisions 2014/401/CFSP and 2009/747/CFSP — SatCen's Appeals Board — Plea of illegality — Request for assistance — Manner in which the administrative investigation was carried out — Suspension — Disciplinary proceedings — Removal — Principle of sound administration — Requirement of impartiality — Right to be heard — Access to the file — Non-contractual liability — Premature claim for damages — Non-material damage)*

(2019/C 4/28)

Language of the case: English

### Parties

**Applicant:** KF (represented by: A. Kunst, lawyer, and N. Macaulay, Barrister)

*Defendant:* The European Union Satellite Centre (represented by: L. Defalque and A. Guillerme, lawyers)

*Intervener in support of the defendant:* Council of the European Union (represented by: F. Naert and M. Bauer, acting as Agents)

**Re:**

Action, first, pursuant to Article 263 TFEU for annulment of the decisions of the Director of SatCen of 5 July 2013 to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the applicant, to suspend the applicant and to reject her request for assistance and of 28 February 2014 to remove the applicant, and the decision of SatCen's Appeals Board of 26 January 2015 confirming those decisions and, second, pursuant to Article 268 TFEU seeking compensation for the harm allegedly suffered.

**Operative part of the judgment**

*The Court:*

1. Annuls the decision of the Appeals Board of the European Union Satellite Centre (SatCen) of 26 January 2015;
2. Annuls the decision of the Director of SatCen of 5 July 2013 suspending KF;
3. Annuls the decision of the Director of SatCen of 28 February 2014 removing KF;
4. Orders SatCen to pay KF the sum of EUR 10 000 as compensation for the non-material harm sustained by her;
5. Dismisses the action as to the remainder;
6. Orders SatCen to bear its own costs and to pay those incurred by KF;
7. Orders the Council of the European Union to bear its own costs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 302, 14.9.2015.

---

**Judgment of the General Court of 8 November 2018 — Lithuania v Commission**

(Case T-34/16) <sup>(1)</sup>

**(EAGF — Expenditure excluded from financing — Specific support for the bovine and ovine meat sectors — On-site inspections — Physical verification of the animals — Quality of the inspections — Inspection report — Flat-rate correction — Obligation to state reasons — Proportionality — One-off correction)**

(2019/C 4/29)

*Language of the case: Lithuanian*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* Republic of Lithuania (represented by: initially, D. Kriauciūnas, T. Orlickas and R. Krasuckaitė, and subsequently T. Orlickas and R. Krasuckaitė, acting as Agents)

*Defendant:* European Commission (represented by: A. Sauka and A. Steiblytė, acting as Agents)