

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are similar to those put forward in Cases T-478/17, *Mutualidad de la Abogacía and Hermandad Nacional de Arquitectos Superiores y Químicos v Single Resolution Board*, T-481/17, *Fundación Tatiana Pérez de Guzmán el Bueno* and *SFL v Single Resolution Board*, T-482/17, *Comercial Vascongada Recalde v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-483/17, *García Suárez and Others v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-484/17, *Fidesban and Others v Single Resolution Board*, T-497/17, *Sánchez del Valle and Calatrava Real State 2015 v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, y T-498/17, *Pablo Álvarez de Linera Granda v Commission and Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 4 August 2017 — Estévez Puerto and Others v Commission and SRB

(Case T-504/17)

(2017/C 347/47)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: José Ramón Estévez Puerto (Jerez de la Frontera, Spain) and 14 other applicants (represented by: B. Gutiérrez de la Roza Pérez, P. Rubio Escobar, R. Ruiz de la Torre Esporrín and B. Fernández García, lawyers)

Defendants: European Commission and Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should annul:

- Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 of the Single Resolution Board taken at its executive session of 7 June 2017 by which the resolution scheme regarding the institution Banco Popular Español S.A was adopted;
- Commission Decision (EU) 2017/1246 of 7 June 2017 endorsing the resolution scheme for Banco Popular Español, S. A.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are similar to those put forward in Cases T-478/17, *Mutualidad de la Abogacía and Hermandad Nacional de Arquitectos Superiores y Químicos v Single Resolution Board*, T-481/17, *Fundación Tatiana Pérez de Guzmán el Bueno* y *SFL v Single Resolution Board*, T-482/17, *Comercial Vascongada Recalde v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-483/17, *García Suárez and Others v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-484/17, *Fidesban and Others v Single Resolution Board*, T-497/17, *Sánchez del Valle and Calatrava Real State 2015 v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, and T-498/17, *Pablo Álvarez de Linera Granda v Commission and Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 4 August 2017 — Inverni and Others v Commission and SRB

(Case T-505/17)

(2017/C 347/48)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Inverni, SL (Madrid, Spain), Inverindesa, SL (Madrid) and Isaac Ignacio Fernández Fernández (Oviedo, Spain) (represented by: B. Gutiérrez de la Roza Pérez, P. Rubio Escobar, R. Ruiz de la Torre Esporrín and B. Fernández García, lawyers)

Defendants: European Commission and Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should annul:

- Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 of the Single Resolution Board taken at its executive session of 7 June 2017 adopting the resolution scheme regarding the institution Banco Popular Español S.A.;
- Commission Decision (EU) 2017/1246 of 7 June 2017 endorsing the resolution scheme for Banco Popular Español.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The pleas in law and main arguments are similar to those put forward in Cases T-478/17, *Mutualidad de la Abogacía and Hermandad Nacional de Arquitectos Superiores y Químicos v Single Resolution Board*, T-481/17, *Fundación Tatiana Pérez de Guzmán el Bueno and SFL v Single Resolution Board*, T-482/17, *Comercial Vascongada Recalde v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-483/17, *García Suárez and Others v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, T-484/17, *Fidesban and Others v Single Resolution Board*, T-497/17, *Sánchez del Valle and Calatrava Real State 2015 v Commission and Single Resolution Board*, and T-498/17, *Pablo Álvarez de Linera Granda v Commission and Single Resolution Board*.

Action brought on 8 August 2017 — Makhlouf v Council

(Case T-506/17)

(2017/C 347/49)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Rami Makhlouf (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: E. Ruchat, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

- Declare the applicant's action admissible and well-founded;
- In consequence, annul Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/917 of 29 May 2017 and its subsequent implementing acts, insofar as they concern the applicant;
- Order the Council of the European Union to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested acts infringe the applicant's rights of the defence, in particular his right to effective judicial protection, enshrined in Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), Article 215 TFEU and Articles 41 and 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the defendant has infringed the obligation to state reasons, since the reasoning provided does not satisfy the obligation on the EU institutions under Article 6 of the ECHR and Article 296 TFEU and 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
3. Third plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment committed by the Council as regards the involvement of the applicant in the financing of the Syrian regime.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the contested acts place an unjustified and disproportionate restriction on the fundamental rights of the applicant, in particular on his right to property, enshrined in Article 1 of the First Additional Protocol to the ECHR and Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, to respect for his reputation, under Articles 8 and 10(2) of the ECHR, to a presumption of innocence, enshrined in Article 6 of the ECHR and Article 48 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and his freedom of movement, guaranteed in Article 2(2) of Protocol No 4 to the ECHR.