

2. The second plea in law is based on a failure to state reasons, error as to the facts and the contested decision's breach of the principle of proportionality in the part thereof that rejects the accurate calculation of the financial effect of the identified failings (were they to be real) which was established by the Greek authorities, given the recommendations of the Conciliation Body to the Commission.

Action brought on 3 August 2017 — UE v Commission

(Case T-487/17)

(2017/C 357/24)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: UE (represented by: S. Rodrigues and A. Tymen, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the European Commission's decision dated 4 October 2016 rejecting the applicant's requests dated 14 October 2013;
- if needed, annul the European Commission's decision dated 26 April 2017 rejecting the applicant's complaint dated 5 January 2017;
- compensate the applicant for the moral and material prejudiced suffered by the fault of the defendant, evaluated at the sum of 120 000 euro (moral harm), 748 800 (loss of earnings), and 576 000 euro (loss of pension);
- compensate the applicant for the harm caused by the course and the outcome of the inquiry on the issue of harassment, evaluated at the sum of 50 000 euro;
- reimburse the applicant's incurred costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging violation of the principle of sound administration, violation of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, violation of the right to be heard and violation of the adversarial principle.
2. Second plea in law, alleging a manifest error of assessment, factual errors and a violation of Article 35, second sentence of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

Action brought on 7 August 2017 — Corra González and Others v SRB

(Case T-511/17)

(2017/C 357/25)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: José María Francisco Corra González (Madrid, Spain) and seven other applicants (represented by: C. de Santiago Álvarez and J. Redondo Martín, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- declare that, by adopting in its executive session of 7 June 2017 Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 establishing the resolution scheme in respect of the financial institution Banco Popular Español S.A., the Single Resolution Board ('the SRB') infringed EU law;
- consequently, annul that measure, and any subsequent implementing measures too that the SRB may have adopted, with effect *ex tunc*.

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 4 August 2017 — Imasa, Ingeniería y Proyectos v Commission and SRB**(Case T-516/17)**

(2017/C 357/26)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

Applicant: Imasa, Ingeniería y Proyectos (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 applicant claims that the Court should annul the following measures:

- Decision (SRB/EES/2017/08) of the Single Resolution Board agreed 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, 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 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*.