

— For payment of all costs related to the present proceedings pursuant to Article 134(1) of the Rules of Procedure.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on one plea in law.

First and only plea in law, alleging that Syria has breached its contractual obligations under Articles 3.01 and 4.01 of the Syrian Healthcare Loan Agreement to make payment of the instalments under the Syrian Healthcare Loan Agreement as they have fallen due, and under Article 3.02 of the Syrian Healthcare Loan Agreement to make payment of default interest on each of the instalments due and not paid, accruing at the annual rate therein. Consequently, Syria is contractually obligated to pay all amounts due under Articles 3.01, 3.02, 4.01, 8.01 and 8.02 of the Syrian Healthcare Loan Agreement.

Action brought on 5 August 2017 — Imabe Ibérica v SRB

(Case T-544/17)

(2017/C 369/40)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Imabe Ibérica, S.A. (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: C. Aguirre de Cárcer Moreno, lawyer)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

— Acknowledge the lodging of the action against Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 made by the Single Resolution Board in its Expanded Executive Session of 7 June 2017, adopting the resolution scheme concerning the institution Banco Popular Español, S.A., in compliance with the provisions of Article 29 of Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2014 establishing uniform rules and a uniform procedure for the resolution of credit institutions and certain investment firms in the framework of a Single Resolution Mechanism and a Single Resolution Fund and amending Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 and, after having allowed access to all the documents in the file and given the possibility of making further claims, annul or revoke the contested decision, reinstating in full the legal effect of the applicant's economic rights, in accordance with the requirements of full compensation.

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 Vascongoda 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 16 August 2017 — Maña and Others v SRB

(Case T-552/17)

(2017/C 369/41)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Maña, S.L. (Teo, Spain) and 113 other applicants (represented by: P. Rúa Sobrino, lawyer)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- Take note of the annulment proceedings against the Decision of the Single Resolution Board made at the Executive Session on 7 June 2017 relating to the resolution plan of Banco Popular Español, S.A., legal person identification No 80H66LPTVDLM0P28XF25, addressed to the FROB (SRB/EES/2017/08);
- Annul the contested Decision;
- Declare Articles 18 and 29 of Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 illegal and inapplicable;
- Order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs.

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 16 August 2017 — Fortischem v Parliament and Council

(Case T-560/17)

(2017/C 369/42)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Fortischem a.s. (Nováky, Slovakia) (represented by: C. Arhold, P. Hodál and M. Staroň, lawyers)

Defendants: European Parliament, Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul letter (d) in Annex III, Part I, to Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 on mercury, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1102/2008 ⁽¹⁾; and
- award the applicant the costs of the action.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested provision must be annulled because it infringes the principle of legitimate expectations by depriving the mercury cell production site operators of their possibility to receive an extension for complying with the best available techniques if the conditions under Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control) are met.