

**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 28 September 2017 — Link Flexible and Others v SRB****(Case T-662/17)**

(2017/C 424/64)

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

*Applicants:* Link Flexible Sicav, SA (Madrid, Spain) and 20 other applicants (represented by: M. Romero Rey and I. Salama Salama, lawyers)

*Defendant:* Single Resolution Board

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- On the basis of Article 263 TFEU, annul Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 of the Single Resolution Board (SRB) of 7 June 2017 adopting a resolution scheme in respect of the Banco Popular Español, S.A.;
- In accordance with Article 340(2) TFEU and Article 41(3) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, order the Single Resolution Board to pay compensation to the applicants for the harm suffered, in a precise amount which will be determined once the information required by the applicants' representatives is provided in full and, in particular Deloitte's provisional report and those prepared by independent experts in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 806/2014, access to which is hereby requested;
- In accordance with Articles 133 and 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs of these proceedings.

**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 27 September 2017 — Sahece and Others v SRB****(Case T-663/17)**

(2017/C 424/65)

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

*Applicants:* Sahece, SA (Carrión de los Céspedes, Spain) and 20 other applicants (represented by: M. Romero Rey and I. Salama Salama, lawyers)

*Defendant:* Single Resolution Board

### **Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- On the basis of Article 263 TFEU, annul Decision SRB/EES/2017/08 of the Single Resolution Board (SRB) of 7 June 2017 adopting a resolution scheme in respect of the Banco Popular Español, S.A.;
- In accordance with Article 340(2) TFEU and Article 41(3) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, order the Single Resolution Board to pay compensation to the applicants for the harm suffered, in a precise amount which will be determined once the information required by the applicants' representatives is provided in full and, in particular Deloitte's provisional report and those prepared by independent experts in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 806/2014, access to which is hereby requested;
- In accordance with Articles 133 and 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Single Resolution Board to pay the costs of these proceedings.

### **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 27 September 2017 — eSlovensko v Commission**

**(Case T-664/17)**

(2017/C 424/66)

*Language of the case: English*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* eSlovensko (Lučenec, Slovakia) (represented by: F. Branislav, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision Ref. ARES(2017)3107844-21/06/2017 of the European Commission excluding the applicant from participating in all procurement and grant award procedures governed by Regulation N° 966/2012 and from the award of funds governed by Regulation 2015/323;
- order the defendant to conduct a new audit, reviewing its findings as to admissible costs;
- order the defendant to pay the 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 misuse of powers, particularly improper legal evaluation of facts and findings.
  - The applicant argues that there was no reasonable basis for the Commission's decision.