

— order the defendant to pay to the application the applicant's costs of and occasioned by this appeal.

Plea in law

— Infringement of Article 7 (1) (b) and (c) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 5 October 2017 — Vendrell Marti v SRB

(Case T-687/17)

(2018/C 005/62)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicant: Pedro Vendrell Marti (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: E. Martínez Martínez and C. López-Mélida de Ramón, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Single Resolution Board (SRB/EES/2017/08) and the independent expert's valuation on which it is based in accordance with Article 20(15) of Regulation No 806/2014;
- 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 5 October 2017 — Uluru and Others v Commission and SRB

(Case T-690/17)

(2018/C 005/63)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Uluru, SL (Madrid, Spain), Juan Adolfo Álvarez Lorenzana (Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic) and Raquel Fortet Rodríguez (Madrid) (represented by: B. Cremades Roman, J. Orts Castro, J. López Useros, S. Cajal Martín, P. Marrodán Lázaro, lawyers)

Defendants: European Commission and Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- Annul SRB's decision SRB/EES/2017/08 and Commission Decision (EU) 2017/1246, both adopted on 7 June 2017 and, consequently, (i) order SRB and the European Commission to reinstate in favour of the applicants their investments in Banco Popular in the terms set out in the application or, (ii) in the alternative, order SRB and the European Commission to pay damages to the applicants on grounds of non-contractual liability in the terms set out in the application;
- Order SRB and the European Commission to pay damages to the applicants on grounds of non-contractual liability in the terms set out in the application;
- Declare the valuation carried out by SRB's independent expert invalid and, following the calculation of the net value of the assets of Banco Popular, order SRB and the European Commission to pay compensation to the applicants in the terms set out in the present application;
- Order SRB and the European Commission to pay the costs of the present proceedings;
- Order that all the sums awarded to the applicants accrue compensatory interest as of 23 May 2017 (or, in the alternative, as of 7 June 2017) up to the date of the judgment and, additionally, default interest as of the date of the judgment, except for the costs resulting from the present proceedings, which will only accrue default interest as of the date of the judgment; and
- Award to the applicants any additional remedy that it considers appropriate in law.

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 October 2017 — De Longhi Benelux v EUIPO (COOKING CHEF GOURMET)

(Case T-697/17)

(2018/C 005/64)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: De Longhi Benelux SA (Luxembourg, Luxembourg) (represented by: M. Arnott, A. Nicholls, solicitors and G. Hollingworth, barrister)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: EU word mark 'COOKING CHEF GOURMET' — Application for registration No 15 549 637

Contested decision: Decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 24 July 2017 in Case R 231/2017-1