

2. The order of 12 July 2017, *Nexans France and Nexans v Commission* (T-423/17 R) is set aside.
3. The costs are reserved.

Action brought on 7 August 2017 — Ruiz Jayo and Others v SRB

(Case T-526/17)

(2018/C 022/58)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: María Concepción Ruiz Jayo (Madrid, Spain) and 3499 other applicants (represented by: S. Rodríguez Bajón, F. Cremades García and M. Ruiz Núñez, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- Declare this action for annulment admissible and well founded;
- Pursuant to Article 277 TFEU, declare Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 inapplicable or, in the alternative, declare Articles 21, 22(2)(a) and 24 inapplicable, as well as Articles 18 and 23 thereof;
- Annul the contested SRB Decision;
- Order SRB to pay compensation to the applicants in respect of harm caused to them by the implementation of rules contrary to EU law;
- In the alternative, order SRB to pay compensation to the applicants, as shareholders and creditors, based on the consideration that the Banco Popular's valuation presented by the applicants is the final valuation under Regulation No 806/2014 in order to determine whether shareholders and creditors would have received better treatment had the institution under resolution initiated ordinary insolvency proceedings;
- Order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The present action concerns the Decision of the Single Resolution Board of 7 June 2017 (SRB/EES/2017/08) allowing the resolution of the Banco Popular Español, S.A.

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 — García Gómez and Others v SRB

(Case T-693/17)

(2018/C 022/59)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Abel García Gómez and Others (Torrevieja, Spain) and 2 199 other applicants (represented by: J. Cremades García, S. Rodríguez Bajón and M. F. Ruiz Núñez, lawyers)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- Declare this action for annulment admissible and well founded;
- Pursuant to Article 277 TFEU, declare Regulation (EU) No 806/2014 inapplicable or, in the alternative, declare Articles 21, 22(2)(a) and 24 inapplicable, as well as Articles 18 and 23 thereof;
- Annul the contested SRB Decision;
- Order SRB to pay compensation to the applicants in respect of harm caused to them by the implementation of rules contrary to EU law;
- In the alternative, order SRB to pay compensation to the applicants, as shareholders and creditors, based on the consideration that the Banco Popular's valuation presented by the applicants is the final valuation under Regulation No 806/2014 in order to determine whether shareholders and creditors would have received better treatment had the institution under resolution initiated ordinary insolvency proceedings;
- Order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The present action concerns the Decision of the Single Resolution Board of 7 June 2017 (SRB/EES/2017/08) allowing the resolution of the Banco Popular Español, S.A.

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 23 October 2017 — DuPont de Nemours and Others v Commission

(Case T-719/17)

(2018/C 022/60)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: DuPont de Nemours (Deutschland) GmbH (Neu-Isenburg, Germany) and 12 others (represented by: D. Waelbroeck, I. Antypas and A. Accarain, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Regulation (EU) 2017/1496 of 23 August 2017 concerning the non-renewal of approval of the active substance Flupyrsulfuron-Methyl ('FPS'), and the withdrawal of marketing authorisations for plant protection products containing that substance ⁽¹⁾;
- order the defendant to pay all costs and expenses.