

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- the Office shall bear its own costs of the proceedings before the Office and General Court and pay those of the Applicant.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 5 October 2017 — Traviacar and Others v SRB**(Case T-700/17)**

(2018/C 005/65)

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

Applicants: Traviacar, S.L. (O Carballiño, Spain) and 96 other applicants (represented by: P. Rúa Sobrino, lawyer)

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim 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 — OCU v SRB**(Case T-701/17)**

(2018/C 005/66)

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

Applicant: Organización de Consumidores y Usuarios (OCU) (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 11 October 2017 — UP v Commission

(Case T-706/17)

(2018/C 005/67)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: UP (represented by: M. Casado García-Hirschfeld, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

- Declare the present application admissible and well-founded;

Consequently:

- Annul the decision of 26 April in which DG HR opposed the applicant's application for part-time work for medical reasons;
- Annul, if necessary, the decision of 12 July 2017 rejecting the appeal;
- Order the compensation of the applicant's pecuniary and non-pecuniary loss following from those decisions, estimated, subject to re-assessment, at the sum of EUR 8 800;
- Order the defendant to pay all the costs.