

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea: infringement of Articles 1 and 2 of Regulation No 1/58, of Article 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter') and of Article 1d of the Staff Regulations through the imposition of the restriction, which extends to the application form, that communication between EPSO and the candidate is to be solely in English, French and German.
2. Second plea: infringement of Articles 1 and 6 of Regulation No 1/58, of Article 22 of the Charter and of Article 1d(1) and (6) of the Staff Regulations in that the choice of second language is improperly restricted to solely three languages, namely English, French and German, to the exclusion of the other official languages of the European Union, and because in Option 1 the third language is restricted to English, French and German, to the exclusion of the other official languages of the European Union.
3. Third plea: the choice of English, French and German constitutes an arbitrary choice that gives rise to discrimination on the ground of language prohibited by Article 1 of Regulation No 1/58, Article 22 of the Charter and Article 1d(1) and (6) of the Staff Regulations.

Action brought on 5 October 2017 — Temes Rial and Others v SRB

(Case T-705/17)

(2017/C 424/78)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Applicants: Enrique Manuel Temes Rial (Vilagarcía de Arousa, Spain), Jon Nuñez Baracaldo (Erandio Astraburua, Spain), Maria Luisa Muniente Pallas (Madrid, Spain), Alfonso Velasco Nieto (Madrid) and Gloria María Zarco Martínez (Guarnizo el Astillero, Spain) (represented by: P. Rúa Sobrino, lawyer).

Defendant: Single Resolution Board

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Single Resolution Board (SRB/EES/2017/08) and the independent expert's valuation on which that decision 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*.
