2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality. In this regard, the applicant considers that, although the dispute concerns only the areas described as 'landes et parcours', the Commission adopted a correction based on all the areas in cases which include such areas, and thus includes the share of those areas which are not areas of that kind, and in any event ignored the calculations sent by the French authorities.

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Commission relied on data which it accepted contrary to Article 6(1) of Regulation No 73/2009 and Annex III thereto, in order to carry out a financial correction of EUR 13 127 243,30 as regards the EAFRD programming period 2014-2020 ('RDR 3').

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality and breach of the duty to state reasons as regards 'Control system gravely deficient Corse' for claim years 2013 and 2014 in the contested decision, in that the Commission applies a flat-rate correction of 100 % to the *Département* of Haute-Corse.

Action brought on 19 January 2018 — Planet v Commission

(Case T-29/18)

(2018/C 112/46)

Language of the case: Greek

Parties

Applicant: Planet AE Anonimi Etairia Parokhis Simvouleftikon Ipiresion (Athens, Greece) (represented by: V. Christianos, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

— annul the refusal decision of the Commission, whereby the Commission implicitly rejected the applicant's request for access to the documents relating to the tendering procedure for the EuropeAid/137681/IH/SER/ROC/4 project; and

— order the Commission to pay all the applicant's costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

By means of this action, Planet seeks the annulment of the Commission's implicit decision whereby it denied Planet access to documents, under Regulation No 1049/2001, in connection with the EuropeAid/137681/IH/SER/ROC/4 tendering procedure.

Planet maintains that the Commission's implicit refusal should be annulled, since no reasons have been stated, which is mandatory under Article 296 TFEU in terms of EU law and which constitutes an essential procedural requirement for EU acts.

Action brought on 20 January 2018 — Izuzquiza and Semsrott v Frontex

(Case T-31/18)

(2018/C 112/47)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: Luisa Izuzquiza (Madrid, Spain) and Arne Semsrott (Berlin, Germany) (represented by: S. Hilbrans and R. Callsen, lawyers)

Defendant: European Border and Coast Guard Agency

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

— annul the decision by Frontex of 10 November 2017 (ref: CGO/LAU/18911 c/2017), refusing the applicants access to the name, flag and type of each vessel deployed by Frontex in the Central Mediterranean under Joint Operation Triton in the period from 1 June 2017 until 30 August 2017, both inclusive;

— order the defendant to pay the costs incurred by the applicants, including the costs of any intervening party, even if the action is dismissed.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicants rely on six pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, ([1]) by failing to carry out an individual examination of each requested document in order to assess whether the exception relied on was applicable.

2. Second plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed the first indent of Article 4(1)(a) of that regulation, which relates to public security, because the reasons given to justify the application of the exception are in a decisive part incorrect in fact: vessels deployed to the operation cannot be tracked by publicly accessible means.

3. Third plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed the first indent of Article 4(1)(a) of that regulation, which relates to public security, because the reasons given to justify the application of the exception leave out of consideration the circumstance that the applicants only requested information on vessels deployed in the past.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed the first indent of Article 4(1)(a) of that regulation, which relates to public a security, because the defendant did not consider — and did not answer this argument put forward by the applicants — that part of the requested information was already published on Twitter for some of the vessels deployed under Joint Operation Triton in 2017 and comparable information for vessels deployed under Joint Operation Triton in 2016 was already published.

5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed Article 4(6) of that regulation because even if the — in fact not existing — risk that criminal networks circumvent border surveillance would be presumed true, this could possibly only justify refusing information on the name of the vessels deployed but not on the type and flag.

6. Sixth plea in law, alleging that Frontex infringed Article 4(6) of that regulation by not considering to give partial access to the requested information, even though the information on some of the vessels was already published.

([1]) Regulation (EC) 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (OJ 2001 L 145, p. 43).

Action brought on 23 January 2018 — Pracsis and Conceptexpo Project v Commission and EACEA

(Case T-33/18)

(2018/C 112/48)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicants: Pracsis SPRL (Brussels, Belgium) and Conceptexpo Project (Wavre, Belgium) (represented by: J.-N. Louis, lawyer)

Defendants: European Commission and Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)