

- Annul the corrigendum to Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004) (corrected version in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004), published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* L 243, 21 September 2017.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant contends that:

1. It is surprising that the Commission has implicitly consented to the divergent application of the import rules for products of animal origin by Member States in well-defined cases, such as containers of frozen fishery products from China, all of which has a negative impact on fair competition between Member States.
2. The main problem has been identified with respect to the import of products of animal origin and the requirement of the so-called 'double listing' of vessels which supply third-state establishments.
3. A food business operator who imports products of animal origin from outside the European Union may only import fishery products from a third country if the third country in question, from where the products are dispatched, and the establishment from which the product is sent and in which the product has been obtained or prepared, are both listed.

Action brought on 30 January 2018 — Tassi v Court of Justice

(Case T-50/18)

(2018/C 134/30)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Smaro Tassi (Berlin, Germany) (represented by: E. Kleani, lawyer)

Defendant: Court of Justice of European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the Court of Justice of 23 November 2017 (reference 20173192) rejecting the applicant's tender submitted in respect of the freelance translator contract notice 2017/S 002-001564 for the Greek language.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant maintains that the contested decision was not accompanied by either a determinate set of criteria establishing the quality level of translations requested in the tender procedure or any kind of a correction sheet or a comparative report which might substantiate why, in the defendant's view, the test translation submitted by the applicant failed to attain the minimum benchmark required. The applicant argues, in that regard, that the contested decision was not properly reasoned and that the selection procedure lacked transparency.

Action brought on 30 January 2018 — Kleani v Court of Justice

(Case T-51/18)

(2018/C 134/31)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Efterpi Kleani (Berlin, Germany) (represented by: S. Tassi, lawyer)

Defendant: Court of Justice of European Union