

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the Court of Justice of 23 November 2017 (reference 20172046) 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 5 February 2018 — Rodriguez Prieto v Commission****(Case T-61/18)**

(2018/C 134/32)

*Language of the case: French***Parties**

*Applicant:* Amador Rodriguez Prieto (Steinsel, Luxembourg) (represented by: S. Orlandi and T. Martin, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

Declare and rule:

- principally, that the Commission is ordered to remedy the losses suffered and therefore to pay the applicant the sum of EUR 68 831 in respect of his pecuniary loss and EUR 100 000 in respect of his non-pecuniary loss;
- in the alternative, that the decision of 28 March 2017 refusing assistance is annulled;
- in any event, that the Commission is ordered to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant alleges, principally, that the Commission committed a *faute de service* in disregarding his status as a whistle-blower, which caused the applicant pecuniary and non-pecuniary harm which it is for the institution to remedy. In the alternative, the applicant argues that the institution failed to have regard to Article 24 of the Staff Regulations by refusing to grant him the assistance provided for in that article after the criminal proceedings.

---

**Action brought on 6 February 2018 — Torro Entertainment v EUIPO — Grupo Osborne (TORRO Grande Meat in Style)****(Case T-63/18)**

(2018/C 134/33)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English***Parties**

*Applicant:* Torro Entertainment (Plovdiv, Bulgaria) (represented by: A. Kostov, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

*Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal:* Grupo Osborne, SA (El Puerto de Santa María, Spain)

### **Details of the proceedings before EUIPO**

*Applicant of the trade mark at issue:* Applicant

*Trade mark at issue:* Application for EU figurative mark TORRO Grande Meat in Style — Application for registration No 14 744 452

*Procedure before EUIPO:* Opposition proceedings

*Contested decision:* Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 20 December 2017 in Case R 1776/2017-2

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision in part where it dismisses the appeal against the decision of the Opposition division;
- order EUIPO and Grupo Osborne S.A. to bear the costs of ‘Torro Entertainment’ Ltd. in relation to the proceeding before the Court and in relation to the appeal and opposition proceedings.

### **Pleas in law**

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 2017/1001;
- Infringement of the duty to state reasons and of the duty of diligence.

---

## **Action brought on 6 February 2018 — Venezuela v Council**

**(Case T-65/18)**

(2018/C 134/34)

*Language of the case:* English

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (represented by: F. Di Gianni and L. Giuliano, lawyers)

*Defendant:* Council of the European Union

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Council Regulation (EU) 2017/2063 of 13 November 2017 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Venezuela, insofar as its provisions concern the Applicant; and
- order the Council to bear the costs of the proceedings.

### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that, by adopting the restrictive measures without previously informing the Applicant of its intention, and without previously hearing the position of the Applicant on the facts allegedly justifying the restrictive measures, the Council infringed the Applicant's right to be heard.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Council infringed its obligation to state the reasons and to provide sufficient evidence for the adoption of the restrictive measures.