

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 9 November 2018 — Pinto Teixeira v EEAS**(Case T-667/18)**

(2019/C 16/69)

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

Applicant: José Manuel Pinto Teixeira (Oeiras, Portugal) (represented by: S. Orlandi and T. Martin, lawyers)

Defendant: European External Action Service

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul the decision of 21 February 2018 by which the Appointing Authority refused to authorise him to engage in an outside activity under Article 16 of the Staff Regulations;
- order the EEAS to pay the costs and to pay the sum of EUR 10 000 for the non-material damage suffered.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 16 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union, in that the contested decision was adopted after the expiry of the period of 30 working days from the reception of his declaration of intention to engage in an occupational activity after leaving the service.
2. Second plea in law, alleging manifest errors of assessment which render the contested decision unlawful, since the proposed activity is manifestly neither connected to the activity which he exercised during the last three years of service nor incompatible with the interests of the EEAS.

Action brought on 15 November 2018 — ZU v Commission**(Case T-671/18)**

(2019/C 16/70)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

Applicant: ZU (represented by: C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission