

Order of the General Court of 25 October 2019 — Le Pen v Parliament(Case T-211/19) ⁽¹⁾

(Law governing the institutions — Member of the European Parliament — Privileges and immunities — Decision waiving parliamentary immunity — Expiry of an MEP's mandate — No further interest in bringing proceedings — No need to adjudicate)

(2019/C 432/69)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Jean-Marie Le Pen (Saint-Cloud, France) (represented by F. Wagner, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Parliament (represented by N. Görlitz and C. Burgos, acting as Agents)**Re:**

Application under Article 263 TFEU seeking annulment of European Parliament Decision P8_TA(2019)0136 of 12 March 2019, waiving the applicant's parliamentary immunity.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no longer any need to adjudicate on the present action.*
2. *Each party shall bear its own costs.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 187, 3.6.2019.

Order of the President of the General Court of 23 October 2019 — Walker and Others v Parliament and Council

(Case T-383/19 R)

(Interlocutory proceedings — Area of freedom, security and justice — Regulation (EU) 2018/1806 — Loss of EU citizenship — Application for interim measures — Manifest inadmissibility of the main action — Inadmissibility)

(2019/C 432/70)

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

Applicants: Hilary Elizabeth Walker (Cadix, Spain), Jennifer Ann Cording (Valdagno, Italy), Douglas Edward Watson (Beaumont-du-Périgord, France), Christopher David Randolph (Ballinlassa Belcarra Castlebar, Ireland), Michael Charles Strawson (Serralongue, France) (represented by: J. Fouchet, lawyer)

Defendants: European Parliament (represented by: D. Warin and R. van de Westelaken, acting as Agents), and Council of the European Union (represented by: S. Cholakova, R. Meyer and M. Bauer, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application based on Articles 278 TFEU and 279 TFEU seeking, first, suspension of the operation of Regulation (EU) 2019/592 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 April 2019 amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1806 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from that requirement, as regards the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the Union (JO 2019 L 103 I, p.1), and second, the adoption of certain interim measures.

Operative part of the order

1. *The application for interim measures is dismissed.*
2. *The costs are reserved.*

Action brought on 8 October 2019 – VeriGraft v EASME**(Case T-688/19)**

(2019/C 432/71)

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

Applicant: VeriGraft AB (Göteborg, Sweden) (represented by: P. Hansson and A. Johansson, lawyers)

Defendant: Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- find and declare that EASME's termination of the Grant Agreement (Grant Agreement N° 778620 P-TEV) is invalid; and
- order EASME to pay costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the invoked ground for termination is not applicable and EASME's termination is thus invalid:
 - EASME has terminated the Grant Agreement citing no other basis for its decision than a provision, according to which the Grant Agreement may be terminated if 'the beneficiary, or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf, has been found guilty of professional misconduct, proven by any means'.
 - As neither the beneficiary, i.e. VERIGRAFT, nor any natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf, has been found guilty of any professional misconduct, this ground is not applicable and the termination is thus invalid.