

Action brought on 7 July 2020 — JR v Commission**(Case T-435/20)**

(2020/C 297/57)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* JR (represented by: L. Levi and A. Champetier, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the present action admissible and well founded;
- consequently:
 - annul the decision of 15 April 2020 in that it rejects the applicant's request for review of the decision of the competition selection board of 16 December 2019 not to include the applicant's name on the reserve list for internal competition COM/03/AD/18 (AD6) — 1 — Administrators, and, if needed, annul that decision of 16 December 2019;
 - order the defendant to pay the costs.

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 manifest error of assessment and breach of the rules governing the proceedings of the selection board.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the obligation to state reasons and breach of the principle of good administration.

Action brought on 10 July 2020 — Jindal Saw and Jindal Saw Italia v Commission**(Case T-440/20)**

(2020/C 297/58)

*Language of the case: English***Parties***Applicants:* Jindal Saw Ltd (New Delhi, India), Jindal Saw Italia SpA (Trieste, Italy) (represented by: R. Antonini, E. Monard and B. Maniatis, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/527 of 15 April 2020 re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of tubes and pipes of ductile cast iron (also known as spheroidal graphite cast iron) originating in India as regards Jindal Saw Limited following the judgment of the General Court in T-301/16;
- order the Commission to bear the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 and of the general principle of non-retroactivity.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the general principle of non-retroactivity and the general principle of legal certainty.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 266 TFEU and Article 264 TFEU.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality and Article 5(1) and 5(4) TEU.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to an effective remedy and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 103 of the Union Customs Code and Article 296 TFEU.
7. Seventh plea in law, alleging lack of competence of the Commission to impose registration of Jindal's imports and infringement of Article 14(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009.

Action brought on 10 July 2020 — Jindal Saw and Jindal Saw Italia v Commission**(Case T-441/20)**

(2020/C 297/59)

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

Applicants: Jindal Saw Ltd (New Delhi, India), Jindal Saw Italia SpA (Trieste, Italy) (represented by: R. Antonini, E. Monard and B. Maniatis, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/526 of 15 April 2020 re-imposing a definitive countervailing duty on imports of tubes and pipes of ductile cast iron (also known as spheroidal graphite cast iron) originating in India as regards Jindal Saw Limited following the judgment of the General Court in T-300/16;
- order the Commission to bear the costs of these proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 16(1) of Regulation (EC) No 597/2009 and of the general principle of non-retroactivity.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the general principle of non-retroactivity and the general principle of legal certainty.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 266 TFEU and Article 264 TFEU.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality and Article 5(1) and 5(4) TEU.