

- order the requested measures of inquiry, as raised in the present application;
- order the European Commission to bear its own and the applicant's legal costs of the present judicial proceedings;
- order the defendant to pay the applicant EUR 50 000 compensation for the damaged incurred because of the above unlawful contested decisions.

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 manifest error of assessment by EPSO/the Selection Board concerning evaluation of the working experience of the applicant — breach of Annex II to the notice of competition at issue detailing the required working experience.
2. Second plea in law, alleging breach of Articles 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Council Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 ⁽¹⁾, together with breach of Articles 1d and 28 of the Staff Regulations and Article 1(1)(f) to Annex III to the Staff Regulations, breach of the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination, and also alleging a plea of illegality of the notice of competition under Article 277 TFEU.
3. Third plea in law, alleging a plea of illegality under Article 277 TFEU of the Talent Screener and of point 2.4 of the General Rules governing open competitions as well as of Article 5 of Annex III to the Staff Regulations, together with breach of Articles 1(d), 4, 7 and 29 of the Staff Regulations.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging a plea of illegality under Article 277 TFEU of the whole Annex II to the notice of competition at issue, together with breach of Article 1(d) of the Staff Regulations.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community (OJ, English Special Edition, Series I 1952-1958, p. 59), as amended.

Action brought on 12 October 2020 — LAICO/Council

(Case T-627/20)

(2020/C 443/27)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Libyan African Investment Co. (LAICO) (Tripoli, Libya) (represented by: A. Bahrami and N. Korogiannakis, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2020/1137 of 30 July 2020 implementing Decision (CFSP) 2015/1333 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya ⁽¹⁾ in so far as it maintains the name of the applicant on the list of entities set out in Annex IV to Council Decision (CFSP) 2015/1333 of 31 July 2015 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya, and repealing Decision 2011/137/CFSP ⁽²⁾;
- annul Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1130 of 30 July 2020 implementing Article 21(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/44 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya ⁽³⁾ and amending Annex III to Council Regulation (EU) 2016/44 of 18 January 2016 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Libya and repealing Regulation (EU) No 204/2011 ⁽⁴⁾ in so far as it maintains the name of the applicant on the list of entities set out in Annex III to Regulation (EU) 2016/44; and

— order the Council to pay the applicant's legal and other costs and expenses incurred in connection with this application.

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 an infringement of Council Regulation (EU) 2016/44 and Council Decision (CFSP) 2015/1333 insofar as the cumulative conditions for listing entities according to recital 3 of Decision 2015/1333 are not met.
2. Second plea in law, alleging an infringement of the obligation of the Council to keep all restrictive measures under review to ensure that they continue to contribute towards achieving their stated objectives.
3. Third plea in law, alleging manifest errors of assessment. In particular, the applicant claims that:
 - LAICO is a state-owned company, governed by the General Meeting of its Shareholders and its Board of Directors;
 - the Board of Directors of LAICO is composed of highly skilled and experienced professionals; and
 - LAICO's parent companies are not subject to the same type of restrictions.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging an infringement of the principle of equal treatment.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging an infringement of the principle of proportionality.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging an infringement of the obligation to state reasons under Article 296 TFEU and of the right to an effective remedy.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2020 L 247, p. 40.

⁽²⁾ OJ 2015 L 206, p. 34.

⁽³⁾ OJ 2020 L 247, p. 14.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ 2016 L 12, p. 1.

Action brought on 21 October 2020 — UPTR v Parliament and Council

(Case T-634/20)

(2020/C 443/28)

Language of the case: Dutch

Parties

Applicant: Unie van Professionele Transporteurs en Logistieke Ondernemers (Herstal, Belgium) (represented by: F. Vanden Bogaerde, lawyer)

Defendants: European Parliament, Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- declare the application for annulment admissible;
- annul Article 2(4) of Regulation (EU) 2020/1055 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2020 amending Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009, (EC) No 1072/2009 and (EU) No 1024/2012 with a view to adapting them to developments in the road transport sector;
- reserve the costs.