

2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the procedural guarantees of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the right of consultation and negotiation of the College [of Representatives of the Staff of the EIB].
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality.

As regards their claim for compensation, the applicants demand payment of the difference in remuneration due, that is 1 % since 1 January 2020 (including the impact of that increase on pecuniary benefits) plus interest for late payment.

Action brought on 9 November 2020 — NZ v Commission

(Case T-668/20)

(2021/C 28/85)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: NZ (represented by: H. Tagaras, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- proceed with the measure of organisation of procedure sought by the applicant in paragraph 35 of the [application] (as well as those referred to in paragraphs 21 and 30) and, at the end of the procedure;
- annul the contested decisions;
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of her action seeking, principally, annulment of the decision of the European Commission rejecting her request for review of the decision of the selection board in competition COM/1/AD10/18 not to include her name on the reserve list of that competition, and of the decision rejecting her complaint and, in the alternative, of the abovementioned decision of the selection board, the applicant relies on five pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging breach of the obligation to state reasons, not solely on the basis of a failure to state adequate reasons, but also on the basis of a manifest contradiction in the reasoning provided because, inter alia, despite the verbal assessment of the applicant's performance being sufficient for her to be included on the reserve list under all the criteria relied on ('very strong'), the selection board gave her a lower average mark ('strong to very strong') which resulted in her being excluded from the list.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of equal treatment, on the ground that, inter alia, the membership of the selection board changed continuously, and candidates, with exactly the same verbal assessment as the applicant, were placed on the reserve list.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the rules governing selection boards.

4. Fourth plea in law, alleging manifest error of assessment.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 27 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union, as a result of the alleged infringement raised by the applicant under the second plea in law.

Action brought on 13 November 2020 — Pluscard Service v EUIPO (PLUSCARD)

(Case T-669/20)

(2021/C 28/86)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Pluscard Service-Gesellschaft für Kreditkarten-Processing mbH (Saarbrücken, Germany) (represented by: M. Dury, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: International registration designating the European Union in respect of the figurative mark PLUSCARD — Application for registration No 1 494 424

Contested decision: Decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 14 September 2020 in Case R 638/2020-4

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that:

- the reasons given by EUIPO and the conclusions drawn by EUIPO shall be revisited;
- the registration of the sign PLUSCARD should therefore be granted as applied for, for all classes, including classes applied for;
- furthermore, due to the distinctive language barriers complicating the resolution of this case, the summoning of oral proceedings is requested and encouraged.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) and Article 7(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 18 November 2020 — Kühne v Parliament

(Case T-691/20)

(2021/C 28/87)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Verena Kühne (Berlin, Germany) (represented by: O. Schmechel, lawyer)

Defendant: European Parliament