



C/2025/6159

24.11.2025

Appeal brought on 26 September 2025 by European Parliament against the judgment of the General Court (Seventh Chamber) delivered on 9 July 2025 in Case T-1031/23, Kaili v Parliament

(Case C-632/25 P)

(C/2025/6159)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: European Parliament (represented by: N. Lorenz, P. Matczak and D. Ó Céilleachair, acting as Agents)

Other party to the proceedings: Eva Kaili

Form of order sought

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- set aside, in its entirety, the judgment under appeal;
- give final judgment in the dispute and dismiss the action;
- order the applicant at first instance to pay the costs of the appeal as well as the costs of the proceedings at first instance.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The appellant relies on two grounds of appeal.

By the first part of its first ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court erred in law by restrictively interpreting the concept of the group of documents covered by the exception relating to court proceedings under Article 4(2), second indent, of Regulation No 1049/2001 ⁽¹⁾.

By the second part of its first ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court erred in law in its legal categorisation of the link between the requested documents and the court proceedings in case T-46/23, *Kaili v Parliament and EPPO*.

By the third part of its first ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court erred in law in its legal categorisation of the disadvantage at which the Parliament would be put in the event of disclosure of the requested documents.

By the fourth part of its first ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court distorted the contested decision with regard to the relevance of the identity of the applicant, the use the latter wished to make of the documents and the purported avoidance by the appellant of having to defend itself in court and by substituting its own reasoning for that set out in the contested decision.

By the first part of its second ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court erred in law in its interpretation of the principle of sound administration of justice and the integrity of court proceedings by failing to recognise the *lex specialis* character of the procedural rules of the Courts of the European Union.

By the second part of its second ground of appeal, the appellant claims that the General Court erred in law in its interpretation of the principle of sound administration of justice and the integrity of court proceedings by failing to recognise the impact of public disclosure of evidence on the sound administration of justice and the integrity and serenity of court proceedings.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (OJ 2001 L 145, p. 43).