

- annul the contested decision in so far as it recognises the distinctive character of the European Union trade mark No 9 943 135 ‘Crédit Mutuel’ for certain goods in Classes 9, 16, 36, 38, 42 and 45;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 52(1)(a), read in combination with Article 7(1)(b) and (c) and 7(3), of Regulation No 207/2009.

Action brought on 17 January 2018 — Lillelam v EUIPO — Pfaff (LITTLE LAMB)**(Case T-18/18)**

(2018/C 094/41)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English***Parties**

Applicant: Lillelam A/S (Oslo, Norway) (represented by: N. Köster, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Nick Pfaff (Ammanford, United Kingdom)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the trade mark at issue: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: EU word mark ‘LITTLE LAMB’ — EU trade mark No 8 121 675

Procedure before EUIPO: Proceedings for a declaration of invalidity

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 7 November 2017 in Case R 536/2017-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- revoke the EU Trademark No 8 121 675 ‘LITTLE LAMB’ for at least ‘Clothing’ and ‘Accessories for Clothing’
- order EUIPO to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 58(1)(a) and Article 18(1) of Regulation No 2017/1001.

Action brought on 19 January 2018 — Nova Brands v EUIPO — Natamil (Natamil)**(Case T-23/18)**

(2018/C 094/42)

*Language in which the application was lodged: English***Parties**

Applicant: Nova Brands SA (Luxembourg, Luxembourg) (represented by: V. Wellens, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Natamil GmbH (Munich, Germany)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Applicant of the trade mark at issue: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: International registration designating the European Union in respect of the word mark 'natamil' — International registration designating the European Union No 1 235 069

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the First Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 25 October 2017 in Case R 1910/2016-1

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation No 207/2009;
- Infringement of Article 75 of Regulation No 207/2009 and of Article 296 TFEU concerning the obligation to state reasons.

Action brought on 20 January 2018 — adidas International Trading and Others v Commission

(Case T-24/18)

(2018/C 094/43)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicants: adidas International Trading BV (Amsterdam, Netherlands), Gabor Footwear GmbH (Rosenheim, Germany), Gabor Shoes AG (Rosenheim), HR Online GmbH (Osnabrück, Germany), Nike European Operations Netherlands BV (Hilversum, Netherlands), Timberland Europe BV (Almelo, Netherlands), Wolverine Europe BV (Amsterdam,), Wolverine Europe Ltd (London, United Kingdom) (represented by: E. Vermulst and J. Cornelis, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1982 of 31 October 2017 re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and Vietnam and produced by Dongguan Luzhou Shoes Co. Ltd, Dongguan Shingtak Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Dragon Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Evervan Footwear Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Guangda Shoes Co. Ltd, Long Son Joint Stock Company and Zhaoqing Li Da Shoes Co., Ltd, implementing the judgment of the Court of Justice in Joined Cases C-659/13 and C-34/14 (OJ 2017 L 285, p. 14); and
- order the European Commission to pay the applicants' costs.