

Action brought on 4 September 2006 — Haelterman and Others v Commission**(Case F-102/06)**

(2006/C 261/71)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicants:* Geert Haelterman (Ninove, Belgium) and Others (represented by: A. Coolen, J.-N. Louis and E. Marchal, lawyers)*Defendant:* Commission of the European Communities**Form of order sought**

- Annulment of the individual decisions rejecting the applicants' applications for the adoption by the Appointing Authority (AIPN) of transitional measures to guarantee, in connection with the 2005 and subsequent promotion procedures, equal treatment and their vested rights;
- An order that the Commission of the European Communities pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of their action, the applicants rely on pleas in law identical to those pleaded in Case F-47/06. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ OJEU C 154, 1.07.2006, p. 25.

Action brought on 4 September 2006 — Blank and Others v Commission**(Case F-103/06)**

(2006/C 261/72)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicants:* Klaus Blank (St. Stevens-Woluwe, Belgium) and Others (represented by: S. Rodrigues and C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyers)*Defendant:* Commission of the European Communities**Form of order sought**

- Annulment of the refusal of the Appointing Authority (AIPN) to enter the applicants on the list of officials

promoted to Grade A*10 in the 2005 promotion procedure, which decisions are to be implied from Administrative Notice No 85-2005 of 23 November 2005;

- Directions to the AIPN as to the effects of the annulment of the contested decisions and, in particular, reclassification of the applicants in Grade A*10, with retrospective effect from 1 March 2005,
- In the alternative, as regards one of the applicants, first, a direction to the defendant to recognise him as being eligible, on his next promotion, for promotion to Grade A*10 and, second, to order the defendant to compensate the same applicant for the loss he suffered as a result of not being promoted to Grade A*10 from 1 March 2005;
- An order that the defendant pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of their action, the applicants rely on pleas in law very similar to those pleaded in Case F-45/06. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ OJEU C 143, 17.06.2006, p. 39.

Action brought on 4 September 2006 — Arpaillange and Others v Commission**(Case F-104/06)**

(2006/C 261/73)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicants:* Joséphine Arpaillange (Santiago do Chile, Chile) and Others (represented by: S. Rodrigues and C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyers)*Defendant:* Commission of the European Communities**Form of order sought by the applicants**

The applicants claim that the Court should:

- annul the decisions of the authority authorised to conclude contracts stipulating the applicants' conditions of employment, as set out in their contracts as contract staff, on the ground that the number of years of professional experience recognised in their cases by the authority authorised to conclude contracts is less than the number of years' professional experience actually acquired by the applicants;