

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

The applicant, a Commission official, was classified in Grade A4, step 7, until the day before the entry into force of the new Staff Regulations. On 1 May 2004, that classification was converted to Grade A\*12, step 7, with a multiplication factor of 0.9442490 (in accordance with Article 2(2) of Annex XIII to the Staff Regulations). On 1 July 2004, the applicant moved to Grade A\*12, step 8, with the same multiplication factor. On 22 July 2005, the applicant was promoted, with retrospective effect from 1 May 2004, to Grade A\*13, step 1, with a multiplication factor of 1.1172071 (in accordance with Article 7(6) of Annex XIII to the Staff Regulations). With effect from 1 May 2006, he was classified in Grade AD 13, step 5, with a multiplication factor of 1, pursuant to a decision of DG ADMIN of 11 May 2006.

In his action, the applicant claims that such a classification (i) breaches, inter alia, Articles 44 and 46 of the Staff Regulations and Article 7 of Annex XIII to the Staff Regulations; (ii) is vitiated by a lack of competence; (iii) breaches the principle of protection of legitimate expectations. In particular, according to the applicant, the Commission's interpretation of Article 7(7) of Annex XIII to the Staff Regulations is incorrect in that it takes the view that, where a multiplication factor is higher than 1, the excess should be converted to seniority in step.

**Order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 15 March 2007 —  
Simon v Court of Justice and Commission****(Case F-58/06) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2007/C 95/119)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

The President of the Second Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 190, 12.8.2006, p. 35.

**Order of the Civil Service Tribunal of 15 March 2007 —  
Simon v Court of Justice and Commission****(Case F-100/06) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2007/C 95/120)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

The President of the Second Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 294, 2.12.2006, p. 65.