

EUROPEAN UNION CIVIL SERVICE TRIBUNAL

Action brought on 22 July 2011 — ZZ v Court of Justice of the European Union

(Case F-71/11)

(2011/C 355/52)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: ZZ (represented by: J.-M. Bauler, lawyer)

Defendant: Court of Justice of the European Union

Subject-matter and description of the proceedings

Annulment of the applicant's staff report for the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2007 and compensation for non-material damage.

Form of order sought

- Annul the staff report for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2007; in the alternative, annul the note of 9 September 2009 established following the annulment of the previous staff report covering the same period;
- annul the decision dismissing the complaint of 14 April 2011;
- order the defendant to pay EUR 50 000 by way of compensation for non-material damage;
- order the Court of Justice of the European Union to pay the costs.

Action brought on 28 September 2011 — ZZ v Commission

(Case F-94/11)

(2011/C 355/53)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: ZZ (represented by: H. Mannes, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Subject-matter and description of the proceedings

Annulment of the decision of EPSO to resume open competition EPSO/AD/26/05 and to call the applicant back for a fresh oral test, and annulment of the decision to exclude him from that competition on the ground of his failure to attend that test.

Form of order sought

- Annul the defendant's decisions of 11 February and 12 August 2011;
- Declare the invitation of 14 January 2011 to the oral test unlawful;
- Rule that a mere repeat of the applicant's test is not appropriate to remedy the fundamental procedural defects found at the time of the applicant's earlier action;
- Rule that the defendant has the power to put the applicant on the reserve list even without a repeat of the test;
- Rule that the defendant must adequately compensate the applicant for the disadvantage suffered by reason of the lapse of time and must avoid any discrimination in comparison with the successful candidates;
- Order the defendant to pay the costs of the proceedings;
- As a precaution, an order for judgment in default.