

Decision of the Opposition Division: Rejected the opposition in its entirety

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Partially annulled the contested decision and upheld the opposition in part

Pleas in law: Infringement of Article 8(1)(a) and (b) CTMR.

**Action brought on 29 July 2014 — Hewlett Packard Development Company v OHIM
(ELITEDISPLAY)**

(Case T-563/14)

(2014/C 351/23)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Hewlett Packard Development Company LP (Dallas, United States) (represented by: T. Raab and H. Lauf, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- Annul the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) of 19 May 2014 given in Case R 1539/2013-2;
- Order the defendant to bear the costs of proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Community trade mark concerned: The word mark 'ELITEDISPLAY' for goods and services in Class 9 — Community trade mark application No 11 541 901

Decision of the Examiner: Rejected the CTM application

Decision of the Board of Appeal: Dismissed the appeal

Pleas in law: Infringement of Articles 7(1)(b), 7(1)(c) and 7(2) CTMR.

Action brought on 4 August 2014 — Gascogne Sack Deutschland and Gascogne v Court of Justice

(Case T-577/14)

(2014/C 351/24)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicants: Gascogne Sack Deutschland GmbH (Wieda, Germany) and Gascogne (Saint-Paul-lès-Dax, France) (represented by: F. Puel and E. Durand, lawyers)

Defendant: Court of Justice of the European Union