

Order of the General Court of 26 September 2016 — Greenpeace Energy and Others v Commission(Case T-382/15) ⁽¹⁾

(Action for annulment — State aid — Nuclear energy — Aid in support of Hinkley Point C nuclear power station — Contract for difference, agreement of the Secretary of State and credit guarantee — Decision declaring the aid to be compatible with the internal market — Absence of any significant effect on a competitive position — Lack of individual concern — Inadmissibility)

(2016/C 419/61)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicants: Greenpeace Energy eG (Hamburg, Germany) and the nine other applicants whose names are set out in the annex to the order (represented by: D. Fouquet and J. Nysten, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission (represented by: É. Gippini Fournier, T. Maxian Rusche and P. Němečková, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application under Article 263 TFEU for the annulment of Decision (EU) 2015/658 of 8 October 2014 on the aid measure SA.34947 (2013/C) (ex 2013/N) which the United Kingdom is planning to implement for support to the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station (OJ 2015 L 109, p. 44).

Operative part of the order

The Court orders as follows:

1. The action is dismissed as inadmissible.
2. There is no need to rule on the applications for leave to intervene submitted by NNB Generation Company Limited, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, the Czech Republic and the Republic of Poland.
3. Greenpeace Energy eG and the other applicants whose names are set out in the annex shall bear their own costs and pay those incurred by the European Commission, with the exception of the costs relating to the applications for leave to intervene.
4. Greenpeace Energy and the other applicants whose names are set out in the annex, the Commission, NNB Generation Company Limited, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, the Czech Republic and the Republic of Poland shall bear their own respective costs relating to the applications for leave to intervene.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 337, 12.10.2015.

Action brought on 27 July 2016 — HX v Council

(Case T-408/16)

(2016/C 419/62)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Parties

Applicant: HX (Damascus, Syria) (represented by: S. Koev, lawyer)

Defendant: Council of the European Union