

— Council implementing Regulation (EU) No 668/2010 of 26 July 2010 implementing Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 423/2007 concerning restrictive measures against Iran

— Council Decision 2010/644/CFSP of 25 October 2010 amending Decision 2010/413/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Common Position 2007/140/CFSP

— Council Regulation (EU) No 961/2010 of 25 October 2010 on restrictive measures against Iran and repealing Regulation (EC) No 423/2007

3. Declares that the effects of Decision 2010/413, as amended by Decision 2010/644, are to be maintained as far as concerns Manufacturing Support & Procurement Kala Naft Co. Tehran from its entry into force on the 20<sup>th</sup> day following its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union until the annulment of regulation No 961/2010 takes effect.

4. Orders the Council of the European Union to bear its own costs and to by those incurred by Manufacturing Support & Procurement Kala Naft Co. Tehran.

5. Orders the European Commission to bear its own costs.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 346, 18.12.2010.

#### Judgment of the General Court of 25 April 2012 — Brainlab v OHIM (BrainLAB)

(Case T-326/11) (<sup>1</sup>)

**(Community trade mark — Community word mark BrainLAB — Failure to apply for renewal of the registration of the trade mark — Removal of the trade mark from the register on expiry of registration — Application for restitutio in integrum — Article 81 of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009)**

(2012/C 165/32)

Language of the case: German

#### Parties

**Applicant:** Brainlab AG (Feldkirchen, Germany) (represented by: J. Bauer, lawyer)

**Defendant:** Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: R. Manea, acting as Agent)

#### Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of OHIM of 15 April 2011 (Case R 1596/2010-4), relating to the application for *restitutio in integrum* and to the application for the renewal of the registration of the trade mark BrainLAB made by the applicant.

#### Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Annuls the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) of 15 April 2011 (Case R 1596/2010-4);

2. Orders each party to bear its own costs.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 269, 10.9.2011.

#### Judgment of the General Court of 24 April 2012 — Leifheit v OHIM (EcoPerfect)

(Case T-328/11) (<sup>1</sup>)

**(Community trade mark — Application for Community word mark EcoPerfect — Absolute grounds for refusal — Descriptive character — Article 7(1)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009)**

(2012/C 165/33)

Language of the case: German

#### Parties

**Applicant:** Leifheit AG (Nassau, Germany) (represented by: G. Hasselblatt, lawyer)

**Defendant:** Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: K. Klüpfel, Agent)

#### Re:

Action brought against the decision of the First Board of Appeal of OHIM of 31 March 2011 (Case R 1658/2010-1) concerning an application for registration of the word sign EcoPerfect as a Community trade mark.

#### Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Dismisses the application;

2. Orders Leifheit AG to pay the costs.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 269, 10.9.2011.

#### Action brought on 12 April 2012 — AX v Council

(Case T-196/11)

(2012/C 165/34)

Language in which the application was lodged: French

#### Parties

**Applicant:** AX (Polotsk, Belarus) (represented by: M. Michaluskas, lawyer)

**Defendant:** Council of the European Union