

**Order of the General Court of 14 January 2014 —
Miettinen v Council**

(Case T-303/13) ⁽¹⁾

*(Access to documents — Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 —
Opinion of the Council's Legal Service — Refusal of access —
Disclosure after the action was brought — Action becoming
devoid of purpose — No legal interest in bringing proceedings
— No need to adjudicate)*

(2014/C 71/40)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Samuli Miettinen (Espoo, Finland) (represented by: O. Brouwer, E. Raedts, lawyers, and A. Villette, Solicitor)

Defendant: Council of the European Union (represented by: K. Pellinghelli and É. Sitbon, acting as Agents)

Re:

Application for annulment of the Council's decision of 25 March 2013 refusing to grant the applicant access to the full text of the opinion of the Council's Legal Service, reference 15309/12.

Operative part of the order

1. *There is no need to adjudicate on the action.*
2. *The Council of the European Union shall pay the costs.*
3. *There is no need to adjudicate on the applications for leave to intervene submitted by the Kingdom of Sweden and the Republic of Finland.*

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 215, 27.7.2013.

**Action brought on 4 December 2013 — Zoltán Lomnici v
European Parliament**

(Case T-650/13)

(2014/C 71/41)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Parties

Applicant: Zoltán Lomnici (Budapest, Hungary) (represented by: Z. Lomnici, lawyer)

Defendant: European Parliament

Form of order sought

— Annul the decision of the Committee on Petitions of the European Parliament of 17 October 2013 concerning Petition No 1298/2012

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on a plea of failure to observe the obligation to state reasons and breach of the right of every Union citizen to a fair hearing. In that regard, he points out, *inter alia*, that his petition was filed without further action without any reasons being given, that he was not invited to the meeting and that he was not notified of the decision.

**Action brought on 19 December 2013 — Axa
Versicherung v Commission**

(Case T-677/13)

(2014/C 71/42)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Axa Versicherung AG (Cologne, Germany) (represented by: C. Bahr, S. Dethof and A. Malec, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested refusal;
- in the alternative, annul the contested refusal in part;
- order the defendant to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The applicant challenges the Commission's decision of 29 October 2013 concerning its second application for access to the Commission's file in Case COMP/39.125 — Carglass.

In support of the action, the applicant puts forward five pleas in law.

1. First plea in law: infringement of the duty to carry out a concrete and individual examination of the requested documents under Articles 2 and 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 ⁽¹⁾