Judgment of the General Court of 7 June 2018 — OW v EASA

(Case T-597/16) (1)

(Civil service — Members of the temporary staff — Assignment in the interest of the service — Transfer to a new post — Manifest error of assessment — Obligation to state reasons — Right to a fair hearing — Misuse of powers)

(2018/C 259/42)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: OW (represented by: S. Rodrigues and C. Bernard-Glanz, lawyers)

Defendant: European Aviation Safety Agency (represented by: initially F. Manuhutu and A. Haug, and subsequently by A Haug, acting as Agents, and by D. Waelbroeck and A. Duron, lawyers)

Re:

Application under Article 270 TFEU for annulment of Decision 2015/155/ED dated 20 July 2015, by which the Executive Director of EASA assigned the applicant to a new post.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Dismisses the action;
- 2. Orders OW to pay the costs.

Judgment of the General Court of 7 June 2018 — Sipral World v EUIPO — La Dolfina (DOLFINA) (Case T-882/16) (1)

(EU trade mark — Revocation proceedings — EU word mark DOLFINA — No genuine use of the mark — Article 51(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 (now Article 58(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001) — Obligation to state reasons — Article 75 of Regulation No 207/2009 (now Article 94 of Regulation 2017/1001))

(2018/C 259/43)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Sipral World, SL (Barcelona, Spain) (represented by: R. Almaraz Palmero and A. Ruo, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: J. Ivanauskas and D. Walicka, acting as Agents)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of EUIPO, intervener before the General Court: La Dolfina, SA (Buenos Aires, Argentina) (represented by: J.Carbonell Callicó, lawyer)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 22 September 2016 (Case R 1897/2015-2), relating to revocation proceedings between La Dolfina and Sipral World.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 296, 16.8.2016 (case initially registered before the European Union Civil Service Tribunal under Case No F-27/16 and transferred to the General Court of the European Union on 1.9.2016).

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Dismisses the action;
- 2. Orders Sipral World, SL, to pay the costs.
- (1) OJ C 46, 13.2.2017.

Judgment of the General Court of 7 June 2018 — Schmid v EUIPO — Landeskammer für Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Steiermark (Steirisches Kürbiskernöl)

(Case T-72/17) $(^1)$

(EU trade mark — Revocation proceedings — International registration designating the European Union — Figurative mark Steirisches Kürbiskernöl — Protected geographical indication — Article 15, Article 51(1)(a) and Article 55(1) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 (now Article 18, Article 58(1)(a) and Article 62(1) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001) — Genuine use of the mark — Use as a trade mark)

(2018/C 259/44)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Gabriele Schmid (Halbenrain, Austria) (represented by: B. Kuchar, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (represented by: D. Hanf, acting as Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of EUIPO, intervener before the General Court: Landeskammer für Landund Forstwirtschaft in Steiermark (Graz, Austria) (represented by: I. Hödl and S. Schoeller, lawyers)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 7 December 2016 (Case R 1768/2015-4), relating to revocation proceedings between Ms Schmid and Landeskammer für Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Steiermark.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

- 1. Annuls the decision of the Fourth Board of Appeal of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) of 7 December 2016 (Case R 1768/2015-4);
- 2. Dismisses the action as to the remainder;
- 3. Orders EUIPO to bear its own costs and also to pay the costs incurred by Ms Gabriele Schmid;
- 4. Orders Landeskammer für Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Steiermark to bear its own costs.
- (1) OJ C 104, 3.4.2017.