

3. Third plea in law, alleging that the ECB failed to consider appropriately the discretionary nature of the decision.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the ECB failed to assess the relevant facts and failed to do so impartially and objectively.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging that the ECB violated the principle of proportionality.
6. Sixth plea in law, alleging that the ECB violated the *nemo auditur* principle.
7. Seventh plea in law, alleging that the ECB erred in law with respect to its considerations in connection with the presumption of innocence.
8. Eighth plea in law, alleging that the ECB violated the principal of equal treatment and acted in a discriminatory manner.
9. Ninth plea in law, alleging that the ECB violated Art. 19 and Recital 75 SSM Regulation and committed a *détournement de pouvoir*.
10. Tenth plea in law, alleging that the ECB violated the Applicants' right of defence and their right to be heard.
11. Eleventh plea in law, alleging that the ECB failed to provide an adequately reasoned decision.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013 conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions.

---

**Order of the President of the General Court of 6 November 2018 — Berliner Stadtwerke v EUIPO  
(berlinGas)**

**(Case T-595/18)** <sup>(1)</sup>

(2019/C 72/61)

*Language of the case: German*

The President of the General Court has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 436, 3.12.2018.