

Action brought on 12 June 2019 — Polisario Front v Council**(Case T-356/19)**

(2019/C 270/36)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Popular Front for the Liberation of Saguia el-Hamra and Rio de Oro (Polisario Front) (represented by: G. Devers, lawyer)*Defendant:* Council of the European Union**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare its action for annulment admissible;
- annul the contested regulation;
- order the Council to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action brought against Council Regulation (EU) 2019/440 of 29 November 2018 on the allocation of fishing opportunities under the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Kingdom of Morocco and the Implementation Protocol thereto (OJ 2019 L 77, p.1), the applicant relies on a single plea in law, alleging lack of legal basis of that regulation on account of the illegality of Decision 2019/441.

That plea is divided into eleven parts which are essentially identical to the eleven pleas in Case T-344/19, *Polisario Front v Council*.

Action brought on 13 June 2019 — Groupe Canal + v Commission**(Case T-358/19)**

(2019/C 270/37)

*Language of the case: French***Parties***Applicant:* Groupe Canal + (Issy-les-Moulineaux, France) (represented by: P. Wilhelm, P. Gassenbach and O. de Juvigny, lawyers)*Defendant:* European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the action admissible and well-founded;
- annul, on the basis of Article 263 TFEU, the Commission Decision of 7 March 2019 in Case AT.40023 so far as concerns the French market and the existing and future contracts of Groupe Canal +;
- order the Commission to pay all of the costs incurred by the company Groupe Canal +.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging misuse of powers by the Commission in so far as the commitments, which it rendered binding, for the purposes of ending geo-blocking in the field of cinema interfere with the legislative reforms recently adopted by the EU legislature.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the Commission made a manifest error of assessment in relation to Article 101(1) TFEU in so far as it found that the commitments proposed by NBCUniversal, Sony Pictures, Warner Bros and Sky do not affect the cultural diversity and more generally the financing and exploitation of films in the European Economic Area.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the principle of proportionality in that the Commission made binding a number of commitments which were manifestly disproportionate to the competition concerns raised and which infringed the interests of third parties.

Action brought on 19 June 2019 — Camerin v Commission

(Case T-367/19)

(2019/C 270/38)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Laure Camerin (Bastia, France) (represented by: M. Casado García-Hirschfeld, lawyer)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the application admissible and well-founded;
- consequently, annul the contested decision in part;