

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

Principally:

- annul the decision of 4 July 2019 dismissing the applicant;
- order the European Parliament to pay compensation in the sum of EUR 20 000 in respect of the non-material harm suffered;
- order the European Parliament to pay the costs;

In the alternative:

- find that the decision dissolving the political group ENF was unlawful;
- accordingly, annul the decision of 4 July 2019 dismissing the applicant;
- order the European Parliament to pay compensation in the sum of EUR 20 000 in respect of the non-material harm suffered;
- order the European Parliament to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

In support of the action, the applicant relies, principally, on five pleas in law that are identical or similar to those relied upon in Case T-154/20, *IY v Parliament*.

In the alternative, the applicant pleads the unlawfulness of the decision dissolving the European political group ENF. The applicant argues that since the dissolution decision was unlawful, as it was vitiated by a manifest error of assessment and a misuse of powers, the dismissal decision — which was based exclusively on that dissolution — is itself, therefore, unlawful and must be annulled.

---

**Action brought on 23 March 2020 — JB v Cedefop**

(Case T-159/20)

(2020/C 201/42)

*Language of the case: Greek*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* JB (represented by: V. Christianos, lawyer)

*Defendant:* European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (‘CEDEFOP’)

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul CEDEFOP’s implied rejection decision of 19 January 2020;
- order CEDEFOP to pay to the applicant the total sum of EUR 442 276,78.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the right to sound administration by reason of the examination of the applicant's claim for compensation by an official of CEDEFOP with the status of an incriminating witness; infringement of Article 11a of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union ('the Staff Regulations').
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement of the presumption of innocence in the context of the examination of the applicant's request under Article 90(1) of the Staff Regulations, as confirmed by the implied decision rejecting the complaint lodged under Article 90(2) of the Staff Regulations.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the defendant downgraded the applicant professionally and decided not to promote her, in breach of the Staff Regulations and the principle of impartiality.

---

**Action brought on 27 March 2020 — 3M Belgium v ECHA**

**(Case T-160/20)**

(2020/C 201/43)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Applicant:* 3M Belgium (Diegem, Belgium) (represented by: J.-P. Montfort and T. Delille, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Chemicals Agency

**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul ECHA Decision of 16 January 2020 (ECHA/01/2020) regarding the 'Inclusion of substances of very high concern in the Candidate List for eventual inclusion in Annex XIV' of the REACH Regulation <sup>(1)</sup>, as regards the listing of 'Perfluorobutane sulfonic acid ("PFBS") and its salts';
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

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

1. First plea in law, alleging that the contested decision was adopted in breach of the Article 57(f) of the REACH Regulation requirements and that the defendant manifestly erred in its assessment, since it has not demonstrated that the Substance is causing probable serious effects to human health and the environment.
2. Second plea in law, alleging that the contested Decision was adopted in breach of the principle of legal certainty, including that of foreseeability, given that the applicant was not placed in a position to identify or ascertain in any manner the definition, criteria or factors used by ECHA to support its decision.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC, OJ L 396, 2006, p. 1