

2. Second plea in law, alleging that recitals 5, 6 and 7 to the contested regulation are contradictory
  - The applicant argues in this respect that recitals 5 and 6 are at variance with recital 7 and that protection is also tacitly conferred on a designation in respect of which registration was not requested and which is liable to give rise to confusion as regards the geographical indication of the main ingredient.
3. Third plea in law, alleging that the Commission's interpretation of the facts was wrong and a misuse of its power
  - The applicant maintains in this respect that recital 9 refers to the fact that existing products are allegedly jeopardised whilst denying that this is the case. However, such harm is not alleged but real and the claims of the association putting forward the proposal have given rise to anti-competitive conduct that is likely to harm, unlawfully, existing competitors on the market, undermining their acquired rights as a result of the misuse of power on the part of the Commission.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging that the transitional protection no longer applied
  - The applicant maintains in this respect that the statement of the facts in recital 10 to the contested regulation is incorrect in that the transitional national protection in Italy has expired since no programme of self-regulation concerning the product specification has been adopted.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of Article 7(e) of Regulation No 1151/2012
  - The applicant maintains in this respect that the contested regulation, in prohibiting deep-freezing and preservation techniques, legitimises unlawful practices on the part of the association putting forward the proposal that are inconsistent with EU law and with the free movement of goods and services, the Commission distorting in recitals 11 and 12 the actual scope of the specification, which clearly infringes Regulation No 1151/2012.

---

**Order of the General Court of 2 March 2015 — Watch TV v Council**

**(Case T-639/13) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2015/C 138/86)

*Language of the case: French*

The President of the Sixth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 45, 15.2.2014.

---

**Order of the General Court of 4 March 2015 — Messi Cuccittini v OHIM — Pires Freitas Campos (LEO)**

**(Case T-459/14) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(2015/C 138/87)

*Language of the case: Spanish*

The President of the Fifth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 329, 22.9.2014.

---