

Action brought on 21 April 2022 — Procter & Gamble v EUIPO (Safeguard)**(Case T-210/22)**

(2022/C 222/63)

*Language of the case: English***Parties**

Applicant: The Procter & Gamble Company (Cincinnati, Ohio, United States) (represented by: M. Körner, lawyer)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Trade mark at issue: Application for European Union figurative mark Safeguard — Application for registration No 18 457 075

Contested decision: Decision of the Fifth Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 21 February 2022 in Case R 1753/2021-5

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 7(1)(b) and (c) in conjunction with Article 7(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 22 April 2022 — Synesis v Council**(Case T-215/22)**

(2022/C 222/64)

*Language of the case: German***Parties**

Applicant: Synesis TAA (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: G. Lansky and A. Egger, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- pursuant to Article 263 TFEU, annul Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2022/307 of 24 February 2022 implementing Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus (OJ 2022 L 46, p. 97) and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/300 of 24 February 2022 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus (OJ 2022 L 46, p. 3), in so far as they concern the applicant;
- pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Council to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the argument that the contested measures are unlawful in so far as they concern the applicant, the applicant relies on a single plea in law, alleging that the Council committed a manifest error of assessment and in particular infringed its examination obligations. In the applicant's view, the Council failed to provide any concrete evidence to justify the validity of the applicant's inclusion on the list in the contested measures.

Action brought on 22 April 2022 — Shatrov v Council**(Case T-216/22)**

(2022/C 222/65)

*Language of the case: German***Parties**

Applicant: Alexander Evgenevich Shatrov (Minsk, Belarus) (represented by: G. Lansky and A. Egger, lawyers)

Defendant: Council of the European Union

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- pursuant to Article 263 TFEU, annul Council Implementing Decision (CFSP) 2022/307 of 24 February 2022 implementing Decision 2012/642/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Belarus (OJ 2022 L 46, p. 97) and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/300 of 24 February 2022 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Belarus (OJ 2022 L 46, p. 3), in so far as they concern the applicant;
- pursuant to Article 134 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court, order the Council to pay the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the argument that the contested measures are unlawful in so far as they concern the applicant, the applicant relies on a single plea in law, alleging that the Council committed a manifest error of assessment and in particular infringed its examination obligations. In the applicant's view, the Council failed to provide any concrete evidence to justify the validity of the applicant's inclusion on the list in the contested measures.

Order of the General Court of 1 April 2022 — Classen Holz Kontor v EUIPO — Deutsche Steinzeug Cremer & Breuer (DRYTILE)**(Case T-307/21) ⁽¹⁾**

(2022/C 222/66)

Language of the case: German

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

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 289, 19.7.2021.
