

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

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

Pleas in law

- Infringement of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
- Infringement of Article 59(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council;
- Infringement of Article 60(1)(a) and Article 60(1)(c) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 9 September 2022 — France v Commission

(Case T-555/22)

(2022/C 408/56)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: French Republic (represented by: T. Stehelin, A. Daniel and E. Leclerc, acting as Agents)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the notice of Open Competition EPSO/AD/400/22, entitled ‘Administrators (AD 7) and experts (AD 9) in the fields of defence industry and space’ published on 16 June 2022 in the Official Journal of the European Union; ⁽¹⁾
- order the European Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

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

1. First plea in law, alleging the notice of Open Competition EPSO/AD/400/22, entitled ‘Administrators (AD 7) and experts (AD 9) in the fields of defence industry and space’ (‘the contested notice of competition’) creates discrimination that is based on language and which is not justified.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the requirement to recruit officials of the highest standard of ability, efficiency and integrity.
3. Third plea in law, alleging the contested notice of competition circumvents the procedures provided by the Treaties to determine the rules governing the languages of the institutions of the European Union and the detailed rules for their application.
4. Fourth plea in law, alleging infringement of the European Union’s duty to respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity and ensure that Europe’s cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced.
5. Fifth plea in law, alleging infringement of the duty to state reasons.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2022 C 233A, p. 1.