

(English version)

**Priority question for written answer P-004882/25
to the Commission
Mirosława Nykiel (PPE)
(10 December 2025)**

Subject: Complaint AT.40851 — Thermal Paper: no final Commission decision

Eco-friendly thermal paper manufacturer Estel has not yet received a final decision from the Commission in relation to complaint AT.40851 — Thermal Paper, submitted in 2021. The trader reports that the Commission's actions have only focused on explanations provided by the Koehler company thus far. At the same time, companies Mitsubishi and Jujo reported that the Commission had not contacted them, even though they have technological and practical knowledge that is relevant for the case to be comprehensively and fairly examined. This raises legitimate concerns that a decision may be made without corroborating the information with other key market players.

In connection with the above:

1. Why has the Commission not sought the opinion of other industry companies, such as Mitsubishi and Jujo, before making a decision on this case?
2. Does the Commission intend to investigate Estel's complaint, taking into account all the technological data and additional evidence relevant to the proceedings?
3. When is the final decision on complaint AT.40851 expected to be? The last action in these proceedings took place on 31 August 2024.

Submitted: 10.12.2025

**Answer given by Executive Vice-President Ribera on behalf of the European Commission
(18 February 2026)**

By its decision of 20 June 2025, which was adopted pursuant to Article 7 (2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 773/2004, the Commission rejected the complaint of Estel in case AT.40851 — Thermal Paper.

In the decision the Commission explained in detail the reasons on which it based the conclusion that the likelihood of establishing the existence of the infringement alleged by the complainant appeared limited.

The decision was notified to the complainant on 24 June 2025. The decision terminated the investigation. Before adopting the decision, the Commission conducted all the investigatory steps deemed necessary to deal with this case.

The Commission explained to the complainant in the decision that he had the right to bring an action against the decision before the General Court of the European Union in accordance with Article 263 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The complainant did not lodge such an action. The decision rejecting the complaint has therefore become final.
