

2. Is the outcome produced by the rules interpreting Article 7(b) of Ministerial Order No 199/94 in conjunction with Article 26 of that order, according to which the occurrence of adverse weather conditions in the years following the evaluation year (which is the year following the year of the restocking) results in partial repayment of the premiums, whereas where the same outcomes, caused by the same adverse weather conditions, occur in the year following the restocking, this results in total loss of entitlement to premiums, consistent with the rules of EU law?
3. Must the outcome established in Article 7(1)(b) of Ministerial Order No 199/94, which results in total loss of the beneficiary's entitlements to premiums for maintenance and loss of income where the reforestation density established in Annex C is not achieved, with no scope for a proportional reduction in payment of the aforementioned premiums where the outcome can be attributed to external factors such as the weather, be considered contrary to the proportionality principle as a general principle of the European Union, as appears to be implied (*a contrario sensu*) by the judgment in *József Lingurâr* (C-315/16, paragraphs 29 and 35)?

(¹) Council Regulation (EEC) No 2080/92 of 30 June 1992 instituting a Community aid scheme for forestry measures in agriculture (OJ 1922 L 215, p. 96).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rayonen sad Nesebar (Bulgaria) lodged on 28 March 2022 — Criminal proceedings against QS

(Case C-219/22)

(2022/C 266/13)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Rayonen sad Nesebar

Party to the main proceedings

QS

Question referred

Must Article 3(3) of **Council Framework Decision 2008/675/JHA** (¹) of 24 July 2008 on taking account of convictions in the Member States of the European Union in the course of new criminal proceedings be interpreted as precluding national legislation such as Article 68(1) of the NK, in conjunction with Article 8(2) thereof, which provides that the national court seised of an application for execution of the sentence imposed by a previous conviction handed down by a court of another Member State may, for that purpose, alter the arrangements for executing that sentence by ordering its actual execution?

(¹) OJ 2008 L 220, p. 32.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Frankfurt am Main (Germany) lodged on 5 April 2022 — FW v LATAM Airlines Group SA

(Case C-238/22)

(2022/C 266/14)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landgericht Frankfurt am Main

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant and appellant: FW

Defendant and respondent: LATAM Airlines Group SA