

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Apelativen sad Sofia (Bulgaria) lodged on 21 June 2022 —
UA v EUROBANK BULGARIA AD**

(Case C-409/22)

(2022/C 359/45)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Apelativen sad Sofia

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: UA

Defendant: EUROBANK BULGARIA AD

Questions referred

1. Does a power of attorney by which the agent makes a disposal of assets on behalf of the payer by means of a payment order constitute a payment instrument within the meaning of Article 4(23) of [Directive 2007/64/EC ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on payment services in the internal market amending Directives 97/7/EC, 2002/65/EC, 2005/60/EC and 2006/48/EC and repealing Directive 97/5/EC]?
2. Does the ‘apostille’ certificate placed on a document by the competent foreign authority in accordance with the 1961 Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents form part of the authentication procedure for both the payment instrument and the payment transaction within the meaning of Article 4 (19) of that directive, in conjunction with Article 59(1) thereof?
3. If the payment instrument (including one authorising a third person to make disposals on behalf of the payer) is formally (*prima facie*) regular, can the national court assume that the payment transaction is authorised, that is to say, that the payer has consented to its execution?

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2007/64/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on payment services in the internal market amending Directives 97/7/EC, 2002/65/EC, 2005/60/EC and 2006/48/EC and repealing Directive 97/5/EC (OJ 2007 L 319, p. 1).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Verwaltungsgerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 21 June
2022 — Thermalhotel Fontana Hotelbetriebsgesellschaft m.b.H.**

(Case C-411/22)

(2022/C 359/46)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Verwaltungsgerichtshof

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant on a point of law: Thermalhotel Fontana Hotelbetriebsgesellschaft m.b.H.

Respondent authority: Bezirkshauptmannschaft Südoststeiermark

Questions referred

1. Does compensation which is due to workers during their isolation as persons infected with, suspected of being infected with, or suspected of being contagious with COVID-19 for the pecuniary disadvantages caused by the impediment to their employment, and which is initially payable to the workers by their employer, with the entitlement to compensation vis-à-vis the Austrian Federal Government then being transferred to the employer at the time of payment, constitute a sickness benefit within the meaning of Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004? ⁽¹⁾