

Question referred

Must Articles 87(3) and 90 of Directive 2001/83/EC, ⁽¹⁾ as amended by Directive 2004/27/EC, ⁽²⁾ be interpreted as not precluding national legislation which prohibits price-based advertising of medicinal products?

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ 2001 L 311, p. 67).

⁽²⁾ Directive 2004/27/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 amending Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ 2004 L 136, p. 34).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Senāts) (Latvia) lodged on 22 June 2022 — SIA DOBELES AUTOBUSU PARKS, AS CATA, SIA VTU VALMIERA, SIA JELGAVAS AUTOBUSU PARKS, SIA Jēkabpils autobusu parks v Iepirkumu uzraudzības birojs, Valsts SIA Autotransporta direkcija

(Case C-421/22)

(2022/C 326/17)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa (Senāts)

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellants in cassation: SIA DOBELES AUTOBUSU PARKS, AS CATA, SIA VTU VALMIERA, SIA JELGAVAS AUTOBUSU PARKS, SIA Jēkabpils autobusu parks

Other parties to the proceedings: Iepirkumu uzraudzības birojs, Valsts SIA Autotransporta direkcija

Question referred

Do the second subparagraph of Article 1(1), Article 2a(2) and Article 3(2) of Regulation No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on public passenger transport services by rail and road and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1191/69 and 1107/70, ⁽¹⁾ as amended by Regulation (EU) No 2016/2338 ⁽²⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2016, permit a compensation scheme which does not impose on the competent authority an obligation to compensate a public transport service provider in full, by periodically index-linking the fare chargeable under the contract (the compensation sum), for any increase in the costs connected with providing the service which fall outside the service provider's control, and which, therefore, does not entirely eliminate the risk that the service provider will incur non-compensable losses?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2007 L 315, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EU) 2016/2338 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2016 amending Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 concerning the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail (OJ 2016 L 354, p. 22).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Kúria (Hungary) lodged on 28 June 2022 — MOL Magyar Olaj- és Gázipari Nyrt. v Mercedes-Benz Group AG

(Case C-425/22)

(2022/C 326/18)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Kúria

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: MOL Magyar Olaj- és Gázipari Nyrt.

Defendant: Mercedes-Benz Group AG

Questions referred

1. Where a parent company brings an action for damages in respect of the anti-competitive conduct of another company in order to obtain compensation for the damage suffered as a result of that conduct solely by its subsidiaries, does the registered office of the parent company determine the forum of jurisdiction, as the place where the harmful event occurred for the purposes of Article 7(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2012 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters ('the Brussels Ia Regulation')? ⁽¹⁾
2. Is the fact that, at the time of the purchases at issue in the proceedings, not all the subsidiaries belonged to the parent company's group of companies relevant for the purposes of the application of Article 7(2) of the Brussels Ia Regulation?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2012 L 351, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Oberlandesgericht München (Germany) lodged on 1 July 2022 — Generalstaatsanwaltschaft München v HF

(Case C-435/22)

(2022/C 326/19)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Oberlandesgericht München

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Generalstaatsanwaltschaft München

Defendant: HF

Question referred

Must Article 54 of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, signed on 19 June 1990 in Schengen, read in conjunction with Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that those provisions preclude the extradition of a third-country national who is not an EU citizen in terms of Article 20 of the TFEU by the authorities of a contracting state to that Convention and an EU Member State to a third country if final judgment has been passed against the person concerned by another Member State of the European Union for the same offences to which the extradition request relates and that judgment has been enforced and where the decision to refuse to extradite that person to the third country would be possible only at the cost of breaching a bilateral extradition treaty that exists with that third country?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2000 C 364, p. 1.

Action brought on 5 July 2022 — European Commission v Ireland

(Case C-439/22)

(2022/C 326/20)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: European Commission (represented by: U. Małecka, L. Malferrari, E. Manhaeve, J. Samnadda, Agents)

Defendant: Ireland