

In that regard, does it make any difference whether, within the meaning of the second question, coordination in bilateral relations must take place separately, that is to say, on the one hand, between the States hitherto concerned and, on the other hand, between one of the States hitherto concerned and the 'other' State?

- (¹) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ 2004 L 166, p. 1).
- (²) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ 2009 L 284, p. 1).
- (³) Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 of the Council of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community (OJ 1971 L 149, p. 2).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Frankfurt am Main (Germany) lodged on
26 May 2023 — MN v Qatar Airways**

(Case C-335/23, Qatar Airways)

(2023/C 271/24)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landgericht Frankfurt am Main

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant and appellant: MN

Defendant and respondent: Qatar Airways

Questions referred

1. Is Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 (¹) to be interpreted as meaning that the passenger travels free of charge under the first alternative in [the first sentence of] Article 3(3) of that regulation in the case where he or she is required to pay only fees and aviation taxes for the flight ticket?
2. If the first question is answered in the negative:

Is Regulation No 261/2004 to be interpreted as meaning that it does not concern a fare available (indirectly) to the public within the meaning of the second alternative in [the first sentence of] Article 3(3) of that regulation in the case where the flight was booked as part of a special offer provided by an air carrier for a limited period and in limited quantity, and which was available only to a certain group of professions?

3. If the second question is also answered in the negative and Regulation No 261/2004 is regarded as applicable:
 - (a) Is Article 8(1)(c) of that regulation to be interpreted as meaning that there must be a temporal link between, on the one hand, the original booked and cancelled flight and, on the other, the desired re-routing at a later date?
 - (b) How should that temporal link, if necessary, be defined?

(¹) Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91 (OJ 2004 L 46, p. 1).

Action brought on 30 May 2023 — European Commission v Slovak Republic

(Case C-341/23)

(2023/C 271/25)

Language of the case: Slovak

Parties

Applicant: European Commission (represented by: M. Ioan and R. Lindenthal, Agents)

Defendant: Slovak Republic

Form of order sought

- Declare that, by failing to ensure that conditioning plans and any corrective measures were submitted for approval in respect of the 11 landfills set out in the application (Vlčie Hory, Bojná part B and part C — Phase I, Čadca –Podzávoz, Rajec — Šuja, Ružomberok — Biela Púť, Landfill TKO Zubrohlava, Hnúšťa — Kotlište, Detva — Studienec Phase II., Hontianske Tesáre, Hôrky — Pláne a Stropkov — Chotča) so that a final decision can be taken on whether the operation of the landfill can continue on the basis of a conditioning plan for the site or whether measures should be taken to close down the landfill as soon as possible, the Slovak Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 14(a) and (b) of Directive 1999/31/EC⁽¹⁾ on the landfill of waste;
- Declare that, by failing to ensure that measures were taken to close down as soon as possible the ten landfill sites set out in the application (Stupava — Žabáreň, Bobogdány, Prietrž, Veronika Dežerice, Landfill KO Duslo, Šahy — Holá Stráž, Židová — Vráble, Smutná, Hnúšťa — Branzová, Veľká Ves), the Slovak Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 14(b) of Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste
- Order the Slovak Republic to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

Under Article 14 of Directive 1999/31, the Slovak Republic was required to take measures in order that existing landfills, that is to say, 'landfills which [had] been granted a permit or which [were] already in operation at the time of transposition of [that] directive', were assessed on the basis of the requirements of the directive and were either closed down as soon as possible or were brought into compliance with the Directive over an eight-year transitional period, which expired on 16 July 2009.

Under Article 14(a) of the Directive, the Slovak Republic was required, within a period of one year from the entry into force of the legislation implementing the Directive, to ensure that the operator of the landfill prepare and present to the competent authorities, for their approval, a conditioning plan for the site including the particulars listed in Article 8 and any corrective measures needed in order to comply with the requirements of that directive. Under Article 14(b) of the Directive, following the presentation of that conditioning plan for the site, the competent authorities were to take, on the basis of that plan and the directive, a definite decision on whether the operation of the site could continue. Under the last sentence of Article 14(b) of the Directive, the Slovak Republic was also required to adopt, in accordance with Article 7(g) and Article 13, the necessary measures to close down as soon as possible sites which were not granted, in accordance with Article 8, a permit to continue to operate.

The Slovak Republic has failed to fulfil those obligations.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste (OJ 1999 L 182, p. 1)

Appeal brought on 8 June 2023 by Compagnie industrielle de la matière végétale (CIMV) against the judgment of the General Court (Eighth Chamber) delivered on 29 March 2023 in Case T-26/22, CIMV v Commission

(Case C-366/23 P)

(2023/C 271/26)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: Compagnie industrielle de la matière végétale (CIMV) (represented by: B. Le Bret, R. Rard and P. Renié, avocats)

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission