

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Sofia Zoo

Defendant: Országos Környezetvédelmi, Természetvédelmi és Vízügyi Főfelügyelőség

Questions referred

1. Under Article 11(2)(a) of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, ⁽¹⁾ must permits and certificates be deemed void only in respect of the specimens actually affected by a ground for invalidity, or in respect also of the other specimens covered by the permit or certificate?
2. Does Article 11(2)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 provide that all the specimens covered by the permits or certificates deemed void in accordance with Article 11(2)(a) must be seized, and may be confiscated, or only those which are actually affected by the ground for invalidity?

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein (OJ L 61, 3.3.1997, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Centrale Raad van Beroep (Netherlands) lodged on 17 October 2013 — Raad van bestuur van de Sociale verzekeringsbank v E. Fischer-Lintjens

(Case C-543/13)

(2014/C 15/07)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Centrale Raad van Beroep

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Raad van bestuur van de Sociale verzekeringsbank

Respondent: E. Fischer-Lintjens

Questions referred

1. Must the term 'payable', as used in Article 27 et seq. of

Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71, ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that the decisive factor for the purpose of determining the point in time from which a pension is payable is the date of the decision to make an award, after which the pension is paid, or the commencement date of the pension awarded with retroactive effect?

2. If the term 'payable' refers to the commencement date of the pension awarded with retroactive effect:

Can this be reconciled with the fact that the person entitled to receive the pension who comes under Article 27 of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 cannot, under Netherlands legislation, take out medical care insurance with the same retroactive effect?

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to members of their families moving within the Community (OJ, English Special Edition 1971(II), p. 416).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Stockholms tingsrätt (Sweden) lodged on 21 October 2013 — Abcur AB v Apoteket Farmaci AB

(Case C-544/13)

(2014/C 15/08)

Language of the case: Swedish

Referring court

Stockholms tingsrätt

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Abcur AB

Defendant: Apoteket Farmaci AB

Questions referred

1. Can a prescription-only medicinal product for human use which is used only in emergency health care, for which no marketing authorisation has been granted by the competent authority in a Member State or pursuant to Regulation (EEC) No 2309/93, ⁽¹⁾ and which is prepared by an operator such as that involved in the proceedings before the Stockholms tingsrätt (Stockholm District Court) and ordered by health care institutions on the conditions material to the case before the Stockholms tingsrätt, be covered by any of the exceptions in Article 3(1) or (2) of Directive 2001/83 ⁽²⁾ on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, in particular in a situation where there is another authorised medicinal product with the same active substance, same dosage and same pharmaceutical form?