

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber) (United Kingdom) made on
12 May 2014 — Portmeirion Group UK Ltd v The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue &
Customs**

(Case C-232/14)

(2014/C 235/12)

Language of the case: English

Referring court

First-tier Tribunal (Tax Chamber)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Portmeirion Group UK Ltd

Defendant: The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs

Questions referred

Is the contested Regulation (Council Regulation No 412/2013 ⁽¹⁾) incompatible with EU law in so far as it

- i. is based on manifest errors of assessment with respect to the definition of the product concerned, thereby invalidating the conclusions of the anti-dumping investigation; and
- ii. lacks adequate reasons as required under Article 296 TFEU?

⁽¹⁾ Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 412/2013 of 13 May 2013 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of ceramic tableware and kitchenware originating in the People's Republic of China
OJ L 131, p. 1

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Audiencia Provincial de Barcelona (Spain) lodged on
13 May 2014 — Safe Interenvíos, S.A. v Liberbank, S.A. and Others**

(Case C-235/14)

(2014/C 235/13)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Audiencia Provincial de Barcelona

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Safe Interenvíos, S.A.

Defendants: Liberbank, S.A., Banco de Sabadell, S.A. and Banco Bilbao Vizcaya Argentaria, S.A.

Questions referred

- 1) The interpretation of Article 11(1) of Directive 2005/60/EC ⁽¹⁾:
 - a) If this provision is read in conjunction with Article 7 of that directive, was it the Union legislature's intention to establish a genuine derogation from the possibility that credit institutions may adopt customer due diligence measures when their customers are themselves payment institutions in turn subject to their own supervision system, or is it simply an authorisation to derogate?
 - b) If this provision is read in conjunction with Article 5 of that directive, may the national legislature transpose the derogation laid down in the provision concerned in terms other than the actual wording thereof?