Request for a preliminary ruling from the Cour d'appel de Bruxelles (Belgium) lodged on 14 July 2014 — Quenon K. SPRL v Citibank Belgium SA, Metlife Insurance SA

(Case C-338/14)

(2014/C 339/08)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Cour d'appel de Bruxelles

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Quenon K. SPRL

Defendants: Citibank Belgium SA, Metlife Insurance SA

Questions referred

1) Must Article 17 of Council Directive 86/653/EEC of 18 December 1986 on the coordination of the laws of the Member States relating to self-employed commercial agents ([1]) be interpreted as meaning that the national legislature is authorised to provide that after the termination of the contract, the commercial agent has the right to an indemnity for customers of which the amount must not be greater than the amount of remuneration for one year, and that, if that amount does not cover the whole of the loss actually suffered, damages in the sum of the difference between the amount of loss actually suffered and the amount of that indemnity?

2) More specifically, must Article 17(2)(c) of [Directive 86/653] be interpreted as making the award of damages additional to the indemnity for customers conditional upon the existence of a breach of contract or breach of a quasi-delictual duty of care by the principal which was the cause of the losses claimed, and to the existence of loss which is distinct from that compensated for by the lump sum of the indemnity for customers?

3) If the answer to the latter question is yes, must the breach be something other than the unilateral termination of the contract, such as, for example, giving insufficient notice, the grant of insufficient compensation in respect of notice and customers, the existence of serious reasons on the part of the principal, a breach of the right to terminate the contract or any other types of breaches of, in particular, market practice?

([1]) OJ 1986 L 382, p. 17.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Raad van State (Netherlands) lodged on 14 July 2014 — R. L. Trijber, trading as Amstelboats; other party: College van Burgemeester en Wethouders van Amsterdam

(Case C-340/14)

(2014/C 339/09)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Raad van State

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: R.L. Trijber, trading as Amstelboats

Other party: College van Burgemeester en Wethouders van Amsterdam

Questions referred

1. Is the transportation of passengers by open sloop on the internal waterways of Amsterdam, with the main purpose of providing, for payment, tours and rentals for festive occasions, as in the case in the present proceedings, a service to which the provisions of Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on services in the internal market (OJ 2006 L 376, p. 36) apply, regard being had to the exception set out in Article 2(2)(d) of that directive in respect of services in the field of transport?

2. If the answer to Question 1 is in the affirmative:

   Does Chapter III of Directive 2006/123 apply to purely internal situations, or is the assessment of the question as to whether that chapter applies subject to the case-law of the Court of Justice concerning the Treaty provisions on freedom of establishment and the free movement of services in purely internal situations?

3. If the answer to Question 2 is that the case-law of the Court of Justice concerning the Treaty provisions on freedom of establishment and the free movement of services in a purely internal situation applies to the assessment of the question as to whether Chapter III of Directive 2006/123 is applicable:

   (a) Should the national courts apply the provisions laid down in Chapter III of Directive 2006/123 in a situation such as that in the present case, in which the service provider has not established himself on a cross-border basis and does not offer services on a cross-border basis, but nevertheless relies on those provisions?

   (b) Is it relevant to the answer to that question that the services are expected to be provided mainly to residents of the Netherlands?

   (c) In order to answer that question, is it necessary to determine whether undertakings established in other Member States have shown or will show genuine interest in providing the same or comparable services?

4. Does it follow from Article 11(1)(b) of Directive 2006/123 that, if the number of authorisations is limited by an overriding reason relating to the public interest, the duration of the validity of the authorisations must also be limited, regard being had also to the objective pursued by that directive of securing free access to the market for services, or is this a matter which lies within the discretion of the competent authority of the Member State?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Raad van State (Netherlands) lodged on 14 July 2014 — J. Harmsen; other party: Burgemeester van Amsterdam

(Case C-341/14)

(2014/C 339/10)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Raad van State

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: J. Harmsen

Other party: Burgemeester van Amsterdam

Questions referred

1. Does Chapter III of Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on services in the internal market (OJ 2006 L 376, p. 36) apply to purely internal situations, or is the assessment of the question as to whether that chapter applies subject to the case-law of the Court of Justice concerning the Treaty provisions on freedom of establishment and the free movement of services in purely internal situations?