

Questions referred

1. Are Articles 19, 22 and 29 of the Montreal Convention to be understood and interpreted as meaning that an air carrier is liable to third parties, inter alia to the passengers' employer, a legal person with which a transaction for the international carriage of passengers was entered into, for damage occasioned by a flight's delay, on account of which the applicant (the employer) incurred additional expenditure connected with the delay (for example, the payment of travel expenses)?
2. If the first question is answered in the negative, is Article 29 of the Montreal Convention to be understood and interpreted as meaning that those third parties have the right to bring claims against the air carrier on other bases, for example, in reliance upon national law?

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Latvia) lodged on 19 September 2014 —
Valsts ieņēmumu dienests v Artūrs Stretinskis**

(Case C-430/14)

(2014/C 421/32)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Valsts ieņēmumu dienests

Defendant: Artūrs Stretinskis

Questions referred

1. Must Article 143(1)(h) of Commission Regulation No 2454/93 ⁽¹⁾ of 2 July 1993 laying down provisions for the implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 ⁽²⁾ establishing the Community Customs Code be interpreted as referring not only to situations in which the parties to the transaction are exclusively natural persons, but also to situations in which there is a family or kinship relationship between a director of one of the parties (a legal person) and the other party to the transaction (a natural person) or a director of that party (in the case of a legal person)?
2. If the answer is affirmative, must the judicial body hearing the matter carry out an in-depth examination of the circumstances of the case in relation to the actual influence of the natural person concerned over the legal person?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1993 L 253, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ 1992 L 302, p. 1.

**Appeal brought on 23 September 2014 by National Iranian Oil Company against the judgment
delivered on 16 July 2014 in Case T-578/12 National Iranian Oil Company v Council**

(Case C-440/14 P)

(2014/C 421/33)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Appellant: National Iranian Oil Company (represented by: J.-M. Thouvenin, avocat)

Other parties to the proceedings: Council of the European Union, European Commission