3. In the event that Article 4(7) of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 is applicable to award procedures under Article 5(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 in conjunction with Directive 2004/18/EC or Directive 2014/24/EU, does the determination of the self-provision rate lie within the discretion of the contracting authority, taking into account recital 19 in the preamble to Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007, with the result that the requirement by the contracting authority of a self-provision rate of 70 %, measured in timetable kilometres, is justifiable?

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on public passenger transport services by rail and by road and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1191/69 and 1107/70 (OJ 2007 L 315, p. 1).

([2]) Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts (OJ 2004 L 134, p. 114).

([3]) Directive 2014/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC Text with EEA relevance (OJ 2014 L 94, p. 65).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Sø- og Handelsretten (Denmark) lodged on 18 June 2015 — Ferring Lægemidler A/S, acting on behalf of Ferring B.V. v Orifarm A/S

(Case C-297/15)

(2015/C 294/42)

Language of the case: Danish

Referring court

Sø- og Handelsretten

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Ferring Lægemidler A/S, acting on behalf of Ferring B.V.

Defendant: Orifarm A/S

Questions referred

1. Must Article 7(2) of Directive 2008/95/EC ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2008 to approximate the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks and the related case-law be interpreted as meaning that a trade mark proprietor may lawfully object to the continued marketing of a medicinal product by a parallel importer, where the importer has repackaged the medicinal product in a new, outer packaging and reaffixed the trade mark in a situation where the trade mark proprietor has marketed the medicinal product in the same volume and packet sizes in all EEA countries where the medicinal product is sold?

2. Will the answer to the first question be different if the trade mark proprietor in both the country of export and the country of import has marketed the medicinal product in two different packet sizes (10-piece packets and 1-piece packets) and the importer has purchased 10-piece packets in the country of export and repackaged them in 1-piece packets, on which the trade mark has been reaffixed before the products are marketed in the country of import?

([1]) OJ 2008 L 299, p. 25.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Administratif (Luxembourg) lodged on 19 June 2015 — Charles Kohll, Sylvie Kohll-Schlesser v Director of the Administration des Contributions Directes

(Case C-300/15)

(2015/C 294/43)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Tribunal Administratif