

Application for authorisation to serve a garnishee order brought on 9 September 2019 — Ntinios Ramon v European Commission

(Case C-675/19 SA)

(2019/C 432/26)

Language of the case: Greek

Parties

Applicant: Ntinios Ramon (represented by: Achilleas Demetriades and Charalampos Pogiatsis, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant requests:

- A. an order by the Court ordering the removal of the immunity of the European Commission under Article 1 of Protocol (No 7) ⁽¹⁾ on the privileges and immunities of the European Union and authorising the service and execution of:
 - 1) the interim garnishee order nisi dated 26 June 2019 which was handed down by the Eparchiako Dikastirio Ammochostou (District Court of Famagusta) in Cyprus,
 - 2) whatever final order is made by that court,
 - 3) any other related order.
- B. whatever order and remedy the Court judges to be fair and equitable in the circumstances.
- C. Costs inclusive of VAT.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2016 C 202, p. 266.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunalul Vâlcea (Romania) lodged on 11 September 2019 — S.C. Valoris S.R.L. v Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice Craiova — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Vâlcea and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

(Case C-677/19)

(2019/C 432/27)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Tribunalul Vâlcea

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: S.C. Valoris S.R.L.

Defendants: Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice Craiova — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Vâlcea and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

Question referred

Are the principles of sincere cooperation, equivalence and effectiveness to be interpreted as precluding a provision of national law, such as Article 1(2) of Ordonanța de urgență a Guvernului nr. 52/2017 (Government Emergency Order No 52/2017), which has laid down a time limit of approximately 1 year for the lodging of applications for the reimbursement of certain taxes levied in breach of EU law, while domestic legislation lays down no similar time limit for the exercise of the right to reimbursement of sums levied in breach of domestic law?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunale di Milano (Italy) lodged on 13 September 2019 — SPV Project 1503 Srl, Dobank SpA v YB

(Case C-693/19)

(2019/C 432/28)

Language of the case: Italian

Referring court

Tribunale di Milano

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: SPV Project 1503 Srl, Dobank SpA

Defendant: YB

Question referred

Under what conditions, if any, do Articles 6 and 7 of Directive 93/13/EEC ⁽¹⁾ and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union preclude a national law, such as the one referred to, which prevents the enforcement court from performing a review of the content of a judicial enforceable instrument that has become final and, where a consumer has expressed his or her desire to rely on the unfairness of a term contained in the contract in respect of which the enforceable instrument was issued, precludes the same court from overriding the effects of the implicit force of *res judicata*?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts (OJ 1993 L 95, p. 29).
