

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: CC

Defendant: VO

Question referred

Does the court of a Member State retain jurisdiction under Article 8(1) of the Brussels II Regulation ⁽¹⁾ if the child concerned by the case changes his or her habitual residence during the proceedings from a Member State to a third country which is a party to the 1996 Hague Convention (see Article 61 of the regulation)?

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000 (OJ 2003 L 338, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Nejvyšší soud České republiky (Czech Republic) lodged on 20 September 2021 — QT v 02 Czech Republic a.s.

(Case C-574/21)

(2021/C 481/25)

Language of the case: Czech

Referring court

Nejvyšší soud České republiky

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: QT

Defendant: 02 Czech Republic a.s.

Questions referred

1. Must the expression 'the commission lost by the commercial agent,' within the meaning of Article 17(2)(a), second indent, of Council Directive 86/653/EEC ⁽¹⁾ of 18 December 1986 on the coordination of the laws of the Member States relating to self-employed commercial agents, be interpreted to the effect that such commissions include commissions for the conclusion of contracts which a commercial agent would have entered into had the commercial agency [contract] endured, with the customers that he or she brought the principal or with which he or she significantly increased the volume of business?
2. If so, subject to what conditions does this conclusion apply to 'one-off commissions' for the conclusion of a contract?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1986 L 382, p. 17.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Itä-Suomen hallinto-oikeus (Finland) lodged on 22 September 2021 — J.M.

(Case C-579/21)

(2021/C 481/26)

Language of the case: Finnish

Referring court

Itä-Suomen hallinto-oikeus

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: J.M.

Other parties: Assistant Data Protection Supervisor, Pankki S

Questions referred

1. Is the data subject's right of access under Article 15(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation,⁽¹⁾ considered in conjunction with the [concept of] 'personal data' within the meaning of point 1 of Article 4 of that regulation, to be interpreted as meaning that information collected by the controller which indicates who processed the data subject's personal data and when and for what purpose they were processed does not constitute information in respect of which the data subject has a right of access, in particular because it consists of data concerning the controller's employees?
2. If Question 1 is answered in the affirmative and the data subject does not have a right of access to the information referred to in that question on the basis of Article 15(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation because it does not constitute 'personal data' of the data subject within the meaning of point 1 of Article 4 of the General Data Protection Regulation, it remains necessary in the present case to consider the information in respect of which the data subject does have a right of access in accordance with Article 15(1)[(a) to (h)]:
 - a. How is the purpose of processing within the meaning of Article 15(1)(a) to be interpreted in relation to the scope of the data subject's right of access, that is to say, can the purpose of the processing give rise to a right of access to the user log data collected by the controller, such as information concerning personal data of the processors and the time and the purpose of the processing of the personal data?
 - b. In that context, can the persons who processed J.M.'s customer data be regarded, under certain criteria, as recipients of the personal data within the meaning of Article 15(1)(c) of the General Data Protection Regulation, in respect of whom the data subject would be entitled to obtain information?
3. Is the fact that the bank at issue performs a regulated activity or that J.M. was both an employee and a customer of the bank at the same time relevant to the present case?
4. Is the fact that J.M.'s data were processed before the entry into force of the General Data Protection Regulation relevant to the examination of the questions set out above?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ 2016 L 119, p. 1).

Order of the President of the Court of 9 September 2021 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per il Lazio — Italy) — Irideos SpA v Poste Italiane SpA, interveners: Fastweb SpA, Tim SpA

(Case C-419/19) ⁽¹⁾

(2021/C 481/27)

Language of the case: Italian

The President of the Court has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 328, 30.9.2019.

Order of the President of the Court of 15 September 2021 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Hoge Raad der Nederlanden — Netherlands) — Stichting Brein v News-Service Europe BV

(Case C-442/19) ⁽¹⁾

(2021/C 481/28)

Language of the case: Dutch

The President of the Court has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 357, 21.10.2019.