

3. Must the phrase 'his or her possessions' (with reference to citizens) in the second sentence of Article 17(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union be interpreted as also covering remuneration rights?
4. Must the phrase 'in the public interest' in the second sentence of Article 17(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union be interpreted as relating to 'economic crisis'?
5. Must the words 'use of property, in so far as is necessary for the general interest' in the third sentence of Article 17(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union be interpreted as covering a '25 % reduction of the salaries of public sector employees'?
6. If the Romanian State were to reduce by 25 % the remuneration of employees paid from public funds, citing as justification the economic crisis and the need to balance the State budget, would that mean that, subsequently, in accordance with the second sentence of Article 17(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the State would be under an obligation to pay those employees fair compensation in good time for the loss sustained?

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Rostock (Germany) lodged on 13 August 2012 — Criminal proceedings against Per Harald Lökkevik

(Case C-384/12)

(2012/C 343/05)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landgericht Rostock

Parties to the main proceedings

Per Harald Lökkevik

Other party: Staatsanwaltschaft Rostock

Question referred

Should the concept of an advantage within the meaning of Article 4(3) of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2988/95 of 18 December 1995⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that it includes a situation in which it appears that simply a lack of competence of the European Commission has been brought about by statements made in a subsidy procedure for the purposes of avoiding the prescribed notification of regional investment aid projects with total project costs of at least

EUR 50 million laid down in Section 2(1)(i) of the Multisectoral framework on regional aid for large investment projects of 7 April 1998 (OJ 1998 C 107, p. 7)?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1995 L 312, p. 1.

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesgerichtshof (Germany), lodged on 15 August 2012 — Hi Hotel HCF SARL v Uwe Spoering

(Case C-387/12)

(2012/C 343/06)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Bundesgerichtshof

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant on a point of law: Hi Hotel HCF SARL

Respondent on a point of law: Uwe Spoering

Question referred

Is Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001⁽¹⁾ to be interpreted as meaning that the harmful event occurred in one Member State (Member State A) in the case where the tort or delict which forms the subject-matter of the proceedings or from which claims are derived was committed in another Member State (Member State B) and consists in participation in the tort or delict (principal act) committed in the first Member State (Member State A)?

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 2001 L 12, p. 1).

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Unabhängiger Verwaltungssenat des Landes Oberösterreich (Austria) lodged on 20 August 2012 — 1. Robert Pfleger and Others

(Case C-390/12)

(2012/C 343/07)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Unabhängiger Verwaltungssenat des Landes Oberösterreich (Austria)