

not run counter to the fundamental objectives of Regulation No 44/2001, do not lead to results which are less favourable for achieving sound operation of the internal market and are sufficiently clear and precise.

-
- (¹) Council Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000 of 29 May 2000 on insolvency proceedings (OJ 2000 L 160, p. 1).
 (²) 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).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Vrhovno sodišče Republike Slovenije (Slovenia) lodged on 29 March 2013 — Damijan Vnuk v Zavarovalnica Triglav d. d.

(Case C-162/13)

(2013/C 156/37)

Language of the case: Slovenian

Referring court

Vrhovno sodišče Republike Slovenije

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Damijan Vnuk

Defendant: Zavarovalnica Triglav d. d.

Question referred

Must the concept of ‘the use of vehicles’ within the meaning of Article 3(1) of Council Directive 72/166/EEC (¹) of 24 April 1972 on the approximation of the laws of Member States relating to insurance against civil liability in respect of the use of motor vehicles, and to the enforcement of the obligation to insure against such liability, be interpreted as not extending to the circumstances of the present case, in which the person insured by the defendant struck the applicant’s ladder with a tractor towing a trailer while hay was being stored in a hayloft, on the basis that the incident did not occur in the context of a road traffic accident?

(¹) OJ 1972 L 103, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Conseil Constitutionnel (France) lodged on 4 April 2013 — Jeremy F. v Premier ministre

(Case C-168/13)

(2013/C 156/38)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Conseil Constitutionnel

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Jeremy F.

Defendant: Premier ministre

Question referred

Must Articles 27 and 28 of Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (¹) be interpreted as precluding the Member States from providing for an appeal suspending execution of the decision of the judicial authority which rules, within a period of 30 days from receipt of the request, in order either to consent to the prosecution, sentencing or detention of a person with a view to the carrying out of a custodial sentence or detention order for an offence committed prior to his surrender pursuant to a European arrest warrant, other than that for which he was surrendered, or to consent to the surrender of a person to a Member State other than the executing Member State pursuant to a European arrest warrant issued for an offence committed prior to his surrender?

(¹) OJ 2002 L 190, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Riigikohus (Estonia) lodged on 28 March 2013 — MTÜ Liivimaa Lihaveis v Eesti-Läti programmi 2007-2013 Seirekomitee

(Case C-175/13)

(2013/C 156/39)

Language of the case: Estonian

Referring court

Riigikohus (Estonia)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant and appellant: MTÜ Liivimaa Lihaveis

Defendant and respondent: Eesti-Läti programmi 2007-2013 Seirekomitee

Intervener: Eesti Vabariigi Siseministeerium

Questions referred

2.1 Are the Member States taking part in the Estonia-Latvia Programme 2007-2013, when setting up the monitoring committee referred to in Articles 63(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 (¹) and Article 14(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006, (²) required, in accordance with the third sentence of Article 19(1) of