

**Order of the Court (Tenth Chamber) of 4 September 2014 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tatabányai Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary)) — István Tivadar Szabó v Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Közép-dunántúli Regionális Adó Főigazgatósága**

(Case C-204/14) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Tax debts accumulated by a commercial company — Director of that company could not be recruited to be a director of another company — Article 53(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Interpretation requested of provisions of EU law that are inapplicable — Manifest lack of jurisdiction of the Court — Hypothetical questions — Manifest inadmissibility)*

(2014/C 431/12)

Language of the case: Hungarian

**Referring court**

Tatabányai Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

**Parties to the main proceedings**

Applicant: István Tivadar Szabó

Defendant: Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Közép-dunántúli Regionális Adó Főigazgatósága

**Operative part of the order**

1. The Court of Justice of the European Union manifestly lacks jurisdiction to provide an answer to the third question posed by the Tatabányai Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary).
2. The other questions posed by the aforementioned court are manifestly inadmissible.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 245, 28.7.2014.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Krajowa Izba Odwoławcza (Poland) lodged on 14 August 2014 — Esaprojekt sp. z o.o. v Województwo Łódzkie**

(Case C-387/14)

(2014/C 431/13)

Language of the case: Polish

**Referring court**

Krajowa Izba Odwoławcza

**Parties to the main proceedings**

Appellant: Esaprojekt sp. z o.o.

Respondent: Województwo Łódzkie

**Questions referred**

- 1) Does Article 51 of 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 ('Directive 2004/18/EC'), <sup>(1)</sup> in conjunction with the principle of equal and non-discriminatory treatment of economic operators and the principle of transparency set out in Article 2 thereof, allow an economic operator, when clarifying or supplementing documents, to refer to the performance of contracts (that is to say, supplies provided) other than those which it referred to in the list of supplies attached to the tender, and in particular can it refer to the performance of contracts by another entity the use of whose resources it did not refer to in the tender?