

2. Article 10(3) of Regulation No 469/2009 is to be interpreted as meaning that the fact that no marketing authorisation has been granted by the Member State concerned at the time the supplementary protection certificate application is lodged in that Member State does not constitute an irregularity that can be cured under that provision.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 22, 23.1.2017.

Judgment of the Court (Eighth Chamber) of 14 December 2017 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Helsingin hallinto-oikeus — Finland) — Proceedings brought by Anstar Oy

(Case C-630/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products — Harmonised standard EN 1090-1:2009+A1:2011 — Criteria for determining the scope of a standard adopted by the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN) in accordance with a mandate of the European Commission — Anchors to be fixed into concrete before it sets and used for fastening facade elements and masonry supports to the building frame)

(2018/C 052/14)

Language of the case: Finnish

Referring court

Helsingin hallinto-oikeus

Parties to the main proceedings

Anstar Oy

Other party: Turvallisuus- ja kemikaalivirasto (Tukes)

Operative part of the judgment

Harmonised standard EN 1090-1:2009+A1:2011, 'Execution of steel structures and aluminium structures — Part 1: Requirements for conformity assessment of structural components', must be interpreted as meaning that products, such as those at issue in the main proceedings, intended to be fixed into concrete before it sets fall within its scope if they have a structural function, in the sense that their removal from a structure would immediately reduce its resistance.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 63, 27.2.2017.

Judgment of the Court (Eight Chamber) of 7 December 2017 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Administrativo No 1 de Pamplona — Spain) — Wilber López Pastuzano v Delegación del Gobierno en Navarra

(Case C-636/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents — Directive 2003/109/EC — Article 12 — Adoption of a decision to expel a long-term resident — Matters to be taken into consideration — National legislation — Failure to take those matters into consideration — Whether compatible)

(2018/C 052/15)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Administrativo No 1 de Pamplona