

**Operative part of the order**

Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts, the second subparagraph of Article 19(1) TEU and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union must be interpreted as meaning that they are not applicable in the context of a dispute relating to the establishment of jurisdiction concerning related cases, since that dispute does not come within the scope of Directive 93/13.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 330, 2.10.2017.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Vilniaus apygardos administracinis teismas (Lithuania) lodged on 3 November 2017 — Baltic Media Alliance Ltd v Lietuvos radijo ir televizijos komisija**

(Case C-622/17)

(2018/C 052/19)

*Language of the case: Lithuanian*

**Referring court**

Vilniaus apygardos administracinis teismas

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Baltic Media Alliance Ltd

*Defendant:* Lietuvos radijo ir televizijos komisija

**Questions referred**

1. Does Article 3(1) and (2) of Directive 2010/13/EU <sup>(1)</sup> of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services cover only cases in which a receiving Member State seeks to suspend television broadcasting and/or re-broadcasting, or does it also cover other measures taken by a receiving Member State with a view to restricting in some other way the freedom of reception of programmes and their transmission?
2. Must recital 8 and Article 3(1) and (2) of Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services be interpreted as prohibiting receiving Member States, after they have established that material referred to in Article 6 of that directive was published, transmitted for distribution and distributed in a television programme re-broadcast and/or distributed via the Internet from a Member State of the European Union, from taking, without the conditions set out in Article 3(2) of that directive having been fulfilled, a decision such as that provided for in Article 33(11) and 33(12)(1) of the Lithuanian Law on the provision of information to the public, that is to say, a decision imposing an obligation on re-broadcasters operating in the territory of the receiving Member State and other persons providing services relating to distribution of television programmes via the Internet to determine, on a provisional basis, that the television programme may be re-broadcast and/or distributed via the Internet only in television programme packages that are available for an additional fee?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2010 L 95, p. 1.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Giudice di Pace di Roma (Italy) lodged on 3 November 2017 — Alberto Rossi and Others v Ministero della Giustizia**

(Case C-626/17)

(2018/C 052/20)

*Language of the case: Italian*

**Referring court**

Giudice di Pace di Roma