

- In such circumstances, may account be taken of the practical difficulties associated with the monitoring of illegal poaching?
 - In considering whether a satisfactory alternative exists, is the objective of preventing harm to dogs and increasing the general feeling of security also potentially a relevant factor?
3. How is the requirement laid down in Article 16(1) of the Habitats Directive concerning the conservation status of species' populations to be assessed when regionally restricted derogation permits are granted?
- Is the conservation status of a species to be assessed by reference both to a particular area and to the territory of the Member State as a whole or by reference to an even wider range of the species in question?
 - Is it possible to satisfy the requirements for granting a derogation permit laid down in Article 16(1) of the Habitats Directive even though the conservation status of a species cannot be regarded as favourable within the meaning of the directive on the basis of a proper assessment?
 - If the previous question is answered in the affirmative, in which circumstances could that be possible?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ 1992 L 206, p. 7).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Curtea de Apel Ploiești (Romania) lodged on 1 December 2017 — Oana Mădălina Călin v Direcția Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploiești — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Dâmbovița, Statul Român — Ministerul Finanțelor Public, and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

(Case C-676/17)

(2018/C 063/11)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Curtea de Apel Ploiești

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Oana Mădălina Călin

Respondents: Direcția Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploiești — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Dâmbovița, Statul Român — Ministerul Finanțelor Public, and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

Question referred

Can Article 4(3) TEU, which refers to the principle of sincere cooperation, Articles 17, 20, 21 and 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 110 TFEU, the principle of legal certainty and the principles of equivalence and effectiveness stemming from the principle of procedural autonomy be interpreted as precluding national legislation, namely Article 21(2) of Law No 554/2004 on administrative proceedings as interpreted by Ruling No 45/2016 of the Înalta Curte de Casație și Justiție (ICCJ) — Completul pentru dezlegarea unor chestiuni de drept (High Court of Cassation and Justice — Panel for the Resolution of Points of Law), under which the period within which a request for revision based on Article 21(2) of Law No 554/2004 may be submitted is one month from the date of notification of the final judgment subject to revision?