

Grounds of appeal and main arguments

The first ground of appeal alleges infringement of Article 19 of the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union. That ground is based on the submission that the interpretation given by the General Court regarding the application of that provision is flawed and contrary to the principles of proportionality and subsidiarity, in so far as it does not take into consideration the fact that the legal relationship indicated between the legal adviser (*radca prawny*) and the university is based on the independence and equality of the parties, and that, by its very nature, the profession of legal adviser in the Polish legal system is characterised by independence and an absence of subordination in relation to third parties and is also a profession of public trust.

The second ground of appeal alleges that the General Court infringed Article 119 of the Rules of Procedure of 23 April 2015. That ground is based on the submission that the General Court did not properly set out the reasons for its decision, because, in the grounds of the order under appeal, it provided an abstract statement and failed to link the view expressed to the facts of the present case, thereby significantly limiting the possibility for the appellant to put forward a proper defence.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Pécsi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary) lodged on 22 September 2017 — Alekszj Torubarov v Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal

(Case C-556/17)

(2018/C 005/25)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Pécsi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Alekszj Torubarov

Defendant: Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal

Question referred

Is Article 46(3) of Directive 2013/32/EU⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection, in conjunction with Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, to be interpreted as meaning that the Hungarian courts have the power to amend administrative decisions of the competent asylum authority refusing international protection, and also to grant such protection?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2013, L 180, p. 60.

Appeal brought on 22 September 2017 by the Republic of Poland against the order of the General Court (Eighth Chamber) of 13 June 2017 in Case T-137/16, Uniwersytet Wrocławski v Research Executive Agency (REA)

(Case C-561/17 P)

(2018/C 005/26)

Language of the case: Polish

Parties

Appellant: Republic of Poland (represented by: B. Majczyna, acting as Agent)