3. If the answer to question 2 is that, in the case referred to in question 2, the grant applicant concerned can rely directly on Article 66(1) of Regulation 508/2014 as the legal basis for a claim against his Member State on the provision of the grant in question, does Article 65(6) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 ([3]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 ('Regulation 1303/2013') then preclude the provision of a grant for the preparation and implementation of a production and implementation plan in a situation where the grant application is submitted after the production and marketing plan has been prepared and implemented?

([1]) OJ 2014 L 149, p. 1.
([2]) OJ 2013 L 354, p. 1.
([3]) OJ 2013 L 347, p. 320.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Wojewódzki Sąd Administracyjny w Warszawie (Poland) lodged on 12 June 2018 — Delfarma Sp. z o.o. v Prezes Urzędu Rejestracji Produktów Leczniczych, Wyrobów Medycznych i Produktów Biobójczych

(Case C-387/18)

(2018/C 294/44)

Language of the case: Polish

Referring court

Wojewódzki Sąd Administracyjny w Warszawie

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Delfarma Sp. z o.o.

Defendant: Prezes Urzędu Rejestracji Produktów Leczniczych, Wyrobów Medycznych i Produktów Biobójczych

Question referred

Does EU law, including without limitation Article 34 and Article 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, preclude national legislation whereby the marketing authorisation in a Member State for a medicinal product imported in parallel cannot be granted quite simply because the medicinal product imported in parallel has been authorised in the Member State of export as a generic medicinal product, namely on the basis of an abridged dossier, whereas in the Member State of import this medicinal product has been authorised as a reference medicinal product, namely on the basis of a full dossier, and the authorisation is refused without examining whether both products are essentially therapeutically identical and without the national authority applying — despite this being possible — for documentation to the appropriate authority in the Member State of export?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal de première instance francophone de Bruxelles (Belgium) lodged on 13 June 2018 — Brussels Securities SA v Belgian State

(Case C-389/18)

(2018/C 294/45)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Tribunal de première instance francophone de Bruxelles