2. If the answer to Question 1 is in the affirmative, does the assessment of the situation depend on who (airline, airport operator etc.) entrusted the tasks to the third party?

(1) Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, OJ 2004 L 46, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Wojewódzki Sąd Administracyjny w Krakowie (Poland) lodged on 27 June 2013 — Drukarnia Multipress sp. z o. o. v Minister for Finance

(Case C-357/13)

(2013/C 274/09)

Language of the case: Polish

Referring court

Wojewódzki Sąd Administracyjny w Krakowie

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Drukarnia Multipress sp. z o. o.

Defendant: Minister for Finance

Questions referred

1. Should Article 2(1)(b) and (c) of Council Directive 2008/7/EC of 12 February 2008 concerning indirect taxes on the raising of capital (1) (OJ L 46, 21.2.2008, p. 11) be interpreted to mean that a limited joint-stock partnership should be regarded as a capital company within the meaning of those provisions if it follows from the legal nature of that partnership that only part of its capital and partners are able to meet the requirements set out in Article 2(1)(b) and (c) of the Directive?

2. If the first question is answered in the negative, should Article 9 of Council Directive 2008/7/EC of 12 February 2008 concerning indirect taxes on the raising of capital (OJ L 46, 21.2.2008, p. 11), which allows a Member State to choose not to recognise the entities referred to in Article 2(2) of the Directive as capital companies, be interpreted to mean that the said Member State is also free to choose whether or not to levy capital duty on such entities?

(1) OJ 2008 L 46, p. 11.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Centrale Raad van Beroep (Netherlands) lodged on 27 June 2013 — B. Martens v Minister van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap

(Case C-359/13)

(2013/C 274/10)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Centrale Raad van Beroep

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: B. Martens

Respondent: Minister van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap

Questions referred

1A. Must European Union law, in particular Article 45 TFEU and Article 7(2) of Regulation No 1612/68, (1) be interpreted as precluding the EU Member State — the Netherlands — from terminating the right to receive study finance for education or training outside the EU of an adult dependent child of a frontier worker with Netherlands nationality who lives in Belgium and works partly in the Netherlands and partly in Belgium, at the point in time at which the frontier work ceases and work is then performed exclusively in Belgium, on the ground that the child does not meet the requirement that she must have lived in the Netherlands for at least three of the six years preceding her enrolment at the educational institution concerned?

1B. If Question 1A must be answered in the affirmative: does European Union law preclude the granting of study finance for a period shorter than the duration of the education or training for which study finance was granted, it being assumed that the other requirements governing eligibility for study finance have been satisfied?

If, in answering Questions 1A and 1B, the Court of Justice should conclude that the legislation governing the right of freedom of movement for workers does not preclude a decision not to grant Ms Martens any study finance during the period from November 2008 to June 2011 or for part of that period:

2. Must Articles 20 TFEU and 21 TFEU be interpreted as precluding the EU Member State — the Netherlands — from not extending the study finance for education or training at an educational institution which is established in the Overseas Countries and Territories (Curaçao), to which there was an entitlement because the father of the person concerned worked in the Netherlands as a frontier worker, on the ground that the person concerned does not meet the requirement, applicable to all European Union citizens, including its own nationals, that she must have lived in the Netherlands for at least three of the six years preceding her enrolment for that education or training?

(1) Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 of the Council of 15 October 1968 on freedom of movement for workers within the Community (OJ, English Special Edition 1968(II), p. 475).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Conseil d'État (Belgium) lodged on 1 July 2013 — Ordre des architectes v Belgian State

(Case C-365/13)

(2013/C 274/11)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Conseil d'État (Belgium)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Ordre des architectes

Defendant: Belgian State

Question referred

In so far as they oblige each Member State, for the purpose of access to and pursuit of professional activities, to give the same effect on its territory to the evidence of formal qualifications to which they refer as to the evidence of formal qualifications which it itself issues, must Articles 21 and 49 of Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications (1) be interpreted as preventing a State from requiring that, in order to be enrolled in a register of the Ordre des architectes, the holder of evidence of formal qualifications as an architect in accordance with Article 46 of that directive or the holder of evidence of formal qualifications referred to in Article 49(1) must also satisfy conditions concerning a professional traineeship or experience, equivalent to those required of the holders of diplomas issued on its territory after they have obtained those diplomas?

(1) OJ 2005 L 255, P.22.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Handelsgericht Wien (Austria) lodged on 3 July 2013 — Harald Kolassa v Barclays Bank PLC

(Case C-375/13)

(2013/C 274/12)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Handelsgericht Wien

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Harald Kolassa

Defendant: Barclays Bank PLC

Questions referred

A. Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 (1) **(the Brussels I Regulation):**

1. Is the wording 'in matters relating to a contract concluded by a person, the consumer, for a purpose which can be regarded as being outside his trade or profession' in Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 to be interpreted as meaning that:

1.1. an applicant, who has acquired a bearer bond as a consumer on the secondary market and now makes claims against the issuer of the bond based on prospectus liability, for breach of information and control obligations, and based on the bond terms and conditions, can invoke that ground of jurisdiction, if, by purchasing the security from a third party, the applicant has entered derivatively into the contractual relationship between the issuer and the original subscriber of the bond?

1.2. (if question 1.1. is answered in the affirmative) the applicant can invoke the wording of Article 15 of