

- 3) Article 1(b) of Regulation No 469/2009 must be interpreted as meaning that a carrier protein conjugated with a polysaccharide antigen by means of a covalent binding may be categorised as an 'active ingredient' within the meaning of that provision only if it is established that it produces a pharmacological, immunological or metabolic action of its own which is covered by the therapeutic indications of the marketing authorisation, a matter which it is for the referring court to determine, in the light of all the facts of the dispute in the main proceedings.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 61, 1.3.2014.

---

**Judgment of the Court (Second Chamber) of 15 January 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Hoge Raad der Nederlanden — Netherlands) — Ryanair Ltd v PR Aviation BV**

(Case C-30/14) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Directive 96/9/EC — Legal protection of databases — Database not protected by copyright or the sui generis right — Contractual limitation on the rights of users of the database)*

(2015/C 073/10)

Language of the case: Dutch

**Referring court**

Hoge Raad der Nederlanden

**Parties to the main proceedings**

Applicant: Ryanair Ltd

Defendant: PR Aviation BV

**Operative part of the judgment**

Directive 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the legal protection of databases must be interpreted as meaning that it is not applicable to a database which is not protected either by copyright or by the sui generis right under that directive, so that Articles 6(1), 8 and 15 of that directive do not preclude the author of such a database from laying down contractual limitations on its use by third parties, without prejudice to the applicable national law.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 135, 5.5.2014.

---

**Judgment of the Court (Fourth Chamber) of 9 January 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Cour d'appel de Bruxelles — Belgium) — RG (\*) v SF (\*)**

(Case C-498/14 PPU) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Urgent preliminary ruling procedure — Judicial cooperation in civil matters — Jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement of decisions in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility — Child abduction — Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Article 11(7) and (8))*

(2015/C 073/11)

Language of the case: French

**Referring court**

Cour d'appel de Bruxelles

---

(\*) Information erased or replaced within the framework of protection of personal data and/or confidentiality.

**Parties to the main proceedings**

Applicant: RG (\*)

Defendant: SF (\*)

**Operative part of the judgment**

Article 11(7) and (8) of Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000, must be interpreted as not precluding, as a general rule, a Member State from allocating to a specialised court the jurisdiction to examine questions of return or custody with respect to a child in the context of the procedure set out in those provisions, even where proceedings on the substance of parental responsibility with respect to the child have already, separately, been brought before a court or tribunal.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 16, 19.1.2015.

---

**Appeal brought on 1 July 2014 by Longevity Health Products, Inc. against the judgment of the General Court (Ninth Chamber) delivered on 28 April 2014 in Case T-473/11 Longevity Health Products, Inc. v Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)**

**(Case C-311/14 P)**

(2015/C 073/12)

Language of the case: German

**Parties**

Appellant: Longevity Health Products, Inc. (represented by: J. Korab, Rechtsanwalt)

Other parties to the proceedings: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs), Weleda Trademark AG

By order of 20 January 2015 the Court of Justice of the European Union (Sixth Chamber) dismissed the appeal and ordered the appellant to bear its own costs.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Amtsgericht Rüsselsheim (Germany) lodged on 10 October 2014 — Dieter Wedzel, Karin Wedzel v Condor Flugdienst GmbH**

**(Case C-466/14)**

(2015/C 073/13)

Language of the case: German

**Referring court**

Amtsgericht Rüsselsheim

---

(\*) Information erased or replaced within the framework of protection of personal data and/or confidentiality.