

## V

(Announcements)

## COURT PROCEEDINGS

## COURT OF JUSTICE

**Appeal brought on 13 January 2014 by Associazione sportiva Taranto calcio Srl against the order of the General Court (Ninth Chamber) delivered on 19 November 2013 in Case T-476/13 Associazione sportiva Taranto calcio Srl v Italian Republic**

(Case C-11/14 P)

(2014/C 245/02)

*Language of the case: Italian*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Associazione sportiva Taranto calcio Srl (represented by: N. Russo, avvocato)

*Other party to the proceedings:* Italian Republic

By order of 30 April 2014, the Court of Justice (Sixth Chamber) dismissed the appeal.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunale di Milano (Italy) lodged on 27 February 2014 — Unione Nazionale Industria Conciaria (UNIC), Unione Nazionale dei Consumatori di Prodotti in Pelle, Materie Concianti, Accessori e Componenti (Unicopel) v FS Retail, Luna srl, Gatsby srl**

(Case C-95/14)

(2014/C 245/03)

*Language of the case: Italian*

**Referring court**

Tribunale di Milano

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicants:* Unione Nazionale Industria Conciaria (UNIC), Unione Nazionale dei Consumatori di Prodotti in Pelle, Materie Concianti, Accessori e Componenti (Unicopel)

*Defendants:* FS Retail, Luna srl, Gatsby srl

**Questions referred**

- (1) Do Articles 34, 35, and 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 — under which it is compulsory, in the case of products obtained from working carried out in foreign countries but which use the Italian word 'pelle' [fine leather], to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin — to products made of leather lawfully worked or placed on the market in other Member States of the European Union, since that law constitutes a measure having an effect equivalent to a quantitative restriction prohibited under Article [34] TFEU and not justified by Article 36 of that Treaty?

- (2) Do Articles 34, 35, and 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 — under which it is compulsory, in the case of products obtained from working carried out in foreign countries but which use the Italian word ‘pelle’, to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin — to products made of leather obtained from working carried out in non-member countries and not already lawfully placed on the market in the European Union, since that law constitutes a measure having an effect equivalent to a quantitative restriction prohibited under Article [34] TFEU and not justified by Article 36 of that Treaty?
- (3) Do Articles 3 and 5 of Directive 94/11/EC <sup>(1)</sup>, correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 — under which it is compulsory, in the case of products obtained from working carried out in foreign countries but which use the Italian word ‘pelle’, to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin — to products made of leather lawfully worked, or lawfully placed on the market, in other Member States of the European Union?
- (4) Do Articles 3 and 5 of Directive 94/11/EC, <sup>(2)</sup> correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013, under which it is compulsory, in the case of products made of leather obtained from working carried out in non-member countries and not already lawfully placed on the market in the European Union, to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin?
- (5) Does Article 60 of Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 October 2013, correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 — under which it is compulsory, in the case of products obtained from working carried out in foreign countries but which use the Italian word ‘pelle’, to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin — to products made of leather obtained from working carried out in Member States of the European Union or not already lawfully placed on the market in the European Union?
- (6) Does Article 60 of Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 October 2013, correctly construed, preclude the application of Article 3(2) of [Italian] Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 — under which it is compulsory, in the case of products obtained from working carried out in foreign countries but which use the Italian word ‘pelle’, to affix a label thereto indicating the country of origin — to products made of leather obtained from working carried out in non-member countries and not already lawfully placed on the market in the European Union?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 1994 L 100, p. 37.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ 1994 L 100, p. 37.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesgerichtshof (Germany) lodged on 18 April 2014 —  
Bundesverband der Verbraucherzentralen und Verbraucherverbände — Verbraucherzentrale  
Bundesverband e.V. v Teekanne GmbH & Co. KG**

**(Case C-195/14)**

(2014/C 245/04)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Bundesgerichtshof

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Bundesverband der Verbraucherzentralen und Verbraucherverbände — Verbraucherzentrale Bundesverband e.V.

*Defendant:* Teekanne GmbH & Co. KG