

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Handelsgericht Wien (Austria) lodged on 21 May 2014 —  
Thomas Cook Belgium NV v Thurner Hotel GmbH**

**(Case C-245/14)**

(2014/C 303/13)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Handelsgericht Wien

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellant:* Thomas Cook Belgium NV

*Respondent:* Thurner Hotel GmbH

**Questions referred**

1. Is Regulation (EC) No 1896/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council creating a European order for payment procedure ('Regulation No 1896/2006') <sup>(1)</sup> to be interpreted as meaning that a defendant may apply for a review by the competent court of the European order for payment in accordance with Article 20(2) of Regulation No 1896/2006 also where the order for payment was effectively served on him but was issued by a court which lacks jurisdiction on the basis of the information relating to jurisdiction provided in the application form?
2. If the answer to Question 1 is in the affirmative: Do exceptional circumstances within the meaning of Article 20(2) of Regulation No 1896/2006 already exist in accordance with paragraph 25 of European Commission Notice 2004/0055 of 7 February 2006 where the European order for payment was issued on the basis of information provided in the application form which may subsequently prove to be inaccurate, particularly where the jurisdiction of the court depends on that information?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2006 L 399, p. 1.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Kecskeméti Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary)  
lodged on 26 May 2014 — György Balázs v Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Dél-alföldi Regionális Vám-  
és Pénzügyőri Főigazgatósága**

**(Case C-251/14)**

(2014/C 303/14)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Kecskeméti Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* György Balázs

*Defendant:* Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Dél-alföldi Regionális Vám- és Pénzügyőri Főigazgatósága