

3. Does the concept of 'terminations of an employment contract which occur on the employer's initiative for one or more reasons not related to the individual workers concerned', as referred to in the last subparagraph of Article 1(1) of Directive 98/59, cover the termination of a contract between the employer and the worker which, although initiated by the worker, comes about in response to a previous change in working conditions that was initiated by the employer on account of the critical difficulties being experienced by the undertaking and for which compensation is ultimately to be awarded in an amount equivalent to that payable for unfair dismissal?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies (OJ 1998 L 225, p. 16).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Latvia) lodged on 18 September 2014 —
Valsts ieņēmumu dienests v SIA 'Veloserviss'**

(Case C-427/14)

(2014/C 421/30)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Valsts ieņēmumu dienests

Defendant: SIA 'Veloserviss'

Questions referred

Should Article 78(3) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92⁽¹⁾ of 12 October 1992 establishing the Community Customs Code be interpreted as meaning that the principle of the protection of legitimate expectations limits the possibility of undertaking for a second time a post-clearance examination and revising the results of the first post-clearance examination?

May the national law of a Member State establish the procedure for the undertaking of post-clearance examinations provided for in Article 78(3) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 of 12 October 1992, establishing the Community Customs Code, and limits on the revision of the results of those examinations?

Should Article 78(3) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 of 12 October 1992, establishing the Community Customs Code, be interpreted as meaning that national legislation may legitimately contain limitations on the revision of the results of a first post-clearance examination, if information is received indicating that the provisions governing the customs procedure were applied on the basis of incorrect and incomplete information, a matter which was not known at the time of adopting the decision on the first post-clearance examination?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1992 L 302, p. 1.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Lietuvos Aukščiausiasis Teismas lodged on 18 September
2014 — Air Baltic Corporation AS v Lietuvos Respublikos specialiujų tyrimų tarnyba**

(Case C-429/14)

(2014/C 421/31)

Language of the case: Lithuanian

Referring court

Lietuvos Aukščiausiasis Teismas

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant in cassation: Air Baltic Corporation AS

Other party to the proceedings: Lietuvos Respublikos specialiujų tyrimų tarnyba