

Form of order sought

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- Set aside the judgment of the General Court;
- Give a final judgment on the pleas of the appellant's action for annulment where the stage of the procedure so permits, and partially annul the decisions contested at first instance;
- In the alternative, refer the case for reconsideration to the General Court;
- Order the Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The Appellant submits that the General Court infringed EU law in its appraisal of the appellant's pleas in law in its judgment as follows:

- The General Court erred in its legal assessment of the Commission's position on the relevance of a single economic entity (an integrated sales department of the exporting producer, located outside of the country of export) for the purposes of applying Article 2(9) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 ⁽¹⁾ ('the Basic Anti-dumping Regulation') and erred in law by abstaining from ruling on the arguments of the Appellant based on the case law in *Interpipe and Nikopolsky*, thereby affecting the appellant's right to judicial review,
- The General Court erred in law, including in its assessment of the case law it examined, when it placed the burden of proof concerning the extent of the amount of adjustment under Article 2(9) of the Basic Anti-dumping Regulation on the interested party who claims that the adjustment is excessive on account of a demonstrated existence of a single economic entity;
- The General Court erred in law by ruling that the existence of a single economic entity was not an issue in the contested decisions and before the General Court, and by basing its ruling on the premise that the Commission's rejection of the existence of a single economic entity was not contained in the text of the contested decisions; the General Court failed to assess that such a rejection by the Commission was made in the parallel interim review investigation conducted pursuant to Article 11(3) of the Basic Anti-dumping Regulation, relating to the same imports and covering the same investigation period.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community (codified version), OJ L 343, p. 51

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Superior de Justicia del País Vasco (Spain) lodged on 1 June 2015 — Gorka Salaberria Sorondo v Academia Vasca de Policía y Emergencias

(Case C-258/15)

(2015/C 270/20)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Tribunal Superior de Justicia del País Vasco

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Gorka Salaberria Sorondo

Defendant: Academia Vasca de Policía y Emergencias

Question referred

Is the setting of a maximum age of 35 years as a condition for participation in the selection process for recruitment to the post of officer of the police force of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country (*Policía Autónoma Vasca*) compatible with the interpretation of Article 2(2), Article 4(1) and Article 6(1)(c) of Council Directive 2000/78/EC ⁽¹⁾ of 27 November 2000?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation OJ 2000 L 303, p. 16.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Vredegerecht te Ieper (Belgium) lodged on 1 June 2015 —
Nationale Maatschappij der Belgische Spoorwegen NV v Gregory Demey**

(Case C-261/15)

(2015/C 270/21)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Vredegerecht te Ieper

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Nationale Maatschappij der Belgische Spoorwegen NV

Defendant: Gregory Demey

Question referred

Does Article 6(2), in fine, of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations preclude the Belgian national penalty provisions, ..., under which a train passenger without a ticket — and in the absence of regularisation within the periods laid down in the relevant regulations — commits a criminal offence, which excludes any contractual relationship between the transport company and the train passenger, with the consequence that the benefit of the legal protection provisions under European and Belgian national law which are based on that (exclusive) contractual relationship with that consumer, ..., is also denied to the train passenger?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2007 L 315, p. 14.

Action brought on 8 June 2015 — European Commission v Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

(Case C-274/15)

(2015/C 270/22)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: European Commission (represented by: F. Dintilhac and C. Soulay, acting as Agents)

Defendant: Grand Duchy of Luxembourg