

3. Are Articles 34 and 35 of Law 1/2000 incompatible with Articles 6(1) and 7(2) of, and [point 1(q) of the Annex to], Directive [93/13/EEC] inasmuch as they preclude the production of evidence for the purpose of resolving the dispute in the administrative procedure for recovery of unpaid fees?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2000 C 364, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts (OJ 1993 L 95, p. 29).

⁽³⁾ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council ('Unfair Commercial Practices Directive') (OJ 2005 L 149, p. 22).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank van Koophandel te Gent (Belgium) lodged on 24 September 2015 — Agro Foreign Trade & Agency Ltd v Petersime NV

(Case C-507/15)

(2015/C 414/24)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Rechtbank van Koophandel te Gent

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Agro Foreign Trade & Agency Ltd

Defendant: Petersime NV

Question referred

Is the Belgian Handelsagentuurwet, ⁽¹⁾ which transposes the Commercial Agency Directive into Belgian national law, in accordance with that Directive and/or the provisions of the Association Agreement which has as its express aim the accession of Turkey to the European Union and/or the obligations between Turkey and the European Union to eliminate restrictions with regard to the free movement of services between them, when that Belgian Handelsagentuurwet provides that it only applies to commercial agents whose principal place of business is in Belgium, and does not apply when a principal established in Belgium and an agent established in Turkey have explicitly chosen Belgian law?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 86/653/EEC of 18 December 1986 on the coordination of the laws of the Member States relating to self-employed commercial agents (OJ 1986 L 382, p. 17).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas lodged on 25 September 2015 in the administrative proceedings for review of legality between Agrodetalė UAB and Lietuvos Respublikos žemės ūkio ministerija

(Case C-513/15)

(2015/C 414/25)

Language of the case: Lithuanian

Referring court

Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas

Parties to the main proceedings

Interested parties: Agrodetalė UAB, Lietuvos Respublikos žemės ūkio ministerija

Questions referred

1. Do the provisions of Directive 2003/37/EC ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on type-approval of agricultural or forestry tractors, their trailers and interchangeable towed machinery, together with their systems, components and separate technical units and repealing Directive 74/150/EEC apply to the supply to the EU market and registration of used or second-hand vehicles manufactured outside the European Union or can Member States regulate the registration of such vehicles in a Member State by special national rules and impose requirements applicable to such registration (for example, the obligation to comply with the requirements of Directive 2003/37/EC)?
2. Can Article 23(1)(b) of Directive 2003/37/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on type-approval of agricultural or forestry tractors, their trailers and interchangeable towed machinery, together with their systems, components and separate technical units and repealing Directive 74/150/EEC, read in conjunction with Article 2(q) thereof, be interpreted as laying down that the provisions of the directive are applicable to machinery in categories T1, T2 and T3 manufactured after 1 July 2009?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2003 L 171, p. 1.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the cour du travail de Bruxelles (Belgium) lodged on
28 September 2015 — Ville de Nivelles v Rudy Matzak**

(Case C-518/15)

(2015/C 414/26)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Cour du travail de Bruxelles

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Ville de Nivelles

Respondent: Rudy Matzak

Questions referred

1. Must Article 17(3)(c)(iii) of Directive 2003/88/EC concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as enabling Member States to exclude certain categories of firefighters recruited by the public fire services from all the provisions transposing that Directive, including the provision that defines working time and rest periods?
2. Inasmuch as Directive 2003/88 of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time provides for only minimum requirements, must it be interpreted as not preventing the national legislature from retaining or adopting a less restrictive definition of working time?