

Operative part of the order

The Court of Justice of the European Union manifestly lacks jurisdiction to answer the questions referred by the Tribunal da Relação do Porto (Court of Appeal, Oporto, Portugal).

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 168, 29.5.2017.

Order of the Court (Seventh Chamber) of 21 November 2017 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság — Hungary) — VE v WD

(Case C-232/17) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 53(2) and Article 94 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Consumer protection — Directive 93/13/EEC — Unfair terms in consumer contracts — Credit agreement denominated in a foreign currency — Lack of sufficient information concerning the factual and legal context of the dispute in the main proceedings and the reasons justifying the need for a reply to the questions referred — Manifest inadmissibility)

(2018/C 032/11)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: VE

Defendant: WD

Operative part of the order

The request for a preliminary ruling from the Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság (Central District Court, Buda, Hungary), by decision of 10 April 2017, is manifestly inadmissible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 256, 7.8.2017.

Order of the Court of 16 November 2017 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Supremo Tribunal Administrativo — Portugal) — Instituto de Financiamento da Agricultura e Pescas, IP v António da Silva Rodrigues

(Case C-243/17) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 53(2) and Article 99 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court — Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 — Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2988/95 — Article 3(1) — Protection of the European Union's financial interests — Concept of 'multiannual programme' — Scope of application)

(2018/C 032/12)

Language of the case: Portuguese

Referring court

Supremo Tribunal Administrativo

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Instituto de Financiamento da Agricultura e Pescas, IP

Defendant: António da Silva Rodrigues

Operative part of the order

1. The first subparagraph of Article 3(1) of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2988/95 of 18 December 1995 on the protection of the European Communities financial interests must be interpreted as meaning that, in the case of an irregularity which is neither continuous nor repeated, the limitation period of four years provided for in that provision runs from the date the irregularity was committed.
2. The second, third and fourth questions referred by the Supremo Tribunal Administrativo (Supreme Administrative Court, Portugal) are manifestly inadmissible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 256, 7.8.2017.

Order of the Court (Seventh Chamber) of 21 November 2017 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság — Hungary) — Zoltán Rózsavölgyi, Zoltánné Rózsavölgyi v Unicredit Leasing Hungary Zrt., Unicredit Leasing Immo Truck Zrt.

(Case C-259/17) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 53(2) and Article 94 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Consumer protection — Unfair terms in consumer contracts — Loan contract denominated in a foreign currency — Insufficient information regarding the factual and regulatory context of the dispute in the main proceedings and the reasons justifying the need for an answer to the questions referred for a preliminary ruling — Manifest inadmissibility)

(2018/C 032/13)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Zoltán Rózsavölgyi, Zoltánné Rózsavölgyi

Defendants: Unicredit Leasing Hungary Zrt., Unicredit Leasing Immo Truck Zrt.

Operative part of the order

The request for a preliminary ruling made by the Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság (Central District Court, Buda, Hungary), by decision of 31 March 2017, is manifestly inadmissible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 256, 7.8.2017.