

**Order of the Court (Eighth Chamber) of 25 April 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal de Contas — Portugal) — Secretaria Regional de Saúde dos Açores v Ministério Público**

(Case C-102/17) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 53(2) and Article 94 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Article 267 TFEU — Concept of a ‘court or tribunal of a Member State’ — Proceedings intended to lead to a decision of a judicial nature — National court of auditors — Prior review of the legality and budgetary justification of public expenditure — Manifest inadmissibility)*

(2018/C 240/09)

Language of the case: Portuguese

**Referring court**

Tribunal de Contas

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Secretaria Regional de Saúde dos Açores

*Interested party:* Ministério Público

**Operative part of the order**

*The request for a preliminary ruling brought by the Tribunal de Contas (Court of Auditors, Portugal), by decision of 17 January 2017, is manifestly inadmissible.*

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 151, 15.5.2017.

---

**Order of the Court (Seventh Chamber) of 12 April 2018 — Cryo-Save AG v European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), MedSkin Solutions Dr. Suwelack AG**

(Case C-327/17 P) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Appeal — European Union trade mark — Revocation proceedings — Withdrawal of the application for revocation — Appeal which has become devoid of purpose — No need to adjudicate)*

(2018/C 240/10)

Language of the case: German

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Cryo-Save AG (represented by: C. Onken, Rechtsanwältin)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) (represented by: D. Hanf, Agent), MedSkin Solutions Dr. Suwelack AG (represented by: A. Thünken, Rechtsanwalt)

**Operative part of the order**

1. *There is no need to adjudicate on the present appeal.*
2. *Cryo-Save AG shall pay the costs incurred by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) in the present proceedings.*

3. *Cryo-Save AG and MedSkin Solutions Dr. Suwelack AG shall bear their own costs.*

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 330, 2.10.2017.

---

**Order of the Court (Eighth Chamber) of 17 April 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Administrativo e Fiscal de Coimbra — Portugal) — Luís Manuel dos Santos v Fazenda Pública**

(Case C-640/17) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 99 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Internal taxation — Prohibition of discriminatory taxation — Article 110 TFEU — Uniform road tax for motor vehicles — Setting of tax rate according to the date of first registration of the vehicle in the taxing Member State — Second-hand motor vehicles imported from other Member States — No account taken of the date of first registration in another Member State)*

(2018/C 240/11)

Language of the case: Portuguese

**Referring court**

Tribunal Administrativo e Fiscal de Coimbra

**Parties to the main proceedings**

Applicant: Luís Manuel dos Santos

Defendant: Fazenda Pública

**Operative part of the order**

Article 110 TFEU must be interpreted as precluding legislation of a Member State pursuant to which the uniform road tax established by that legislation is levied on light passenger motor vehicles registered or listed in that Member State without taking into account the date of first registration of the vehicle where registration took place in another Member State, which results in higher taxation of vehicles imported from another Member State compared with similar non-imported vehicles.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 42, 5.2.2018.

---

**Order of the Court (First Chamber) of 10 April 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Judecătoria Oradea — Romania) — CV v DU**

(Case C-85/18 PPU) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Urgent preliminary ruling procedure — Article 99 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court — Judicial cooperation in civil matters — Jurisdiction in matters of parental responsibility — Child custody — Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Articles 8, 10 and 13 — Concept of ‘habitual residence’ of a child — Judgment delivered by a court of another Member State concerning the place of residence of a child — Wrongful removal or retention — Jurisdiction in cases of child abduction)*

(2018/C 240/12)

Language of the case: Romanian

**Referring court**

Judecătoria Oradea