

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Oberster Gerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 13 April 2017 —  
Bundeskammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte v ING-DiBa Direktbank Austria Niederlassung der ING-  
DiBa AG**

(Case C-191/17)

(2017/C 239/29)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Oberster Gerichtshof

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Bundeskammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte

*Defendant:* ING-DiBa Direktbank Austria Niederlassung der ING-DiBa AG

**Question referred**

Must Article 4(14) of Directive 2007/64/EC<sup>(1)</sup> on payment services in the internal market (the Payment Services Directive) be interpreted as meaning that an online savings account with which a customer (without notice and without any particular involvement of the bank) may by way of telebanking make deposits into and withdrawals from a reference account (a current account in Austria) held in his name is also to be included within the term ‘payment account’ (Article 4(14) of that directive) and thus falls within the scope of that directive?

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2007/64/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on payment services in the internal market amending Directives 97/7/EC, 2002/65/EC, 2005/60/EC and 2006/48/EC and repealing Directive 97/5/EC (OJ 2007 L 319, p. 1).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank Den Haag, sitting in Amsterdam (Netherlands)  
lodged on 25 April 2017 — X v Staatssecretaris van Veiligheid en Justitie**

(Case C-213/17)

(2017/C 239/30)

*Language of the case: Dutch*

**Referring court**

Rechtbank Den Haag, sitting in Amsterdam

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* X

*Defendant:* Staatssecretaris van Veiligheid en Justitie

**Questions referred**

1. Must Article 23(3) of the Dublin Regulation<sup>(1)</sup> be interpreted as meaning that Italy has become responsible for examining the application for international protection lodged by the applicant in that country on 23 October 2014, despite the fact that the Netherlands were the Member State primarily responsible on the basis of the applications for international protection, within the meaning of Article 2(d) of the Dublin Regulation, previously lodged in that country, the last of which was still under examination in the Netherlands at that time, because the Administrative Law Division of the Raad van State had not yet delivered judgment in the appeal brought by the applicant against the ruling [AWB 14/13866] of the Rechtbank [Den Haag, sitting in Middelburg] of 7 July 2014 ...?