

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary)
lodged on 16 June 2017 — Ahmed Shajin v Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal**

(Case C-369/17)

(2017/C 293/22)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Ahmed Shajin

Defendant: Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal

Question referred

Does it follow from the expression ‘that he or she has committed a serious crime’ used in Article 17(1)(b) of Directive 2011/95/EU ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted, that the penalty provided for a specific crime under the law of the particular Member State may constitute the sole criterion to determine whether the person claiming subsidiary protection may be excluded from it?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2011 L 337, p. 9.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Högsta förvaltningsdomstolen (Sweden) lodged on 29 June
2017 — Konkurrensverket v SJ AB**

(Case C-388/17)

(2017/C 293/23)

Language of the case: Swedish

Referring court

Högsta förvaltningsdomstolen

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Konkurrensverket

Defendant: SJ AB

Questions referred

1. Must the second subparagraph of Article 5(1) of Directive 2004/17 ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that there is a network in the field of transport services when transport services on a State-administered rail network for national and international rail traffic are provided in accordance with provisions in national legislation which implement Directive 2012/34 ⁽²⁾, which involve the allocation of rail infrastructure capacity on the basis of requests from railway companies and a requirement that all requests are to be met so far as possible?