

2. If so, in circumstances where the executing member state has applied in its national legislation the optional grounds for non-execution of the European arrest warrant set out in Article 4.1 and Article 4.7(b) of the Framework Decision, how is the executing judicial authority to make its determination as regards an offence stated to be committed in the third state, but where the surrounding circumstances of that offence display preparatory acts that took place in the issuing state?

(¹) Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (OJ 2002, L 190, p. 1).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Sąd Okręgowy w Poznaniu (Poland) lodged on 26 June 2019 –
Kancelaria Medius SA, established in Kraków v RN**

(Case C-495/19)

(2019/C 337/06)

Language of the case: Polish

Referring court

Sąd Okręgowy w Poznaniu

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Kancelaria Medius SA, established in Kraków

Defendant: RN

Question referred

Should Article 7(1) of Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts (¹) be interpreted as precluding procedural rules under which a court may issue a default judgment on the basis merely of an applicant's statements contained in the application, and which the court is obliged to accept as true, in a case where the defendant (a consumer), who has been duly notified of the date of the hearing, does not appear when summoned and does not mount a defence?

(¹) OJ 1993 L 95, p. 29.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Sąd Najwyższy (Poland) lodged on 3 July 2019 — M.F. v J.M.

(Case C-508/19)

(2019/C 337/07)

Language of the case: Polish

Referring court

Sąd Najwyższy