

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Conseil d'État (Belgium) lodged on 2 September 2019 — JP v
Commissaire général aux réfugiés et aux apatrides**

(Case C-651/19)

(2019/C 372/24)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Conseil d'État

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: JP

Defendant: Commissaire général aux réfugiés et aux apatrides

Question referred

Must Article 46 of Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection ⁽¹⁾ (recast), by virtue of which applicants must be given a right to an effective remedy against decisions 'taken on their application for international protection', and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union be interpreted as precluding a rule of national procedure, such as Article 39/57 of the Law of 15 December 1980 on entry to the territory, residence, establishment and removal of foreign nationals, read in conjunction with Article 51/2, 5^o of the first subparagraph of Article 57/6(3) and Article 57/6/2(1) of that law, establishing a time limit of 10 'calendar' days, starting from the notification of the administrative decision, for bringing an action against a decision declaring a subsequent application for international protection lodged by a third-country national inadmissible, in particular where that notification was made to the Office of the Commissioner General for Refugees and Stateless Persons where the applicant is 'deemed' by law to have elected a domicile?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2013 L 180, p. 60.

**Appeal brought on 5 September 2019 by NeXovation, Inc. against the judgment of the General Court
(First Chamber, Extended Composition) delivered on 19 June 2019 in Case T-353/15: NeXovation
v Commission**

(Case C-665/19 P)

(2019/C 372/25)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: NeXovation, Inc. (represented by: A. von Bergwelt, M. Nordmann, L. Hettstedt, Rechtsanwälte)

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission

Form of order sought

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- set aside points 3 and 4 of the operative part of the judgment under appeal, and annul Article 3(2) and the final indent of Article 1 of the Commission Decision ⁽¹⁾ of 1 October 2014 on the State aid SA.31550 implemented by Germany for Nurburgring (with a corrigendum of 13 April 2015);