

Operative part of the order

The request for a preliminary ruling from the Krajský soud v Ostravě (Ostrava Regional Court Czech Republic), by decision of 18 June 2019, is manifestly inadmissible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 328 of 30.9.2019.

Order of the Court (Ninth Chamber) of 19 December 2019 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunalul Ilfov — Romania) — NL v Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice București (Case C-679/19) ⁽¹⁾

(Request for a preliminary ruling — Article 99 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Controls of cash entering or leaving the European Union — Regulation (EC) No 1889/2005 — Scope — Articles 63 and 65 TFEU — Free movement of capital — Transport of large amounts of cash entering or leaving the territory of a Member State — Obligation to declare — Sanctions — Fine and confiscation for the benefit of the State of an undeclared sum in excess of 10 000 euros — Proportionality)

(2020/C 137/36)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Tribunalul Ilfov

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: NL

Defendant: Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice București

Operative part of the order

Articles 63 and 65 TFEU must be interpreted as precluding the rules of a Member State which, for the purpose of sanctioning the failure of the obligation to declare large sums of cash entering or leaving the territory of that State provides, in addition to the imposition of an administrative fine, for the confiscation for the benefit of the State an undeclared sum in excess of 10 000 euros.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 423, 17.12.2019

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Senāts) (Latvia) lodged on 27 December 2019 — SIA ‘ONDO’ v Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs

(Case C-943/19)

(2020/C 137/37)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa (Senāts)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant at first instance and appellant on a point of law: SIA ‘ONDO’

Respondent in the appeal proceedings: Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs

Questions referred

1. Is the concept of 'total cost of the credit to the consumer', defined in Article 3(g) of Directive 2008/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 on credit agreements for consumers and repealing Council Directive 87/102 EEC, ⁽¹⁾ an autonomous concept of EU law?
2. Are the costs of extending the credit included in the concept of 'total cost of the credit to the consumer' in Article 3(g) of Directive 2008/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 on credit agreements for consumers and repealing Council Directive 87/102 EEC, in circumstances such as those of the present case, if the clauses on extending the credit form part of the terms and conditions of the credit agreement agreed by the borrower and the lender?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2008 L 133, p. 66.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Senāts) (Latvia) lodged on 27 December 2019 — AS '4finance' v Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs

(Case C-944/19)

(2020/C 137/38)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa (Senāts)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant at first instance and appellant on a point of law: AS '4finance'

Respondent in the appeal proceedings: Patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības centrs

Questions referred

1. Is the concept of 'total cost of the credit to the consumer', defined in Article 3(g) of Directive 2008/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 on credit agreements for consumers and repealing Council Directive 87/102 EEC, ⁽¹⁾ an autonomous concept of EU law?
2. Are the costs of extending the credit included in the concept of 'total cost of the credit to the consumer' in Article 3(g) of Directive 2008/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 on credit agreements for consumers and repealing Council Directive 87/102 EEC, in circumstances such as those of the present case, if the clauses on extending the credit form part of the terms and conditions of the credit agreement agreed by the borrower and the lender?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2008 L 133, p. 66.