

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Conseil d'État (Belgium) lodged on 17 January 2020 —
E. M. T. v Commissaire général aux réfugiés et aux apatrides**

(Case C-20/20)

(2020/C 95/22)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Conseil d'État

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: E. M. T.

Respondent: 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⁾ by virtue of which applicants must have the 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, read in conjunction with Articles 20 and 26 of [Directive 2013/32], be interpreted as precluding a rule of national procedure, such as Article 39/57 of the Belgian Law of 15 December 1980 on entry to the territory, residence, establishment and removal of foreign nationals, establishing a time limit of 10 'calendar' days, starting from the notification of the administrative decision, for bringing an action against a decision rejecting a subsequent application for international protection, 'where the action is brought by a foreign national who, at the time of notification of the decision, is in a specific place referred to in Articles 74/8 and 74/9 [of the same Law] or who is placed at the disposal of the [Belgian] Government', in particular where the applicant must, following the notification of the administrative decision in question, take the step of finding a new legal adviser and securing free legal assistance in order to initiate proceedings?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2013 L 180, p. 60.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Administrativen sad Sofia-grad (Bulgaria) lodged on
17 January 2020 — Balgarska natsionalna televizia v Direktor na Direktsia 'Obzhalsvane i
danachno-osiguritelna praktika' — Sofia pri Zentralno upravlenie na Natsionalnata Agentsia za
Prihodite**

(Case C-21/20)

(2020/C 95/23)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Administrativen sad Sofia-grad

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Balgarska natsionalna televizia

Defendants: Direktor na Direktsia 'Obzhalsvane i danachno-osiguritelna praktika' — Sofia pri Zentralno upravlenie na Natsionalnata Agentsia za Prihodite

Questions referred

1. Can the supply of audiovisual media services to viewers by the public television broadcaster be regarded as a service supplied for consideration within the meaning of Article 2(1)(c) of Directive 2006/112/EC ⁽¹⁾ if it is financed by the State in the form of subsidies, with the viewers paying no fees for the broadcasting, or does it not constitute a service supplied for consideration within the meaning of that provision and not fall within the scope of that Directive?
2. If the answer is that the audiovisual media services provided to viewers by the public television broadcaster fall within the scope of Article 2(1)(c) of Directive 2006/112/EC, can it then be considered that exempt supplies for the purposes of Article 132(1)(q) of the Directive are involved, and is a national regulation which exempts this activity solely on the basis of the payment from the State budget received by the public television broadcaster, regardless of whether that activity is also of a commercial nature, permissible?
3. Is a practice which makes a full right of input tax deduction for purchases dependent not solely on the use of the purchases (for taxable or non-taxable activity), but also on the way in which those purchases are financed, namely on the one hand from self-generated income (advertising services inter alia), and on the other hand from State subsidisation, and which grants the right to full input tax deduction only for purchases financed from self-generated income and not for those financed through State subsidies, with the delimitation thereof being required, permissible pursuant to Article 168 of Directive 2006/112/EC?
4. If it is considered that the activity of the public television broadcaster consists of taxable and exempt supplies, having regard to its mixed financing, what is the scope of the right to input tax deduction in respect of those purchases and which criteria must be applied for the determination thereof?

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax (OJ 2006 L 347, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the *Klagenævnet for Udbud* (Denmark) lodged on 17 January 2020 — *Simonsen & Weel A/S v Region Nordjylland and Region Syddanmark*

(Case C-23/20)

(2020/C 95/24)

Language of the case: Danish

Referring court

Klagenævnet for Udbud

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Simonsen & Weel A/S

Defendants: Region Nordjylland and Region Syddanmark

Questions referred

1. Are the principles of equal treatment and transparency laid down in Article 18(1) of [Directive 2014/24] ⁽¹⁾ and Article 49 of [Directive 2014/24], in conjunction with points 7 and 10(a) of Part C of Annex V to Directive 2014/24, to be interpreted as meaning that the contract notice in a case such as the present must contain information on the estimated quantity and/or the estimated value of the supplies under the framework contract to which the tender relates?