Request for a preliminary ruling from the Consiglio di Stato (Italy) lodged on 13 July 2020 — Colt Technology Services SpA, Wind Tre SpA, Telecom Italia SpA, Vodafone Italia SpA v Ministero della Giustizia, Ministero dello sviluppo economico, Ministero dell'Economia e delle Finanze, Procura Generale della Repubblica presso la Corte d'appello di Reggio Calabria, Procura della Repubblica presso il Tribunale di Cagliari, Procura della Repubblica presso il Tribunale di Roma, Procura della Repubblica presso il Tribunale di Locri

(Case C-318/20)

(2020/C 348/08)

Language of the case: Italian

Referring court

Consiglio di Stato

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellants: Colt Technology Services SpA, Wind Tre SpA, Telecom Italia SpA, Vodafone Italia SpA

Respondents: Ministero della Giustizia, Ministero dello sviluppo economico, Ministero dell'Economia e delle Finanze, Procura Generale della Repubblica presso la Corte d'appello di Reggio Calabria, Procura della Repubblica preso il Tribunale di Cagliari, Procura della Repubblica presso il Tribunale di Roma, Procura della Repubblica presso il Tribunale di Locri

Question referred

Do the general principles laid down in Articles 18, 26 and 102 et seq. TFEU preclude a provision of national law that identifies procedures for calculating the rate applied for the performance by telecommunications operators of interception activities ordered by the judicial authorities, where that provision does not require compliance with the principle of the full reimbursement of costs?

Appeal brought on 14 July 2020 by Wonder Line, SL against the judgment of the General Court (Sixth Chamber) delivered on 13 May 2020 in Case T-284/19, Wonder Line v EUIPO — De Longhi Benelux (KENWELL)

(Case C-322/20 P)

(2020/C 348/09)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Wonder Line, SL (represented by: E. Manresa Medina, abogado)

Other party to the proceedings: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

By order of 26 August 2020 of the Vice-President, the Court of Justice held that the appeal is dismissed as inadmissible and ordered the appellant to bear its own costs.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesverwaltungsgericht (Germany) lodged on 30 July 2020 — Federal Republic of Germany v BL, BC

(Case C-355/20)

(2020/C 348/10)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Bundesverwaltungsgericht

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Federal Republic of Germany

Defendants: BL, BC

Joined party: Stadt Chemnitz

Questions referred

1 (a) In the case of subsequent immigration in order to join an unaccompanied minor refugee in accordance with Article 10(3)(a) and Article 2(f) of Council Directive 2003/86/EC ([1]) of 22 September 2003, can the continued existence of the refugee's minority be a 'condition' within the meaning of Article 16(1)(a) of Directive 2003/86/EC? Is legislation of a Member State under which parents who immigrated subsequently to join an unaccompanied minor refugee for the purposes of Article 2(f) of Directive 2003/86/EC are granted a (derived) right of residence in the Member State only for as long as the refugee is actually still a minor compatible with the aforesaid provisions?

(b) If the questions in 1(a) are answered in the affirmative: Is Article 16(1)(a), read in conjunction with Article 10(3)(a) and Article 2(f), of Directive 2003/86/EC to be interpreted as meaning that a Member State under whose legislation the parents' (derived) right of residence is limited to the period up until when the child comes of age is allowed to reject an application for entry and residence for the purpose of family reunification submitted by parents still resident in a third country if the refugee has come of age before the adoption of a final decision, in administrative or court proceedings, on an application lodged within three months of recognition of the child's refugee status?

2. If the answer to Question 1 is that it is not permissible to refuse family reunification:

What requirements are to be imposed in terms of a real family relationship within the meaning of Article 16(1)(b) of Directive 2003/86/EC in cases of subsequent immigration of parents to join a refugee who comes of age before a decision is adopted on the application for entry and residence for the purposes of family reunification? In particular:

(a) Does a first-degree relationship in the direct ascending line suffice (Article 10(3)(a) of Directive 2003/86/EC) or is a real family life also necessary?

(b) If a real family life is also necessary:

How close must it be? For example, do occasional or regular visits suffice, must the family cohabit in a single household or must they also be part of a support unit whose members are reliant upon one another?

(c) For the subsequent immigration of parents who are still in a third country and who have submitted an application for family reunification to join a child with recognised refugee status who has since come of age, must there be the expectation that, following their entry, family life will be (re-)established in the Member State in the manner required in Question 2(b)?

([1]) Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification (OJ 2003 L 251, p. 12).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landesverwaltungsgericht Steiermark (Austria) lodged on 5 August 2020 — NW v Landespolizeidirektion Steiermark

(Case C-368/20)

(2020/C 348/11)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landesverwaltungsgericht Steiermark