

3. Is the right of residence on the basis of Article 20 TFEU, which by its nature depends on the existence [of] a relationship of dependency between the third-country national and the Union citizen and is therefore finite, of a temporary nature?
4. If the right of residence on the basis of Article 20 TFEU is of a temporary nature, must Article 3(2)(e) of the Directive [then] be interpreted as precluding national legislation which only excludes residence permits issued under national law from acquiring long-term residence status within the meaning of the Directive?

(¹) Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents (OJ 2004 L 16, p. 44).

Appeal brought on 23 November 2020 by Arkadiusz Kaminski against the judgment of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 23 September 2020 in Case T-677/19, Polfarmex v EUIPO — Kaminski

(Case C-626/20 P)

(2021/C 128/10)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Arkadiusz Kaminski (represented by: E. Pijewska, M. Mazurek, W. Trybowski, radcowie prawni)

Other parties to the proceedings: European Union Intellectual Property Office, Polfarmex S.A

By order of 28 January 2021, the Court of Justice (Chamber determining whether appeals may proceed) held that the appeal was not allowed to proceed and that Mr Arkadiusz Kaminski should bear his own costs.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank Amsterdam (Netherlands) lodged on 7 December 2020 — European arrest warrant issued against X; other Party to the proceedings: Openbaar Ministerie

(Case C-665/20)

(2021/C 128/11)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Rechtbank Amsterdam

Parties to the main proceedings

European arrest warrant issued against: X

Other Party to the proceedings: Openbaar Ministerie

Questions referred

1. Should Article 4(5) of Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA (¹) be interpreted as meaning that, where a Member State chooses to transpose that provision into domestic law, the executing judicial authority must have a certain discretion as to whether or not it is appropriate to refuse to execute the EAW?
2. Should the concept of ‘the same acts’ in Article 4(5) of Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA be interpreted in the same way as in Article 3(2) of Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA and, if not, how should that concept be interpreted in the former provision?