

2. Orders the European Parliament to bear its own costs and to pay the costs incurred by the Council of the European Union;
3. Orders the European Commission to bear its own costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 217, 7.6.2021.

Judgment of the Court (Fifth Chamber) of 24 November 2022 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Administrativen sad Sofia-grad — Bulgaria) — IG v Varhoven administrativen sad

(Case C-289/21) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union — Effective judicial protection — National procedural rule providing that an action seeking to dispute the compatibility of a national provision with EU law is devoid of purpose where the provision is repealed in the course of proceedings)

(2023/C 24/10)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Administrativen sad Sofia-grad

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: IG

Defendant: Varhoven administrativen sad

Operative part of the judgment

The principle of effectiveness as enshrined in Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union must be interpreted as precluding a procedural rule of a Member State according to which, where a provision of domestic law challenged by an action for annulment on the ground that it is contrary to EU law is repealed and therefore ceases to have any effect for the future, the dispute is deemed to have become devoid of purpose with the result that there is no longer any need to adjudicate on it, without the parties having first been able to assert any interest they may have in the continuation of the proceedings and without any account having been taken of any such interest.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 289, 19.7.2021.

Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 24 November 2022 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Korkein hallinto-oikeus — Finland) — Proceedings brought by A

(Case C-296/21) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Control of the acquisition and possession of weapons — Directive 91/477/EEC — Annex I, Part III — Deactivation standards and techniques — Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/2403 — Verification and certification of deactivation of firearms — Article 3 — Verifying entity approved by a national authority — Issuance of a deactivation certificate — Entity not included on the list published by the European Commission — Transfer of deactivated firearms within the European Union — Article 7 — Mutual recognition)

(2023/C 24/11)

Language of the case: Finnish

Referring court

Korkein hallinto-oikeus

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: A

Intervening parties: Helsingin poliisilaitos, Poliisihallitus

Operative part of the judgment

1. Part III of Annex I to Council Directive 91/477/EEC of 18 June 1991 on control of the acquisition and possession of weapons, as amended by Directive 2008/51/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008, and Article 3 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/2403 of 15 December 2015 establishing common guidelines on deactivation standards and techniques for ensuring that deactivated firearms are rendered irreversibly inoperable

must be interpreted as not precluding a legal person governed by private law, such as a commercial company, from coming within the concept of ‘verifying entity’, referred to in paragraph 1 of the latter provision, where that person appears on the list published by the European Commission pursuant to Article 3(3) of that implementing regulation.

2. Part III of Annex I to Directive 91/477, as amended by Directive 2008/51, and Article 7(2) of Implementing Regulation 2015/2403

must be interpreted as meaning that, where a deactivation certificate for a firearm is issued by a ‘verifying entity’, the Member State to which the deactivated firearm is transferred is required to recognise that certificate, unless the competent authorities of that Member State find, during a summary examination of the weapon in question, that that certificate clearly does not satisfy the requirements laid down in that implementing regulation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 289, 19.7.2021.

Judgment of the Court (Fourth Chamber) of 24 November 2022 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Juzgado de Primera Instancia nº 4 de Castelló de la Plana — Spain) — Casilda v Banco Cetelem SA

(Case C-302/21) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Dispute in the main proceedings which has become devoid of purpose — No need to adjudicate)

(2023/C 24/12)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Juzgado de Primera Instancia nº 4 de Castelló de la Plana

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Casilda

Defendant: Banco Cetelem SA