

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas (Lithuania) lodged on 30 April 2021 — P.I. v Migracijos departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerijos

(Case C-280/21)

(2021/C 278/46)

Language of the case: Lithuanian

Referring court

Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: P.I.

Respondent: Migracijos departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerijos

Question referred

Is opposition to an illegally operating and corruptly influential group which oppresses an applicant for asylum through the machinery of the State and against which it is impossible to mount a legitimate defence due to extensive corruption in the State to be regarded as equivalent to attributed political opinion within the meaning of Article 10 of Directive 2011/95/EU? ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2011/95/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted (OJ 2011 L 337, p. 9).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landesgericht Salzburg (Austria) lodged on 5 May 2021 — FC v FTI Touristik GmbH

(Case C-287/21)

(2021/C 278/47)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landesgericht Salzburg

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: FC

Defendant: FTI Touristik GmbH

Questions referred

1. Must Article 12(2) of Directive (EU) 2015/2302 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on package travel and linked travel arrangements ⁽¹⁾ ('the Directive') be interpreted as meaning that termination of the package by the traveller on the basis of 'unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances' is in principle permitted only immediately prior to the start of the trip or may that termination occur, in an individual case, also three to four months in advance?
2. Should a declaration of termination in principle be permitted without any limitation in time, the following questions are also asked:
 - (a) is it sufficient, for the prospective analysis to be made from the perspective of a traveller with regard to the planned travel period as part of an *ex ante* assessment, that the abovementioned circumstances and the adverse effect resulting therefrom can already be predicted with a reasonable degree of probability and, in the case of a risk situation that has already occurred, that a significant improvement cannot be expected with a high degree of probability; and