

Order of the Court (Sixth Chamber) of 20 April 2023 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Zemgales rajona tiesa — Latvia) — SIA ‘Sinda & V R’ v Rīgas domes Satiksmes departaments

(Case C-619/22, ⁽¹⁾ Sinda & V R)

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 53(2) and Article 94 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Requirement to provide the legislative context of the dispute in the main proceedings — Requirement to set out the relationship between the provisions of European Union law of which an interpretation is sought and the applicable national legislation — Lack of sufficient information — Manifest inadmissibility)

(2023/C 189/04)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Zemgales rajona tiesa

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: SIA ‘Sinda & V R’

Defendant: Rīgas domes Satiksmes departaments

Operative part of the order

The request for a preliminary ruling made by the Zemgales rajona tiesa (District Court, Zemgale, Latvia), by decision of 20 September 2022, is manifestly inadmissible.

⁽¹⁾ Date lodged: 27.9.2022.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Raad van State (Netherlands) lodged on 16 November 2022 — WU v Directie van het Centraal Bureau Rijvaardigheidsbewijzen (CBR)

(Case C-703/22)

(2023/C 189/05)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Raad van State

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: WU

Respondent: Directie van het Centraal Bureau Rijvaardigheidsbewijzen (CBR)

Questions referred

1. Should point 6.4 of Annex III to Directive 2006/126/EC, ⁽¹⁾ more specifically the standard of a horizontal field of vision of both eyes of at least 160°, read in the light of the principle of proportionality, be interpreted as meaning that a person who does not meet this standard from a medical point of view, but who, according to different medical experts, is actually fit to drive a lorry, can nevertheless meet the standard?
2. If the answer to that question is in the negative, can a proportionality assessment be carried out within the framework of the Driving Licence Directive in an individual case, even if the criterion laid down in point 6.4 of Annex III to Directive 2006/126/EC does not provide any scope for exemption in such cases?