

Appeal brought on 8 February 2022 by Carlos Correia de Matos against the order of the General Court (First Chamber) delivered on 17 December 2021 in Case T-719/21, Correia de Matos v Commission

(Case C-79/22 P)

(2022/C 463/17)

Language of the case: Portuguese

Parties

Appellant: Carlos Correia de Matos (represented by: C. Correia de Matos, advogado)

Other party: European Commission

By order of 20 October 2022, the Court of Justice (Tenth Chamber) dismissed the appeal as manifestly inadmissible and ordered Mr Carlos Correia de Matos to bear his own costs.

Appeal brought on 5 July 2022 by Fidelity National Information Services, Inc. against the judgment of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 4 May 2022 in Case T-237/21, Fidelity National Information Services v EUIPO — IFIS (FIS)

(Case C-446/22 P)

(2022/C 463/18)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: Fidelity National Information Services, Inc. (represented by: P. Wilhelm, avocat)

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

By order of 20 October 2022, the Court of Justice (Chamber determining whether appeals may proceed) held that the appeal was not allowed to proceed and that Fidelity National Information Services, Inc., should bear its own costs.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunalul Argeş (Romania) lodged on 9 August 2022 — SC Adient Ltd & Co. KG v Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală and Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploiești — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Argeş

(Case C-533/22)

(2022/C 463/19)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Tribunalul Argeş

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: SC Adient Ltd & Co. KG

Defendants: Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală and Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploiești — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Argeş

Questions referred

1. Are the provisions of Article 44 of Directive 2006/112/EC on the common system of value added tax⁽¹⁾ and of Articles 10 and 11 of Council Implementing Regulation No 282/2011 laying down implementing measures for [that directive]⁽²⁾ to be interpreted as precluding the practice of a national tax authority whereby an independent resident legal person is classified as the fixed establishment of a non-resident entity solely on the basis that the two companies belong to the same group?