

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landesgericht Korneuburg (Austria) lodged on 9 February 2022 — TT v AK

(Case C-87/22)

(2022/C 213/34)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landesgericht Korneuburg

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: TT

Respondent: AK

Questions referred

1. Must Article 15 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000, ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that the courts of a Member State having jurisdiction as to the substance of the matter, if they consider that a court of another Member State, with which the child has a particular connection, would be better placed to hear the case, or a specific part thereof, may request such a court to assume jurisdiction even in the case where that other Member State has become the place of habitual residence of the child following wrongful removal?

2. If Question 1 is answered in the affirmative:

Must Article 15 of Regulation No 2201/2003 be interpreted as meaning that the criteria for the transfer of jurisdiction that are set out in that article are regulated exhaustively, without the need to consider further criteria in the light of proceedings initiated under Article 8(f) of the Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2003 L 338, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank Den Haag, zittingsplaats's-Hertogenbosch (Netherlands) lodged on 22 February 2022 — X, Y, and their six minor children v Staatssecretaris van Justitie en Veiligheid

(Case C-125/22)

(2022/C 213/35)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Rechtbank Den Haag, zittingsplaats's-Hertogenbosch

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: X, Y, and their six minor children

Defendant: Staatssecretaris van Justitie en Veiligheid

Questions referred

1. Must Article 15 of the Qualification Directive, ⁽¹⁾ read in conjunction with Article 2(g) of the Qualification Directive, Article 4 of the Qualification Directive, Article 4 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 19(2) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, be interpreted as meaning that, in considering whether an applicant is in need of subsidiary protection, all relevant factors relating both to the applicant's individual situation and personal circumstances, and to the general situation in the country of origin, must always be examined and assessed as an integrated whole and having regard to their mutual interdependence before determining what feared manifestation of serious harm may be substantiated by those factors?