

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Okresný súd Prešov (Slovakia) lodged on 26 April 2022 —
DZ, EO, YV, YE, MP v Ministerstvo vnútra Slovenskej republiky**

(Case C-283/22)

(2022/C 303/18)

Language of the case: Slovak

Referring court

Okresný súd Prešov

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: DZ, EO, YV, YE, MP

Defendant: Ministerstvo vnútra Slovenskej republiky

Questions referred

1. Must Article 3(g) of Regulation (EC) No 785/2004 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operators be interpreted as meaning that a person
 - who is not on board a helicopter of a [Union] air carrier, but who is suspended from a hoist cable as an integral piece of equipment (or component) of the helicopter while the helicopter is in flight and who was lifted along with the ascent of the helicopter (as a result of being suspended from the hoist cable);
 - who was transported as part of a free transport operation provided by the State (a State helicopter used in police services) as a carrier under a ‘carriage contract’ between the air carrier (State) and the employer of the person performing a special task (namely, on the basis of an uznesenie vlády Slovenskej republiky č. 411/2006 Z.z., of 10. mája 2006 k návrhu zásad vykonávania letov lietadiel v policajných službách (Decree No 411/2006 of the Government of the Slovak Republic of 10 May 2006 on the proposed arrangements for the implementation of air flights in police services) and the nariadenie Ministerstva vnútra Slovenskej republiky č. 50/2012 zo dňa 14 March 2012 o vyžadovaní a schvaľovaní letov (Decree No 50/2012 of the Ministry of the Interior of the Slovak Republic of 14 March 2012 on the need for flights and their approval), which provided that the aircraft of the air carrier would perform flights in order to ensure the performance of the tasks of the employer of the person concerned];
 - the purpose of the carriage was to perform a special task such as that at issue in the main proceedings {performance of a service task consisting in the specialised training of officers of the Hasičský a záchranný zbor (fire-fighting and rescue unit) using aerial equipment (helicopter) in the form of a crane hoisting exercise for rescuer and [rescued]},and
 - who was participating in a task as a trainee member of a firefighting module attached to the helicopter by means of a hoist cable as an integral piece of equipment (or component) of the helicopter on the instructions of the helicopter’s pilot and operator, and was to be hoisted aboard the helicopter during the flight,
 - (a) is a passengeror
 - (b) a member of the flight crew or cabin crew?
2. Must Article 17(1) of the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules for International Carriage by Air, concluded at Montreal on 28 May 1999, signed by the European Community on 9 December 1999 pursuant to Article 300(2) EC and approved on its behalf by Council Decision 2001/539/EC ⁽²⁾ of 5 April 2001, be interpreted as meaning that, in the circumstances set out in the first question, such person is deemed to be:
 - (a) a passengeror
 - (b) a member of the flight crew or a member of the cabin crew?

3. Can the use of the State helicopter on 10 May 2017 be regarded as carriage within the meaning of Article 2(1) [and] Article 1 of the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules for International Carriage by Air, concluded at Montreal on 28 May 1999, signed by the European Community on 9 December 1999 pursuant to Article 300(2) EC and approved on its behalf by Council Decision 2001/539/EC of 5 April 2001?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2004 L 138, p. 1, Special edition in Slovak: Chapter 07 Volume 008 P. 160.

⁽²⁾ 2001/539/EC: Council Decision of 5 April 2001 on the conclusion by the European Community of the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules for International Carriage by Air (the Montreal Convention) (OJ 2001 L 194, p. 38, Special edition in Slovak: Chapter 07 Volume 005 P. 491).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Hof van Cassatie (Belgium) lodged on 28 April 2022 —
KBC Verzekeringen NV v P&V Verzekeringen CVBA**

(Case C-286/22)

(2022/C 303/19)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Hof van Cassatie

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: KBC Verzekeringen NV

Respondent: P&V Verzekeringen CVBA

Question referred

Is Article 1(1) of Directive 2009/103/EC ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 relating to insurance against civil liability in respect of the use of motor vehicles, and the enforcement of the obligation to insure against such liability, as amended by Directive (EU) 2021/2118 ⁽²⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2021, which defines 'vehicle' as 'any motor vehicle intended for travel on land and propelled by mechanical power, but not running on rails, and any trailer, whether or not coupled', must be interpreted as meaning that an electric bicycle (Speed-Pedelec) whose engine provides pedal assistance only, so that the bicycle does not move autonomously, without muscular power, but only by means of engine and muscular power, and an electric bicycle which is equipped with a boost function, whereby the bicycle accelerates to a speed of 20 km/h when the boost button is pressed without pedalling, yet muscular power is required in order to be able to use the boost function, are not vehicles within the meaning of that directive?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2009 L 263, p. 11.

⁽²⁾ Directive (EU) 2021/2118 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2021 amending Directive 2009/103/EC relating to insurance against civil liability in respect of the use of motor vehicles, and the enforcement of the obligation to insure against such liability (OJ 2021 L 430, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Varhoven administrativen sad (Bulgaria) lodged on 11 May 2022 — 'Consortium Remi Group' AD v Direktor na Direktsia 'Obzhalvane i danachno-osiguritelna praktika' Varna pri Tsentralno upravlenie na Natsionalnata agentsia za prihodite

(Case C-314/22)

(2022/C 303/20)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Varhoven administrativen sad

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant in cassation: 'Consortium Remi Group' AD