

3. How must the phrase 'Member States may determine a shorter initial period corresponding to the period of conversion' ([second] sentence of Article 29(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) be interpreted? Are the terms 'initial period' and 'period of conversion' used interchangeably or do they have different meanings?
4. Must the phrase 'Member States may determine a shorter initial period corresponding to the period of conversion' in the [second] sentence of Article 29(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 be interpreted as meaning that the entire 'organic farming' measure applies to activities for 'conversion' to organic farming for a period shorter than that referred to in the first sentence of Article 29(3) of that regulation, or must that phrase be interpreted as meaning that, within the framework of the overall commitment to 'organic farming', there is an initial period for activities during the conversion to organic farming?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2013 L 347, p. 487.

⁽²⁾ OJ 2008 L 250, p. 1.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesgerichtshof (Germany) lodged on 27 May 2022 —
PT v VB**

(Case C-343/22)

(2022/C 340/21)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Bundesgerichtshof

Parties to the main proceedings

Defendant and appellant on a point of law: PT

Claimant and respondent in the appeal on a point of law: VB

Question referred

Must Article 34(2) of the Lugano Convention on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters of 30 October 2007 ('the Lugano Convention') ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that the statement of claim in an action seeking repayment of a debt, which was brought after a Swiss order for payment had been issued previously and which did not include an application for the annulment of the objection lodged against the order for payment, constitutes the document which instituted the proceedings?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2009 L 147, p. 1.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank van eerste aanleg Oost-Vlaanderen, afdeling
Gent (Belgium) lodged on 1 June 2022 — BV Osteopathie Van Hauwermeiren v Belgische Staat**

(Case C-355/22)

(2022/C 340/22)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Rechtbank van eerste aanleg Oost-Vlaanderen, afdeling Gent

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: BV Osteopathie Van Hauwermeiren

Defendant: Belgische Staat