

2. Order the other party to the proceedings to pay the costs of the proceedings, including the costs before the General Court.

Grounds of appeal and main arguments

In its appeal, the EESC argues that the concept of a reasonable period for submitting a request for career reconstitution, and the case-law on the factors to be taken into account in determining whether the period is reasonable, have been misinterpreted.

The first ground of appeal alleges an incorrect legal characterisation of the facts. It is argued that the General Court misrepresented part of the content of the defence and rejoinder and failed to undertake a complete characterisation of the points of fact and of law.

The second ground of appeal alleges infringement of the principle of legal certainty.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Corte suprema di cassazione (Italy) lodged on 28 June 2022 — Scuola europea di Varese v PD and LC, as persons exercising parental responsibility over the minor NG

(Case C-431/22)

(2022/C 359/52)

Language of the case: Italian

Referring court

Corte suprema di cassazione

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Scuola europea di Varese

Defendants: PD and LC, as persons exercising parental responsibility over the minor NG

Question referred

Is the first sentence of the first subparagraph of Article 27(2) of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools, done in Luxembourg on 21 June 1994, to be interpreted as meaning that the Complaints Board referred to therein is to have sole jurisdiction in the first and final instance, once all administrative channels provided for in the General Rules have been exhausted, in any dispute concerning a decision on repeating a year adopted in relation to a secondary-school pupil by the Class Council?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Administratīvā rajona tiesa (Latvia) lodged on 30 June 2022 — AS Latvijas valsts meži v Dabas aizsardzības pārvalde, Vides pārraudzības valsts birojs, intervening party: Valsts meža dienests

(Case C-434/22)

(2022/C 359/53)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Administratīvā rajona tiesa

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: AS Latvijas valsts meži

Defendants: Dabas aizsardzības pārvalde, Vides pārraudzības valsts birojs

Intervening party: Valsts meža dienests

Questions referred

1. Does the concept of 'project' within the meaning of Article 1(2)(a) of Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment ⁽¹⁾ also include activities undertaken in a forest area to ensure maintenance of the area's forest fire protection infrastructure installations in accordance with the fire protection requirements established in the applicable legislation?
2. If the answer to the first question is in the affirmative, must the activities undertaken in a forest area to ensure maintenance of the area's forest fire protection infrastructure installations in accordance with the fire protection requirements established in the applicable legislation be deemed, for the purposes of Article 6(3) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, ⁽²⁾ to constitute a project which is directly connected with or necessary to that management, meaning that an assessment procedure for special areas of conservation of European importance (*Natura 2000*) is not required for the activities in question?
3. If the answer to the second question is in the negative, does Article 6(3) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora also require an assessment to be carried out for plans and projects (activities) which are not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the special area of conservation but which are likely to have a significant effect on conservation areas of European importance (*Natura 2000*), but which are nevertheless undertaken in accordance with national legislation in order to satisfy forest fire protection and firefighting requirements?
4. If the answer to the third question is in the affirmative, is it possible to continue and complete the activity in question before carrying out an assessment procedure for special areas of conservation of European importance (*Natura 2000*) *ex post facto*?
5. If the answer to the third question is in the affirmative, in order to avoid a possibly significant impact, are the competent authorities under a duty to require the damage to be made good and to adopt measures if the significance of the impact was not assessed during the assessment procedure for special areas of conservation of European importance (*Natura 2000*)?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2012 L 26, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ 1992 L 206, p. 7, Special edition in Latvian: Chapter 15 Volume 002 P. 102

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla y León (Spain)
lodged on 1 July 2022 — Asociación para la Conservación y Estudio del Lobo Ibérico (ASCEL) v
Administración de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla y León**

(Case C-436/22)

(2022/C 359/54)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla y León

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Asociación para la Conservación y Estudio del Lobo Ibérico (ASCEL)

Defendant: Administración de la Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla y León