

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Krajský soud v Ostravě (Czech Republic) lodged on 27 December 2019 —
Samohýl group a. s. v Generální ředitelství cel**

(Case C-941/19)

(2020/C 68/38)

Language of the case: Czech

Referring court

Krajský soud v Ostravě

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Samohýl group a. s.

Defendant: Generální ředitelství cel

Question referred

Should the product labelled 'Bob Martin Clear 50 mg roztok pro nakapání na kůži — spot-on pro kočky' made available in pipettes (0.5 ml), which contains the active substance fipronil (50 mg per pipette) and the excipients butylated hydroxyanisole E 320, butylated hydroxytoluene E 321, benzyl alcohol and diethylene glycol monoethyl ether, be classified under heading 3004 or heading 3808 of the Combined Nomenclature of the Customs Tariff?

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Court of Appeal (England & Wales) (Civil Division) made on 27 December
2019 – MG v HH**

(Case C-946/19)

(2020/C 68/39)

Language of the case: English

Referring court

Court of Appeal (England & Wales) (Civil Division)

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: MG

Respondent: HH

Questions referred

1. Does Article 4(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 ⁽¹⁾ ('Brussels I Recast') confer a directly enforceable right upon a person domiciled in a Member State?

2. If it does:

- a) Where such a right is breached by the bringing of proceedings against that person in a third State, is there an obligation upon the Member State to provide a remedy, including by the grant of an anti-suit injunction?
- b) Does any such obligation extend to a case where a cause of action available in the courts of a third State is not available under the law applicable in the courts of the Member State?

(¹) Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2012 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 2012, L 351, p. 1).

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the High Court of Justice (Queen's Bench Division) (United Kingdom) made on 6 January 2020 – Daimler AG v Walleniusrederierna Aktiebolag, Wallenius Wilhelmsen ASA, Wallenius Logistics AB, Wilhelmsen Ships Holding Malta Limited, Wallenius Wilhelmsen Ocean AS, 'K' Line Holding (Europe) Limited, 'K' Line Europe Limited, Nyk Group Europe Limited, Compañía Sudamericana de Vapores SA

(Case C-2/20)

(2020/C 68/40)

Language of the case: English

Referring court

High Court of Justice (Queen's Bench Division)

Parties to the main proceedings

Claimant: Daimler AG

Defendants: Walleniusrederierna Aktiebolag, Wallenius Wilhelmsen ASA, Wallenius Logistics AB, Wilhelmsen Ships Holding Malta Limited, Wallenius Wilhelmsen Ocean AS, 'K' Line Holding (Europe) Limited, 'K' Line Europe Limited, Nyk Group Europe Limited, Compañía Sudamericana de Vapores SA

Question referred

1. Does a national court have jurisdiction to determine a claim for damages under Article 85 EEC/Article 81 EC where the conduct complained of involved the provision of international maritime services exclusively between non-EEC/EC ports in the period prior to 1 May 2004 and the national court was not a relevant authority in a Member State for the purposes of Article 88 EEC/Article 84 EC?
 2. If question 1 is answered in the negative, does a national court have jurisdiction to determine such a claim in respect of the provision of international maritime services exclusively between non-EEC/EC ports in the period between 1 May 2004 and 18 October 2006?
-