

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Østre Landsret (Denmark) lodged on 1 December 2022 —  
Staten og Kommunernes Indkøbsservice A/S v BibMedia A/S**

**(Case C-737/22)**

(2023/C 63/28)

*Language of the case: Danish*

**Referring court**

Østre Landsret

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Staten og Kommunernes Indkøbsservice A/S

*Defendant:* BibMedia A/S

**Question referred**

Do the principles of transparency and equal treatment in Article 18 of the Public Procurement Directive<sup>(1)</sup> and the consequent ban on negotiations preclude a tenderer who has submitted the second most economically advantageous tender in connection with an open procedure for separate lots (see Articles 27 and 46 of the Public Procurement Directive) from being given the opportunity, after the deadline for submission of the tender has expired, and in accordance with the predetermined terms in the specifications, to supply the proposed services within a lot under the same terms as a tenderer who has submitted the most economically advantageous tender and who, therefore, is awarded another lot put out to tender at the same time?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2014/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC (OJ 2014 L 94, p. 65).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Itä-Suomen hovioikeus (Finland) lodged on 2 December  
2022 — Endemol Shine Finland Oy**

**(Case C-740/22)**

(2023/C 63/29)

*Language of the case: Finnish*

**Referring court**

Itä-Suomen hovioikeus

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellant:* Endemol Shine Finland Oy

**Questions referred**

1. Does an oral transfer of personal data constitute processing of personal data within the meaning of Article 2(1) and Article 4(2) of the General Data Protection Regulation? <sup>(1)</sup>
2. Can public access to official documents be reconciled with the right to protection of personal data pursuant to the General Data Protection Regulation, in the manner referred to by Article 86 of the regulation, by allowing information on criminal convictions or offences of a natural person to be obtained from a court's register of persons without restriction where a request is made to transfer the information orally to the applicant?

3. Is it relevant for the answer to Question 2 whether the applicant is a company or a private individual?

- (<sup>1</sup>) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ 2016 L 119, p. 1).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Fővárosi Törvényszék (Hungary) lodged on 6 December 2022 — Slovenské Energetické Strojárne A. S. v Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Fellebbviteli Igazgatósága**

**(Case C-746/22)**

(2023/C 63/30)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Fővárosi Törvényszék

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Slovenské Energetické Strojárne A. S.

*Defendant:* Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Fellebbviteli Igazgatósága

**Questions referred**

1. Is Article 23(2) of Council Directive 2008/9/EC (<sup>1</sup>) laying down detailed rules for the refund of value added tax, provided for in Directive 2006/112/EC, to taxable persons not established in the Member State of refund but established in another Member State ('Directive 2008/9') to be construed as meaning that national legislation — to be specific, Paragraph 124(3) of the az adóigazgatási rendtartásról szóló 2017. évi CLI. törvény (Law CLI of 2017 governing tax administration; 'the Law on tax administration') — which, for the purposes of the examination of applications for a refund of value added tax pursuant to Council Directive 2006/112/EC (<sup>2</sup>) on the common system of value added tax ('the VAT Directive'), does not allow, at the appeal stage, new facts to be pleaded or new evidence to be relied on or produced, where the applicant was aware of that evidence before the adoption of the first-tier decision but did not present it, even though it was requested to do so by the tax authority, or did not rely on it, thereby creating a material constraint which exceeds the requirements as to form and time limits laid down by Directive 2008/9, is compatible with the requirements laid down in that Directive with regard to appeals?
2. Does an affirmative answer to the first question mean that the one-month period indicated in Article 20(2) of Directive 2008/9 is to be considered mandatory? Is the foregoing compatible with the right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial enshrined in Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter'), with Articles 167, 169, 170 and 171(1) of the VAT Directive, and with the fundamental principles of fiscal neutrality, effectiveness and proportionality developed by the Court of Justice of the European Union?
3. Is Article 23(1) of Directive 2008/9, which relates to the refusal of a refund application in whole or in part, to be interpreted as meaning that national legislation — specifically, Paragraph 49(1) of the Law on tax administration — pursuant to which the tax authority is to bring the proceedings to a close if the applicant taxable person does not respond to a request from the tax authority or comply with its obligation of rectification, failing which it is not possible to examine the application without the proceedings continuing ex officio, is compatible with that provision?

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ 2008 L 44, p. 23.

(<sup>2</sup>) OJ 2006 L 347, p. 1.