

4. In the event that the first or the second question is answered in the affirmative: does the avoidability criterion relate to the extraordinary circumstance or, rather, to the consequences of the occurrence of the extraordinary circumstance?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, OJ 2004 L 46, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Amtsgericht Hannover (Germany) lodged on 13 April 2017 — Peter Rebbe, Hans-Peter Rebbe, Harmine Rebbe v TUIfly GmbH

(Case C-202/17)

(2017/C 231/15)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Amtsgericht Hannover

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Peter Rebbe, Hans-Peter Rebbe, Harmine Rebbe

Defendant: TUIfly GmbH

Questions referred

1. Is the absence on sick leave of a significant part of an operating air carrier's staff for flight operation an extraordinary circumstance under Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004? ⁽¹⁾ In the event that the first question is answered in the affirmative: how high must the rate of absence be to constitute such an extraordinary circumstance?
2. In the event that the first question is answered in the negative: is the spontaneous absence, due to unauthorised work stoppage under employment law or collective agreements ('wildcat strike'), of a significant part of an operating air carrier's staff for flight operation an extraordinary circumstance under Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004? In the event that the second question is answered in the affirmative: how high must the rate of absence be to constitute such an extraordinary circumstance?
3. In the event that the first or the second question is answered in the affirmative: must the extraordinary circumstance itself have been present at the time the flight was cancelled or is the operating air carrier entitled to devise a new flight plan pursuant to economic considerations?
4. In the event that the first or the second question is answered in the affirmative: does the avoidability criterion relate to the extraordinary circumstance or, rather, to the consequences of the occurrence of the extraordinary circumstance?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, OJ 2004 L 46, p. 1.

Appeal brought on 21 April 2017 by NF against the order of the General Court (First Chamber, Extended Composition) delivered on 28 February 2017 in Case T-192/16: NF v European Council

(Case C-208/17 P)

(2017/C 231/16)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellant: NF (represented by: P. O'Shea, BL, I. Whelan, BL, B. Burns, Solicitor)