

## V

(Announcements)

## COURT PROCEEDINGS

## COURT OF JUSTICE

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per le Marche (Italy)  
lodged on 6 March 2017 — Comune di Castelbellino v Regione Marche and Others**

(Case C-117/17)

(2017/C 221/02)

*Language of the case: Italian*

**Referring court**

Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per le Marche

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Comune di Castelbellino

*Defendants:* Regione Marche, Ministero per i beni e le attività culturali, Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, Regione Marche Servizio Infrastrutture Trasporti Energia — P.F. Rete Elettrica Regionale, Provincia di Ancona

**Questions referred**

1. Does EU law (and in particular Directive 2011/92/EU, <sup>(1)</sup> in the version in force on the date of adoption of the contested measures) preclude, as a rule, a national rule or administrative practice which allows EIA screening or EIAs in respect of plants already in existence at the time when the procedure takes place, or does it, on the other hand, allow exceptional circumstances justifying a derogation from the general rule that an EIA is, by nature, a preventative assessment to be taken into account?
2. More particularly, is such a derogation justified in the case in which a new law exempts from an EIA a specific project which would have been subject to screening on the basis of a decision of the national court that declared unconstitutional or disapplied an earlier rule providing for exemption?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 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 (OJ 2012 L 26, p. 1).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság (Hungary) lodged on  
7 March 2017 — Zsuzsanna Dunai v ERSTE Bank Hungary Zrt**

(Case C-118/17)

(2017/C 221/03)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Budai Központi Kerületi Bíróság

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Zsuzsanna Dunai

*Defendant:* ERSTE Bank Hungary Zrt

**Questions referred**

1. Should point 3 [of the operative part] of the judgment delivered by the Court of Justice in Case C-26/13 be interpreted as meaning that a national court may remedy the fact that a term of a contract concluded between a seller or supplier and a consumer is invalid where the continuation of the contract is contrary to the economic interests of the consumer?
2. Is it consistent with the powers conferred on the European Union in order to ensure a high level of consumer protection and with the fundamental EU principles of equality before the law, non-discrimination, the right to an effective judicial remedy and the right to fair legal process, for the parliament of a Member State to alter, by the adoption of an act, private law contracts in similar categories concluded between a seller or supplier and a consumer?
  - 2/a. If the answer to the previous question is in the affirmative, is it consistent with the powers conferred on the European Union in order to ensure a high level of consumer protection and with the fundamental EU principles of equality before the law, non-discrimination, the right to an effective judicial remedy and the right to fair legal process, for the parliament of a Member State to alter, by the adoption of an act, various parts of loan contracts denominated in a foreign currency, supposedly for consumer protection purposes but triggering an effect which is in fact contrary to the fair interests of consumer protection, in that the loan contract remains valid following those alterations and the consumer is required to continue to bear the costs resulting from the foreign exchange risk?
3. With regard to the content of contracts concluded between a seller or supplier and a consumer, is it consistent with the powers conferred on the European Union in order to ensure a high level of consumer protection and with the fundamental EU principles of the right to an effective judicial remedy and the right to fair legal process in respect of any civil law matter for the standardisation panel of the highest court of a Member State to direct the rulings of courts hearing such proceedings by means of 'decisions adopted with a view to ensuring uniform interpretation of the law'?
  - 3/a. If the answer to the previous question is in the affirmative, is it consistent with the powers conferred on the European Union in order to ensure a high level of consumer protection and with the fundamental EU principles of the right to an effective judicial remedy and the right to fair legal process in respect of any civil law matter for the standardisation panel of the highest court of a Member State to direct the rulings of courts hearing such proceedings by means of 'decisions adopted with a view to ensuring uniform interpretation of the law' where the appointment of judges as members of the standardisation panel is not carried out transparently, in accordance with predetermined rules, where the procedure before that panel is not public, and where it is not possible to know a posteriori the procedure followed, namely the expert evidence and academic works relied on and the way in which the various members have voted (for or against)?

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Fővárosi Törvényszék (Hungary) lodged on 10 March 2017 — Orsolya Czakó v ERSTE Bank Hungary Zrt.**

(Case C-126/17)

(2017/C 221/04)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Fővárosi Törvényszék

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Orsolya Czakó

*Defendant:* ERSTE Bank Hungary Zrt.