

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicants:* Andrei Emilian Boncea, Filofteia Catrinel Boncea, Adriana Boboc, Cornelia Mihăilescu

*Defendant:* Romanian State represented by the Ministry of Public Finance

**Questions referred**

1. Do the provisions of Article 5 of Law No 221/2009, as amended by decision No 1358 of the Constitutional Court of Romania of 21 October 2010, infringe Article 5 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and Article 8 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?
2. Do Article 5 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and Article 8 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights preclude national legislation which, in the case of the politically-motivated conviction of an individual by a decision contrary to law, allows that individual's right to compensation for the non-material damage suffered to be limited?

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from Tribunalul Argeş (Romania) lodged on 20 September 2011 — Mariana Budan v Romanian State — Ministerul Finanțelor Publice represented by the Direcția Generală a Finanțelor Publice Argeş**

(Case C-484/11)

(2011/C 347/22)

*Language of the case: Romanian*

**Referring court**

Tribunalul Argeş

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Mariana Budan

*Defendant:* Romanian State — Ministerul Finanțelor Publice (Ministry for Public Finance) represented by the Direcția Generală a Finanțelor Publice (Directorate General for Public Finance), Argeş

*Intervener:* Iulian-Nicolae Cujbescu

**Question referred**

In the interpretation given by the Court of Justice of the European Union of the fundamental principles laid down by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and by the Treaties of the European Union — and in the absence of any domestic legislation (as result of the declaration

that Article 5 of Law No 221/[2009] is unconstitutional) — are the applicant, Mariana Budan, ... and the intervener, Iulian-Nicolae Cujbescu ... entitled to compensation for non-material damage as victims of the Communist regime and now citizens of the European Union?

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Administratīvā rajona tiesa (Republic of Latvia) lodged on 22 September 2011 — Laimonis Treimanis v Valsts ieņēmumu dienests**

(Case C-487/11)

(2011/C 347/23)

*Language of the case: Latvian*

**Referring court**

Administratīvā rajona tiesa

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Laimonis Treimanis

*Defendant:* Valsts ieņēmumu dienests

**Question referred**

Does Article 7(1) of Regulation No 918/83<sup>(1)</sup> preclude the owner of a private car imported into the European Union from a third country from transferring the car, for use free of charge, to a family member who has actually moved his residence from that third country to the European Union and who formed part of a household with the owner of the car in that third country before the car was imported into the European Union, where the car owner has essentially remained in the third country since the vehicle was imported?

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 918/83 of 28 March 1983 setting up a Community system of reliefs from customs duty (OJ 1983 L 105, p. 1).

**Appeal brought on 23 September 2011 by Mitsubishi Electric Corp. against the judgment of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 12 July 2011 in Case T-133/07: Mitsubishi Electric Corp. v European Commission**

(Case C-489/11 P)

(2011/C 347/24)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Mitsubishi Electric Corp. (represented by: R. Denton, Solicitor, J. J Vyavaharkar, Solicitor, K. Haegeman, avocat)

*Other party to the proceedings:* European Commission