

**Operative part of the order**

Articles 89 and 90 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 of 20 November 2009 establishing a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy, amending Regulations (EC) No 847/96, (EC) No 2371/2002, (EC) No 811/2004, (EC) No 768/2005, (EC) No 2115/2005, (EC) No 2166/2005, (EC) No 388/2006, (EC) No 509/2007, (EC) No 676/2007, (EC) No 1098/2007, (EC) No 1300/2008, (EC) No 1342/2008 and repealing Regulations (EEC) No 2847/93, (EC) No 1627/94 and (EC) No 1966/2006, read in the light of the principle of proportionality enshrined in Article 49(3) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, must be interpreted as meaning that it is for the national courts to assess, in accordance with the assessment criteria provided by the Court in the judgment of 11 February 2021, *K. M. (Sanctions imposed on the master of a vessel)* (C-77/20, EU:C:2021:112), whether, in relation to the infringement committed, including its seriousness, the mandatory forfeiture of all catch and all fishing gear found on board the vessel concerned is proportionate to the attainment of the objective legitimately pursued by the prohibition, laid down in Article 32(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 850/98 of 30 March 1998 for the conservation of fishery resources through technical measures for the protection of juveniles of marine organisms, as amended by Regulation (EU) No 227/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 March 2013, relating to grading equipment, and to examine, if necessary, the need to adjust, modulate or mitigate the extent of the forfeiture order in respect of the catch and the fishing gear.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 401, 4.10.2021.

---

**Order of the Court (Eighth Chamber) of 1 March 2022 — Antonius Maria Vervloet, Cornelia Wilhelmina Vervloet-Mulder v Agència Estatal de Resolució d'Entitats Bancàries (AREB)**

(Case C-526/21 P) <sup>(1)</sup>

**(Appeal — Article 181 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Requirement of clarity and precision of the pleas in law — Manifest inadmissibility)**

(2022/C 222/08)

*Language of the case: Dutch*

**Parties**

*Appellants:* Antonius Maria Vervloet, Cornelia Wilhelmina Vervloet-Mulder (represented by: P. Van der Veld, advocaat)

*Other party to the proceedings:* Agència Estatal de Resolució d'Entitats Bancàries (AREB)

**Operative part of the order**

1. The appeal is dismissed as manifestly inadmissible.
2. Mr Antonius Maria Vervloet and Mrs Cornelia Wilhelmina Vervloet-Mulder shall bear their own costs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 158, 11.4.2022.

---

**Appeal brought on 16 August 2021 by Bálint Krátky against the order of the General Court (Third Chamber) delivered on 22 June 2021 in Case T-13/21 Krátky v European Parliament and Others**

(Case C-503/21 P)

(2022/C 222/09)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Bálint Krátky (represented by: I. Kriston, ügyvéd)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Parliament, Council of the European Union, European Commission

By order of 22 March 2022, the Court of Justice of the European Union (Ninth Chamber) dismissed the appeal and ordered the appellant to pay the costs.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Visoki trgovački sud Republike Hrvatske (Croatia) lodged on 8 September 2021 — Financijska agencija v HANN-INVEST d.o.o.**

(Case C-554/21)

(2022/C 222/10)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Visoki trgovački sud Republike Hrvatske

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellant:* Financijska agencija

*Respondent:* HANN-INVEST d.o.o.

**Question referred**

Can the rule laid down in the second part of the first sentence and in the second sentence of Article 177(3) of the Sudski poslovnik (Rules of Procedure of the Courts), which provides that 'a case before a court of second instance shall be deemed to be closed on the date on which the decision is sent from the court office, after the case has been returned by the Registration Service. The Registration Service shall be required to return the file to the court office as promptly as possible after receipt thereof. The decision shall then be notified within a further period of eight days' be considered compatible with Article 19(1) TEU and Article 47 of the Charter?

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Visoki trgovački sud Republike Hrvatske (Croatia) lodged on 7 October 2021 — Financijska agencija v MINERAL-SEKULINE d.o.o.**

(Case C-622/21)

(2022/C 222/11)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Visoki trgovački sud Republike Hrvatske

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellant:* Financijska agencija

*Respondent:* MINERAL-SEKULINE d.o.o.

**Question referred**

Can the rule laid down in the second part of the first sentence and in the second sentence of Article 177(3) of the Sudski poslovnik (Rules of Procedure of the Courts), which provides that 'a case before a court of second instance shall be deemed to be closed on the date on which the decision is sent from the court office, after the case has been returned by the Registration Service. The Registration Service shall be required to return the file to the court office as promptly as possible after receipt thereof. The decision shall then be notified within a further period of eight days' be considered compatible with Article 19(1) TEU and Article 47 of the Charter?

---