

**Questions referred**

1. For the purposes of a review of transparency in the context of a collective action, is an abstract assessment of terms used by more than one hundred financial institutions in millions of banking contracts, without taking into account the level of pre-contractual information offered on the legal and financial burden of the term or the other circumstances occurring in each case at the time when the contract was concluded, covered by Article 4(1) of Directive 93/13/EEC, <sup>(1)</sup> where it refers to the circumstances attending the conclusion of the contract, and by Article 7(3) of that directive, where it refers to similar terms?
2. Is the possibility of conducting an abstract review of transparency from the perspective of the average consumer, where a number of the contracts offered are aimed at different specific groups of consumers or where numerous financial institutions having, economically and geographically, very different business areas were using standard terms and conditions over a very long period of time during which public awareness of such terms was developing, compatible with Articles 4(2) and 7(3) of Directive 93/13/EEC?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts (OJ 1993 L 95, p. 29).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Spetsialisiran nakazatelen sad (Bulgaria) lodged on 13 July 2022 — Criminal proceedings against VB**

**(Case C-468/22)**

(2022/C 408/43)

*Language of the case: Bulgarian*

**Referring court**

Spetsialisiran nakazatelen sad

**Accused person**

VB

**Question referred**

Is it compatible with Article 9 of Directive 2016/343 <sup>(1)</sup> and the principle of effectiveness for a national provision such as Article 423(3) of the NPK to oblige a person who makes a request for a new trial, because he or she had been absent from the first trial and neither of the cases in Article 8(2) [of that directive] applied, to appear before the court in person in order to have that request examined on the merits?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive (EU) 2016/343 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2016 on the strengthening of certain aspects of the presumption of innocence and of the right to be present at the trial in criminal proceedings (OJ 2016 L 65, p. 1).

---

**Appeal brought on 10 August 2022 by Roberto Aquino against the judgment of the General Court (First Chamber) delivered on 1 June 2022 in Case T-253/21, Aquino v Parliament**

**(Case C-534/22 P)**

(2022/C 408/44)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Roberto Aquino (represented by: L. Levi, S. Rodrigues, avocats)