

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Varhoven kasatsionen sad (Bulgaria) lodged on 28 June 2022 — Criminal proceedings against BG

(Case C-427/22)

(2022/C 408/36)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Varhoven kasatsionen sad

Party to the main proceedings

BG

Questions referred

1. Is the definition of a credit institution in Article 4(1)(1) of Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 to be interpreted as meaning that credit is to be granted exclusively from funds received from the public as deposits or other repayable funds, or may a credit institution also grant credit from funds from other sources?
2. How is the content of the ‘instrument [...] in any form [...] by which the right to carry out the business is granted’ within the meaning of Article 4(1)(42) of Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 to be interpreted, and does it include both the authorisation scheme and the registration scheme which grant approval for credit operations?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2013 L 176, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Spetsializiran nakazatelen sad (Bulgaria) lodged on 28 June 2022 — Criminal proceedings against VB

(Case C-430/22)

(2022/C 408/37)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Spetsializiran nakazatelen sad

Party to the main proceedings

VB

Questions referred

Must the second sentence of Article 8(4) of Directive 2016/343 ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as obliging a national court which convicts an accused person *in absentia*, without the conditions of Article 8(2) being met, to make express reference to the accused person’s right to have the proceedings reopened, to which he or she is entitled under Article 9 of that directive, in order that he or she can be informed of that right at a later stage, in particular when he or she is detained for the purpose of executing the sentence? The question arises in the light of the fact that national law provides neither for the person convicted *in absentia* to be informed of his or her right to have the proceedings reopened when he or she is detained for the purpose of executing the sentence, nor for the involvement of a court in the issuing of a European arrest warrant for the purpose of executing the sentence.