

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellants: M.G. Tjebbes, G.J.M. Koopman, E. Saleh Abady, L. Duboux

Defendant: Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken

Questions referred

Must Articles 20 and 21 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in the light of, inter alia, Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, be interpreted — in view of the absence of an individual assessment, based on the principle of proportionality, with regard to the consequences of the loss of nationality for the situation of the person concerned from the point of view of EU law — as precluding legislation such as that in issue in the main proceedings, which provides:

- (a) that an adult, who is also a national of a third country, loses, by operation of law, the nationality of his or her Member State, and consequently loses citizenship of the Union, on the ground that, for an uninterrupted period of 10 years, that person had his or her principal residence abroad and outside the European Union, although there are possibilities for interrupting that 10-year period;
- (b) that under certain circumstances a minor loses, by operation of law, the nationality of his or her Member State, and consequently loses citizenship of the Union, as a consequence of the loss of the nationality of his or her parent, as referred to under (a) above?

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Oberster Gerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 4 May 2017 —
XC and Others**

(Case C-234/17)

(2017/C 239/33)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Oberster Gerichtshof

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: XC, YB, ZA

Question referred

Is EU law, in particular Article 4(3) TEU in conjunction with the principles of equivalence and effectiveness inferred from it, to be interpreted as requiring the Oberster Gerichtshof (Supreme Court, Austria), upon application by the person concerned, to review a final decision delivered by a criminal court with respect to an alleged infringement of EU law (in this case, Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Article 54 of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement), where national law (Paragraph 363a of the Strafprozeßordnung (Austrian Code of Criminal Procedure)) provides for such a review only with respect to an alleged violation of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms or one of the protocols thereto?

Appeal brought on 8 May 2017 by Canadian Solar Emea GmbH, Canadian Solar Manufacturing (Changshu), Inc., Canadian Solar Manufacturing (Luoyang), Inc., Csi Cells Co. Ltd, Csi Solar Power (China), Inc. against the judgment of the General Court (Fifth Chamber) delivered on 28 February 2017 in Case T-162/14: Canadian Solar Emea GmbH and Others v Council

(Case C-236/17 P)

(2017/C 239/34)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Appellants: Canadian Solar Emea GmbH, Canadian Solar Manufacturing (Changshu), Inc., Canadian Solar Manufacturing (Luoyang), Inc., Csi Cells Co. Ltd, Csi Solar Power (China), Inc. (represented by: J. Bourgeois, avocat, S. De Knop, advocaat, M. Meulenbelt, advocaat, A. Willems, avocat)