2. *The first paragraph of Article 51 TFEU must be interpreted as meaning that the activities of vehicle roadworthiness testing centres, such as those covered by the legislation at issue in the main proceedings, are not connected with the exercise of official authority within the meaning of that provision, notwithstanding the fact that the operators of those centres have the power to take vehicles off the road in cases where vehicles display, during the control, safety defects creating an imminent danger.*

3. *Article 49 TFEU must be interpreted as precluding national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which makes the authorisation for an undertaking or group of undertakings to open a vehicle roadworthiness testing centre subject to the condition, first, that there is a minimum distance between that centre and centres belonging to that undertaking or group of undertakings which are already authorised and, secondly, that that undertaking or group of undertakings will, if such an authorisation is granted, not hold a market share in excess of 50 %, unless it is established that that condition is genuinely appropriate in order to achieve the objectives of consumer protection and road safety and does not go beyond what is necessary for that purpose, these being matters for the referring court to determine.*

([1]) OJ C 175, 10.6.2014.

Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 15 October 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Amtsgericht Laufen — Germany) — Criminal proceedings against Gavril Covaci

(Case C-216/14) ([1])

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Judicial cooperation in criminal matters — Directive 2010/64/EU — Right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings — Language of the proceedings — Penalty order imposing a fine — Possibility of lodging an objection in a language other than the language of the proceedings — Directive 2012/13/EU — Right to information in criminal proceedings — Right to be informed of the charge — Service of a penalty order — Procedures — Mandatory appointment by the accused person of person authorised to accept service — Period for lodging an objection running from service on the person authorised to accept service)

(2015/C 406/06)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Amtsgericht Laufen

Party in the main criminal proceedings

Gavril Covaci

Operative part of the judgment

1. *Articles 1 to 3 of Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings must be interpreted as not precluding national legislation such as that at issue in the main proceedings which, in criminal proceedings, does not permit the individual against whom a penalty order has been made to lodge an objection in writing against that order in a language other than that of the proceedings, even though that individual does not have a command of the language of the proceedings, provided that the competent authorities do not consider, in accordance with Article 3(3) of that directive, that, in the light of the proceedings concerned and the circumstances of the case, such an objection constitutes an essential document.*

2. *Articles 2, 3(1)(c) and 6(1) and (3) of Directive 2012/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2012 on the right to information in criminal proceedings must be interpreted as not precluding legislation of a Member State, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which, in criminal proceedings, makes it mandatory for an accused person not residing in that Member State to appoint a person authorised to accept service of a penalty order concerning him, provided that that accused person does in fact have the benefit of the whole of the prescribed period for lodging an objection against that order.*

([1]) OJ C 253, 4.8.2014.

Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 15 October 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Kecskeméti Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság — Hungary) — György Balázs v Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Dél-alföldi Regionális Vám- és Pénzügyőri Főigazgatósága

(Case C-251/14) ([1])

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Approximation of laws — Quality of diesel fuels — National technical specification imposing additional quality requirements compared to EU law)

(2015/C 406/07)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Kecskeméti Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: György Balázs

Defendant: Nemzeti Adó- és Vámhivatal Dél-alföldi Regionális Vám- és Pénzügyőri Főigazgatósága

Operative part of the judgment

1. *Articles 4(1) and 5 of Directive 98/70/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1998 relating to the quality of petrol and diesel fuels and amending Council Directive 93/12/EEC, as amended by Regulation (EC) No 1882/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 September 2003, must be interpreted as meaning that they do not preclude a Member State from laying down in its national law quality requirements that are additional to the ones contained in that directive for the marketing of diesel fuels, such as that relating to the flash point at issue in the main proceedings, since it does not constitute a technical specification of diesel fuels relating to the protection of health and the environment for the purposes of that directive.*

2. *Article 1(6) and (11) of Directive 98/34/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 June 1998 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations and of rules on Information Society services, as amended by Council Directive 2006/96/EC of 20 November 2006, must be interpreted as meaning that a Member State is not precluded from making a national standard such as Hungarian standard MSZ EN 590:2009 at issue in the main proceedings mandatory.*