

9. Finally, the General Court erred in dismissing the Appellant's arguments that his right to property had been infringed and that the Regulation was unjustified and disproportionate as applied to him.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 194/2008 of 25 February 2008 renewing and strengthening the restrictive measures in respect of Burma/Myanmar and repealing Regulation (EC) No 817/2006 OJ L 66, p. 1

Action brought on 29 July 2010 — European Commission v Republic of Finland

(Case C-380/10)

(2010/C 260/16)

Language of the case: Swedish

Parties

Applicant: European Commission (represented by: A. Alcover San Pedro and K. Nyberg, acting as Agents)

Defendant: Republic of Finland

Form of order sought

— declare that, by failing to adopt the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with Directive 2007/2/EC ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2007 establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE), or in any event by failing to notify the Commission thereof, the Republic of Finland, with regard to the province of Åland, has failed to fulfil its obligations under that directive;

— order the Republic of Finland to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The time-limit for implementing the Directive expired on 14 May 2009.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2007 L 108, p. 1.

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Supreme Court (Ireland) made on 6 August 2010 — J. McB. v L. E.

(Case C-400/10)

(2010/C 260/17)

Language of the case: English

Referring court

Supreme Court, Ireland

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: J. McB.

Defendant: L. E.

Question referred

Does Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ⁽¹⁾ of 27th November 2003 on the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000 ⁽²⁾, whether interpreted pursuant to Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union or otherwise, preclude a Member State from requiring by its law that the father of a child who is not married to the mother shall have obtained an order of a court of competent jurisdiction granting him custody in order to qualify as having 'custody rights' which render the removal of that child from its country of habitual residence wrongful for the purposes of Article 2.11 of that Regulation?

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000 OJ L 338, p. 1

⁽²⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000 of 29 May 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and in matters of parental responsibility for children of both spouses OJ L 160, p. 19