

EUROPEAN UNION / JUDGMENT

SQ v YR

Source: eur-lex.europa.eu · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Provisional text

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT (Third Chamber)

24 September 2026 (*)

(Reference for a preliminary ruling – Area of freedom, security and justice – Regulation (EU) 2016/1103 – Jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of matrimonial property regimes – Article 1(1) – Scope – Article 3(1)(a) – Concept of ‘matrimonial property regime’ – Immoveable property acquired in co-ownership by spouses under a separate property regime – Proceedings for the liquidation and division of co-ownership brought after the dissolution of a marriage – Included)

In Case C-300/25 [Duftošek], (i)

REQUEST for a preliminary ruling under Article 267 TFEU from the Nejvyšší soud (Supreme Court, Czech Republic), made by decision of 26 March 2025, received at the Court on 24 April 2025, in the proceedings

SQ

v

YR,

THE COURT (Third Chamber),

composed of C. Lycourgos, President of the Chamber, O. Spineanu-Matei (Rapporteur), S. Rodin, N. Piçarra and N. Fenger, Judges,

Advocate General: J. Richard de la Tour,

Registrar: I. Illéssy, Administrator,

having regard to the written procedure and further to the hearing on 16 April 2026,

after considering the observations submitted on behalf of:

– SQ, by A. Andruško and P. Marek, advokáti, and M. Odin, avocate,

– YR, by J. Pacovský, advokát,

– the Czech Government, by A. Edelmannová, L. Halajová, A. Pagáčová and J. Vlácil, acting as Agents,

– the European Commission, by M. Monfort and S. Noë, acting as Agents,

after hearing the Opinion of the Advocate General at the sitting on 2 July 2026,

gives the following

Judgment

1 This request for a preliminary ruling concerns the interpretation of Article 1 and Article 3(1)(a) of Council Regulation (EU) 2016/1103 of 24 June 2016 implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of matrimonial property regimes (OJ 2016 L 183, p. 1).

2 The request has been made in proceedings between SQ and YR concerning the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immoveable property acquired when they were married under a separate property regime.

Legal context

European Union law

Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012

3 Recital 34 of Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2012 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 2012 L 351, p. 1) provides:

‘Continuity between the [Convention of 27 September 1968 on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 1972 L 299, p. 32), as amended by the successive conventions on the accession of new Member States to that convention (“the Brussels Convention”)], [Council] Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 [of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 2001 L 12, p. 1)] and this Regulation should be ensured, and transitional provisions should be laid down to that end. The same need for continuity applies as regards the interpretation by the Court of Justice of the European Union of the [Brussels Convention] and of the Regulations replacing it.’

4 Article 1 of Regulation No 1215/2012, which appears in Chapter I thereof, entitled ‘Scope and definitions’, provides:

‘1. This Regulation shall apply in civil and commercial matters whatever the nature of the court or tribunal. It shall not extend, in particular, to revenue, customs or administrative matters or to the liability of the State for acts and omissions in the exercise of State authority (*acta iure imperii*).

2. This Regulation shall not apply to:

- (a) the status or legal capacity of natural persons, rights in property arising out of a matrimonial relationship or out of a relationship deemed by the law applicable to such relationship to have comparable effects to marriage;

...'

5 Under the heading 'Jurisdiction', Chapter II of that regulation contains several sections, including Section 6, entitled 'Exclusive jurisdiction'. Section 6 contains, inter alia, Article 24 of that regulation, point 1 of which is worded as follows:

'The following courts of a Member State shall have exclusive jurisdiction, regardless of the domicile of the parties:

- (1) in proceedings which have as their object rights in rem in immovable property or tenancies of immovable property, the courts of the Member State in which the property is situated.

...'

Regulation 2016/1103

6 Recitals 15, 18, 19 and 24 of Regulation 2016/1103 state:

'(15) To provide married couples with legal certainty as to their property and offer them a degree of predictability, all the rules applicable to matrimonial property regimes should be covered in a single instrument.

...

- (18) The scope of this Regulation should include all civil-law aspects of matrimonial property regimes, both the daily management of matrimonial property and the liquidation of the regime, in particular as a result of the couple's separation or the death of one of the spouses. For the purposes of this Regulation, the term "matrimonial property regime" should be interpreted autonomously and should encompass not only rules from which the spouses may not derogate but also any optional rules to which the spouses may agree in accordance with the applicable law, as well as any default rules of the applicable law. It includes not only property arrangements specifically and exclusively envisaged by certain national legal systems in the case of marriage but also any property relationships, between the spouses and in their relations with third parties, resulting directly from the matrimonial relationship, or the dissolution thereof.
- (19) For reasons of clarity, a number of questions which could be seen as having a link with matters of matrimonial property regime should be explicitly excluded from the scope of this Regulation.

...

(24) This Regulation should allow for the creation or the transfer resulting from the matrimonial property regime of a right in immovable or moveable property as provided for in the law applicable to the matrimonial property regime. It should, however, not affect the limited number (‘*numerus clausus*’) of rights in rem known in the national law of some Member States. A Member State should not be required to recognise a right in rem relating to property located in that Member State if the right in rem in question is not known in its law.’

7 Article 1 of that regulation, entitled ‘Scope’, provides:

‘1. This Regulation shall apply to matrimonial property regimes.

It shall not apply to revenue, customs or administrative matters.

2. The following shall be excluded from the scope of this Regulation:

...

(g) the nature of rights in rem relating to a property; and

...’

8 Under the heading ‘Definitions’, Article 3 of that regulation provides, in paragraph 1 thereof:

‘For the purposes of this Regulation:

(a) “matrimonial property regime” means a set of rules concerning the property relationships between the spouses and in their relations with third parties, as a result of marriage or its dissolution;

...’

9 As set out in Article 6 of that regulation, headed ‘Jurisdiction in other cases’:

‘Where no court of a Member State has jurisdiction pursuant to Article 4 or 5 or in cases other than those provided for in those Articles, jurisdiction to rule on a matter of the spouses’ matrimonial property regime shall lie with the courts of the Member State:

...

(b) in whose territory the spouses were last habitually resident, in so far as one of them still resides there at the time the court is seised; ...

...’

Czech law

Law No 89/2012 on the Civil Code

10 The zákon č. 89/2012 Sb., občanský zákoník (Law No 89/2012 on the Civil Code) provides, in Paragraph 708 thereof, that any property belonging to spouses that has financial value and is not excluded from legal relationships constitutes part of the spouses' community of property.

According to subparagraph 2 of Paragraph 708, that community of property is subject to a statutory regime, a contractual regime or a regime based on a court decision.

11 Pursuant to Paragraph 709(1) of that law, under the statutory regime, community of property covers any property acquired by one of the spouses or by both spouses jointly during the marriage, with the exception of property expressly excluded by that provision.

12 The first sentence of Paragraph 716(1) of that law provides that spouses may enter into a matrimonial property regime that differs from the statutory regime.

13 According to the first sentence of Paragraph 717(1) of that law, a contractual matrimonial regime may consist of a separate property regime.

14 Pursuant to Paragraph 729 of Law No 89/2012 on the Civil Code, under the separate property regime, a spouse may dispose of his or her property without the other spouse's consent.

15 Paragraph 1115(1) of that law provides that persons who hold joint title over property are to be regarded as co-owners.

16 Paragraph 1140 of that law provides that no person is obliged to remain in co-ownership, and that each co-owner may request the separation of his or her share of common property at any time, if the co-owned property is able to be divided, or dissolution thereof.

17 According to Paragraph 1143 of that law, if the co-owners fail to reach an agreement on the dissolution of co-ownership, the court shall decide on the matter at the request of one of the co-owners. If the court decides to dissolve co-ownership, it must also determine the arrangements for the division between the co-owners.

The dispute in the main proceedings and the question referred for a preliminary ruling

18 It is apparent from the file before the Court that the parties to the main proceedings were married under a separate property regime and acquired in co-ownership, during that marriage, in an immovable property situated in Paris (France) ('the property in question').

19 Following the dissolution of the marriage, YR brought an application before the Czech courts for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of the property in question.

20 By order of 26 October 2022, the Obvodní soud pro Prahu 5 (Prague 5 District Court, Czech Republic), ruling at first instance, found that, having regard to the separate property regime agreed when the marriage was entered into, no community of property had ever existed between the former spouses. That court therefore held that that application fell within the scope of

Regulation No 1215/2012. According to Article 24(1) of that regulation, only the courts of the Member State in which the property is situated have jurisdiction, namely, in the present case, the French courts.

21 That decision was set aside by order of 22 January 2024 of the Městský soud v Praze (Municipal Court, Prague, Czech Republic), which held that the case in the main proceedings fell within the scope of Regulation 2016/1103. According to that court, the separate property regime, under which the immovable property in question was acquired, constitutes a ‘matrimonial property regime’ within the meaning of that regulation, since it concerns rights in property arising from the marriage. It follows that the Czech courts have jurisdiction to hear that case on the basis of Article 6(b) of that regulation.

22 An appeal on a point of law was brought against that order before the Nejvyšší soud (Supreme Court, Czech Republic), which is the referring court.

23 That court states that the determination of the court which has jurisdiction to hear an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immovable property acquired by spouses married under a separate property regime depends on whether such an application forms part of a property dispute arising directly from the marital relationship or the dissolution thereof, thus falling within the scope of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ within the meaning of Regulation 2016/1103, or is unrelated to marriage, thus falling within the scope of ‘rights in rem in immovable property’ within the meaning of Regulation No 1215/2012.

24 According to that court, the main proceedings differ from the case which gave rise to the order of 14 June 2017, *Iliev* (C-67/17, EU:C:2017:459), in so far as, in the present case, what is sought is not the division of property resulting from the dissolution of the marriage by divorce, but the liquidation of co-ownership existing between the parties to the main proceedings, in accordance with ordinary law.

25 The referring court observes that, in order to determine whether a dispute falls within the scope of Regulation No 1215/2012 or Regulation 2016/1103, it must be determined, respectively, whether that dispute results ‘directly’ from the matrimonial relationship or the dissolution thereof, or has no connection to the marriage, for the purposes of the judgment of 27 March 1979, *de Cavel* (143/78, EU:C:1979:83). To that end, it might be appropriate to examine whether the aspects relating to the formation or dissolution of the marriage are decisive for the resolution of that dispute, or whether they are merely contextual factors with no ‘direct’ influence on the outcome of that dispute.

26 That court states that, under Czech law, the mere fact that the spouses have agreed on a separate property regime, under which they acquired an immovable property, does not distinguish the resulting co-ownership from other, statutory forms of co-ownership. That court indicates that property may be held in co-ownership by the spouses alone, as in the case in the main proceedings, but also jointly with third parties, without those third parties being affected by the existence of a marital relationship between certain co-owners. To hold that a dispute relating to the liquidation and division of such co-ownership falls within the scope of Regulation

2016/1103 would amount to determining the international jurisdiction of a court on the basis of circumstances which might not be known to all the co-owners.

27 Furthermore, according to that court, the procedure for the liquidation and division of co-ownership under Czech law may take place both during the marriage of the co-owners and long after it has been dissolved.

28 In those circumstances, the Nejvyšší soud (Supreme Court) decided to stay the proceedings and to refer the following question to the Court of Justice for a preliminary ruling:

‘Do proceedings for the [liquidation and division] of joint ownership interests in an immoveable property, acquired by the spouses as joint ownership interests as a result of an agreed separate property regime, constitute proceedings [relating to] a matrimonial property regime within the meaning of [Article 1 and Article] 3(1)(a) of [Regulation 2016/1103]?’

Consideration of the question referred

29 By its question, the referring court asks, in essence, whether Article 1(1) and Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103 must be interpreted as meaning that an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immoveable property, acquired solely by spouses married under an agreed separate property regime, brought after the dissolution of the marriage, falls within the scope of a matrimonial property regime, within the meaning of those provisions.

30 In order to answer that question, it is necessary, in accordance with settled case-law, to take into account not only the wording of those provisions, but also the context in which they occur and the objectives pursued by the act of which they form part (see judgments of 17 November 1983, *Merck*, 292/82, EU:C:1983:335, paragraph 12, and of 27 November 2025, *Manuel Costa Filhos*, C-643/24, EU:C:2025:923, paragraph 37 and the case-law cited).

31 As regards, in the first place, the wording of those provisions, it should be noted that Article 1(1) of Regulation 2016/1103 provides that that regulation is to apply to matrimonial property regimes, with the exception of revenue, customs or administrative matters.

32 In that regard, the Court has held that that regulation was adopted in order to cover all civil law aspects of matrimonial property regimes, including both the daily management of matrimonial property and the liquidation of the matrimonial property regime (see, to that effect, judgment of 1 March 2018, *Mahnkopf*, C-558/16, EU:C:2018:138, paragraph 41).

33 Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103 defines the term ‘matrimonial property regime’ as covering a set of rules concerning the property relationships between the spouses and in their relations with third parties, as a result of marriage or its dissolution.

34 It is apparent from the very wording of those provisions that they make no reference to the law of the Member States as regards the meaning and scope to be attributed to the concept of ‘matrimonial property regime’, with the result that, having regard to the requirements both of the uniform application of EU law and of the principle of equality, that concept must be regarded as

an autonomous concept of EU law and must be interpreted uniformly throughout the territory of the European Union (see, by analogy, judgment of 16 February 2023, *Lufthansa Technik AERO Alzey*, C-393/21, EU:C:2023:104, paragraph 31 and the case-law cited).

35 The meaning and scope of that concept cannot therefore be determined in the light of the definition given in the law of the Member States.

36 The reference in the wording of Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103 to ‘a set’ of rules concerning the property relationships between the spouses and, where appropriate, in their relations with third parties, resulting from marriage or its dissolution also supports the view that the concept of ‘matrimonial property regime’ must be interpreted broadly.

37 The need for an autonomous and broad interpretation of that concept, which follows from the wording of Article 1(1) and Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103, is, in the second place, supported by the context of those provisions.

38 In that regard, it should be observed, first, that recital 18 of that regulation states that its scope should include all civil-law aspects of matrimonial property regimes, both the daily management of matrimonial property and the liquidation of the regime, in particular as a result of the couple’s separation or the death of one of the spouses.

39 According to recital 18, the term ‘matrimonial property regime’ should be interpreted autonomously and should encompass not only rules from which the spouses may not derogate but also any optional rules to which the spouses may agree in accordance with the applicable law, as well as any default rules of that law. It includes not only property arrangements specifically and exclusively envisaged by certain national legal systems in the case of marriage, but also any property relationships between the spouses and in their relations with third parties resulting directly from the matrimonial relationship or the dissolution thereof.

40 Secondly, in the scheme of Regulation 2016/1103, the scope of the concept of ‘matrimonial property regime’ is also circumscribed by the list, in Article 1(2) of that regulation, of matters excluded from the scope of that regulation. As stated in recital 19 of that regulation, a number of questions which could be seen as having a link with matters of matrimonial property regime should be explicitly excluded from the scope of that regulation.

41 Those exclusions include the one set out in Article 1(2)(g) of Regulation 2016/1103 concerning the nature of rights in rem relating to a property.

42 In that regard, it should be noted that, as stated in recital 24 of that regulation, the objective of that exclusion is to ensure that it does not affect the limited number of rights in rem known in the national law of some Member States. According to that recital, a Member State should not be required to recognise a right in rem relating to property located in that Member State if the right in rem in question is not known in its law. Consequently, the scope of that exception does not encompass all actions that have a connection with a right in rem in property, since the existence of such a link is not, in itself, sufficient to justify the non-application of that regulation.

43 Although an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immovable property, acquired solely by spouses married under a separate property regime, may indeed result in the transfer of a right in rem over that property, it does not concern the question of the ‘nature of rights in rem’ relating to that property within the meaning of Article 1(2)(g) of Regulation 2016/1103.

44 Thirdly, in the context of a more general contextual interpretation, it should be noted that the concept of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ in Regulation 2016/1103 is also found in other EU law instruments, in particular Regulation No 1215/2012 and the legal instruments which preceded it, namely, in particular, the Brussels Convention, in order to designate a matter excluded from their respective scopes.

45 In so far as those regulations and other EU law instruments relate to judicial cooperation in civil matters having cross-border implications, it is necessary to harmonise the interpretation of the equivalent concepts used by the EU legislature in those areas (see, by analogy, judgment of 3 June 2021, *Generalno konsultstvo na Republika Bulgaria*, C-280/20, EU:C:2021:443, paragraph 32 and the case-law cited).

46 It is therefore relevant to recall that, when asked to interpret the Brussels Convention in the context of divorce proceedings pending before a national court, the Court held that the concept of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ includes not only proprietary regimes specifically and exclusively envisaged by certain national legal systems in the case of marriage but also any property relationships resulting directly from the matrimonial relationship, or the dissolution thereof (judgment of 27 March 1979, *de Cavel*, 143/78, EU:C:1979:83, paragraph 7).

47 The Court stated that disputes relating to the assets of spouses in the course of divorce proceedings may therefore, depending on the circumstances, concern or be closely connected with questions relating to the status of persons, legal relationships concerning property which exist between spouses and result directly from the matrimonial relationship or the dissolution thereof, or legal relationships concerning property that exist between them and have no connection with the marriage, and that, whereas disputes of the latter category come within the scope of the Brussels Convention, those relating to the first two categories must be excluded therefrom (see, to that effect, judgment of 27 March 1979, *de Cavel*, 143/78, EU:C:1979:83, paragraph 7).

48 Applying the same criteria in a case concerning the interpretation of Article 1(2)(a) of Regulation No 1215/2012, the Court held that a dispute between former spouses relating to the liquidation of moveable property acquired during the marriage concerns proprietary legal relationships between those persons resulting directly from the dissolution of the marriage and therefore falls within the scope of ‘matrimonial property regimes’, which excludes the application of that regulation (see, to that effect, order of 14 June 2017, *Iliev*, C-67/17, EU:C:2017:459, paragraph 30).

49 In the light of the case-law cited in paragraphs 46 to 48 above, which can be transposed to the interpretation of the concept of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ or ‘matrimonial property regime’ within the meaning of Article 1(1) and Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103, it must be held that that concept covers a set of rules concerning the property relationships between spouses or former spouses and in their relations with third parties resulting directly from the matrimonial relationship or the dissolution thereof.

50 That interpretation corresponds, in the third place, to the objectives pursued by Regulation 2016/1103.

51 In that regard, it should be noted that, as stated in recital 15 of that regulation, that regulation seeks to provide married couples with legal certainty as to their property and offer them a degree of predictability, by grouping together in a single instrument all the rules applicable to matrimonial property regimes.

52 As the Advocate General submits, in essence, in points 65 and 66 of his Opinion, the objective of simplification on which Regulation 2016/1103 is based is reflected in the fact that a single authority has jurisdiction to rule on all matters relating to the spouses’ property relationships, in accordance with a single law chosen by the spouses or determined according to the objective connecting factors set out in that regulation.

53 As regards, in particular, the rules on jurisdiction, that objective of simplifying the spouses’ legal situation resulted in the adoption, inter alia, of Article 6 of Regulation 2016/1103, which lays down the criteria for determining which court has jurisdiction to rule on the spouses’ ‘matrimonial property regime’, defined in Article 3(1)(a) of that regulation as a ‘set’ of rules concerning the property relationships between the spouses and in their relations with third parties, as a result of marriage or its dissolution.

54 Consequently, a broad definition of the concept of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ which allows disputes relating to a set of rules concerning the property relationships of spouses or former spouses to be brought before a single court, including where those relationships concern the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immoveable property, meets the objective of simplification and predictability pursued by Regulation 2016/1103. That is all the more so where spouses or former spouses apply for the liquidation and division of co-ownership as co-owners of several immoveable properties located in different Member States and acquired as a result of a separate property regime. The possibility of consolidating those claims before a single court with jurisdiction under Regulation 2016/1103 is consistent with the proper administration of justice, since it can prevent litigation from becoming fragmented based on the location of those immoveable properties.

55 In the present case, it is apparent from the request for a preliminary ruling that, when the marriage was entered into, the spouses adopted a separate property regime and that, during the marriage, they acquired co-ownership of the immoveable property in question. Following the dissolution of their marriage by divorce, one of them brought an action before a Czech court for the liquidation and division of co-ownership, which concerns only the former spouses, since no third party is among the co-owners.

56 In such a situation, which is characterised by the fact that the legal relationship at issue, namely co-ownership of immoveable property between former spouses, arose in the course of a marriage which was subject to a separate property regime, it must be held that there is a direct link between that proprietary legal relationship and the marital relationship.

57 In that regard, it should be noted that, in order to govern their proprietary legal relationships, the parties typically have a choice between several matrimonial property regimes which, as stated in paragraph 45 of the Report by Professor Dr Peter Schlosser on the Convention of 9 October 1978 on the Association of the Kingdom of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters and to the Protocol on its interpretation by the Court of Justice (OJ 1979 C 59, p. 71), may range from a general ‘community of property’ to a strict ‘separation of property’. As is apparent from the case-law referred to in paragraph 46 above, such property regimes, envisaged in the case of marriage, fall within the concept of ‘matrimonial property regimes’. In the present case, it appears, subject to verification by the referring court, that the separate property regime chosen by the spouses characterised, in property law terms, their marital relationship and directly led, at the time of the purchase of the immoveable property in question, to the legal relationship that exists between them as co-owners.

58 Such a conclusion is not undermined by the fact, set out in paragraph 26 above, that, in Czech law, the legal regime of co-ownership which results from the acquisition of immoveable property by married spouses under a separate property regime does not differ, in essence, from that of statutory forms of co-ownership. That fact is irrelevant for the purpose of determining whether an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, falls within the scope of ‘matrimonial property regimes’ within the meaning of Regulation 2016/1103 since, as stated in paragraph 35 above, that term ‘matrimonial property regimes’ constitutes an autonomous concept of EU law the scope of which cannot be determined in the light of the law of the Member States.

59 Furthermore, the fact that that application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership was made after the dissolution of the marriage is not such as to prevent a finding of a direct link between the legal relationship in question and the marital relationship. As the Commission submitted, in essence, at the hearing before the Court, the date on which the application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership was brought, whether before or after the dissolution of the marriage, is not decisive for the application of Regulation 2016/1103.

60 In the light of the foregoing considerations, and without there being any need to examine, in the context of the present case, whether the interpretation provided in the present judgment is also applicable to situations in which one or more third parties are among the co-owners, the answer to the question referred is that Article 1(1) and Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation 2016/1103 must be interpreted as meaning that an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immovable property, acquired solely by spouses married under an agreed separate property regime, brought after the dissolution of the marriage, falls within the scope of a matrimonial property regime within the meaning of those provisions.

Costs

61 Since these proceedings are, for the parties to the main proceedings, a step in the action pending before the referring court, the decision on costs is a matter for that court. Costs incurred in submitting observations to the Court, other than the costs of those parties, are not recoverable.

On those grounds, the Court (Third Chamber) hereby rules:

Article 1(1) and Article 3(1)(a) of Council Regulation (EU) 2016/1103 of 24 June 2016 implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of matrimonial property regimes

must be interpreted as meaning that an application for the liquidation and division of co-ownership of an immovable property, acquired solely by spouses married under an agreed separate property regime, brought after the dissolution of the marriage, falls within the scope of a matrimonial property regime within the meaning of those provisions.

[Signatures]

* Language of the case: Czech.

i The name of the present case is a fictitious name. It does not correspond to the real name of any party to the proceedings.

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62025CJ0300>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/european-union/sq-v-yr-2026>

Prepared on 26 October 2026 · Esheria