JUDGMENT OF THE COURT (Sixth Chamber)
27 June 1990 *

In Case C-18/89

REFERENCE to the Court under Article 177 of the EEC Treaty by the Bundesfinanzhof (Federal Finance Court), for a preliminary ruling in the proceedings pending before that court between

Maizena GmbH

and

Hauptzollamt Krefeld (Principal Customs Office),

on the interpretation and, in the alternative, the validity of Article 5a of Regulation (EEC) No 2742/75 of the Council of 29 October 1975 on production refunds in the cereals and rice sectors (Official Journal 1975, L 281, p. 57), as amended by Council Regulation (EEC) No 1665/77 of 20 July 1977 amending Regulation (EEC) No 2742/75 (Official Journal 1977, L 186, p. 15),

THE COURT (Sixth Chamber)

composed of: C. N. Kakouris, President of Chamber, F. A. Schockweiler, G. F. Mancini, T. F. O'Higgins and M. Diez de Velasco, Judges,

(the grounds of the judgment are not reproduced)

in answer to the questions referred to it by the Bundesfinanzhof, by order of 14 December 1988, hereby rules:

Article 5a(1) of Regulation (EEC) No 2742/75 of the Council of 29 October 1975 on production refunds in the cereals and rice sectors, as amended by Council Regulation (EEC) No 1665/77 of 20 July 1977 amending Regulation (EEC) No

* Language of the case: German.

2742/75, properly construed, does not prohibit production refunds in respect of products intended for the manufacture of isoglucose when that isoglucose is to be used as an intermediate product, not intended for marketing, in the manufacture of sorbitol.