

every day until the child reaches nine months of age) to the effect that, regardless of the sex of either parent, such leave is not be granted to the person applying for it if the other parent is unemployed?

Does Article 3 of Directive 2006/54/EC, 2 which seeks to guarantee full equality between men and women in their working lives, preclude an interpretation of the said Article 37.4 ET to the effect that, if the male parent is working, he has no entitlement to such leave if his wife and fellow parent is unemployed?

Case C-258/17. Discrimination and pension

E.B. – v – Versicherungsanstalt öffentlich Bediensteter BVA, reference lodged by the German Verwaltungsgerichtshof on 15 May 2017

Does Article 2 of Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation 1 ('the Directive') preclude the maintenance in being of the new legal position created by an administrative decision that has become final under national law, in the area of law governing disciplinary action in the civil service (disciplinary decision), compulsorily retiring and reducing the pension benefits of a civil servant, where that administrative decision was not yet subject to provisions of EU law, in particular the Directive, at the time when it was adopted, but a (notional) decision to the same effect would infringe the Directive if it were adopted within the temporal scope of the Directive?

If the first question is answered in the affirmative, is it, for the purposes of creating a non-discriminatory situation,

- a. necessary under EU law, for the purposes of determining the civil servant's pension, to treat him as if, in the period between the entry into force of the administrative decision and his reaching statutory pensionable age, he had not been retired but working, or is it
- b. sufficient for these purposes to recognise as due the unreduced pension accruing in consequence of compulsory retirement at the time specified in the administrative decision?

Does the answer to Question 2 depend on whether the civil servant did in fact proactively seek active employment in the federal civil service before reaching retirement age?

If it is considered sufficient to annul the percentage reduction of pension entitlement (and depending also,

if necessary, on the circumstances referred to in Question 3):

Can the principle of non-discrimination contained in the Directive support a primacy of application over conflicting national law which a national court must observe, when calculating pension entitlement, even in respect of periods before the Directive became directly applicable in national law?

If Question 4 is answered in the affirmative, to which point in time does such 'retroactive effect' extend?

Case C-315/17. Fixed term work

Pilar Centeno Meléndez – v – Universidad de Zaragoza, reference lodged by the Spanish Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Administrativo de Zaragoza on 29 May 2017

Is Clause 4(1) of the Framework Agreement annexed to Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1 applicable to the horizontal career increment claimed by the applicant, on the basis that it is an employment condition, or, rather, does the increment constitute an element of remuneration with the characteristics described in the present order that depends on the subjective qualities of the recipient which have been gained by working for a number of years under a system based on increasing levels of difficulty and responsibility and on continuity, specialisation and professionalism?

If the previous question is answered in the affirmative and the Court of Justice considers [the increment] to be an employment condition for the purposes of Clause 4(1) of the Framework Agreement, is the difference in remuneration justified on objective grounds?

Case C-370/17. Social security

Caisse de retraite du personnel navigant professionnel de l'aéronautique civile (CRPNPAC) – v – Vueling Airlines SA, reference lodged by the French Tribunal de grande instance de Bobigny on 19 June 2017

Is the effect of an E 101 certificate issued, in accordance with Article 11(1) and Article 12a(1a) of Regulation (EEC) No 574/72 of 21 March 1972 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation No 1408/71 of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to members of their families moving within the

Community, 1 by the institution designated by the authority of the Member State whose social security legislation remains applicable to the situation of the employee to be preserved even though the E 101 certificate has been obtained as a result of fraud or an abuse of right, which has been established in a final decision of a court of the Member State in which the employee carries out or should carry out his activity?

If the answer to that question is in the affirmative, does the issuing of E 101 certificates prevent the victims of the damage suffered as a result of the conduct of the employer, who has committed the fraud, from being compensated for that damage, without the affiliation of the employees to the schemes designated by the E 101 certificate being called into question by the action for damages brought against the employer?

List of national correspondents

Country	Name	Website
Austria	Andreas Tinhofer, MOSATI Rechtsanwälte	www.mosati.at
Belgium	Chris van Olmen, Van Olmen & Wynant	www.vow.be
Bulgaria	Kalina Tchakarova, Djingov, Gouginski, Kyutchukov & Velichkov	www.dgkv.com
Croatia	Dina Vlahov, Schoenherr Attorneys at Law	www.schoenherr.eu
Cyprus	George Z. Georgiou, Georgiou & Associates	www.georgezgeorgiou.com
Czech Republic	Michael Kosnar, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs	www.mpsv.cz
Denmark	Christian K. Clasen, Norrbom Vinding	www.norrbomvinding.com
Estonia	Gaabriel Tavits, Law Office PACTA OÜ and University of Tartu, School of Law	www.ut.ee
Finland	Janne Nurminen, Roschier	www.roschier.com
France	Claire Toumieux, Allen & Overy	www.allenoverly.com
Germany	Paul Schreiner, Luther Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft	www.luther-lawfirm.com
Greece	Effie Mitsopoulou, Kyriakides Georgopoulos	www.kgdi.gr
Hungary	Gabriella Ormai, CMS Cameron McKenna	www.cms-cmck.com
Ireland	Orla O'Leary, Mason Hayes & Curran	www.mhc.ie
Italy	Caterina Rucci, Bird & Bird	www.twobirds.com
Latvia	Andis Burkevics, Sorainen	www.sorainen.com
Lithuania	Vida Petrylaitė, CONFIDENCE Law Office	www.confidence.lt
Luxembourg	Michel Molitor, Molitor	www.molitorlegal.lu
Malta	Matthew Brincat, Ganado Advocates	www.ganadoadvocates.com
Netherlands	Zef Even, SteensmaEven	www.steensmaeven.com
Norway	André Istad Johansen, Advokatfirmaet Selmer	www.selmer.no
Poland	Marcin Wujczyk, Ksiazek & Bigaj	www.ksiazeklegal.pl
Portugal	César Sá Esteves, SRS Advogados	www.srslegal.pt
Romania	Andreea Suci, S.P.R.L. Menzer & Bachmann-Noerr	www.noerr.com
Slovakia	Gabriel Havrilla, Legal Counsels	www.legalcounsels.sk
Slovenia	Petra Smolnikar, Petra Smolnikar Law	www.petrasmolnikarlaw.eu
Spain	Sonia Cortés, Abdón Pedrajas & Molero	www.abdonpedrajas.com
United Kingdom	James Davies, Lewis Silkin	www.lewissilkin.com

Members of the Academic Board

Country	Name	University
Austria	Dr. Erika Kovacs	Vienna University of Economics and Business
Belgium	Prof. Dr. Marc de Vos	University of Ghent
Czech Republic	Dr. iur. Petr Hůrka, PhD	Charles University – Prague
Finland	Prof. Niklas Bruun	University of Helsinki
France	Prof. Jean-Philippe Lhernould	Université de Nantes
Germany	Prof. Dr. Gregor Thüsing, LL.M (Harvard)	Universität Bonn
Italy	Dr. Luca Calcaterra	Università Suor Orsola Benincasa, Naples
Ireland	Prof. Anthony Kerr	University College Dublin
Lithuania	Daiva Petrylaite	Vilnius University
Luxembourg	Luca Ratti	University of Luxembourg
Netherlands	Prof. Ruben Houweling	Erasmus University Rotterdam
Norway	Prof. Stein Evju	University of Oslo
Poland	Prof. Dr. hab. Andrzej Marian Świątkowski	Jesuit University
Slovakia	Andrej Poruban	Comenius University, Bratislava
Spain	Prof. Eduardo Gonzalez Biedma	Universidad de Sevilla
United Kingdom	Prof. Catherine Barnard	University of Cambridge (Trinity College)

