

- Should Directive 1999/70/EC be interpreted as requiring the conversion of the contracts as being the only means to prevent abuse arising from the use of successive fixed-term employment contracts?

Case C-163/20, Social Insurance

AZ – v – Finanzamt Hollabrunn Korneuburg Tulln, reference lodged by the Bundesfinanzgericht (Austria) on 16 April 2020

Are Articles 18 and 45(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 7(1) and (2) of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union, Article 4, Article 5(b), Article 7 and Article 67 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems and the second sentence of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems to be interpreted as precluding the application of national legislation which provides that family benefits for a child who is not actually permanently resident in the Member State that pays those family benefits, but is actually resident in another Member State of the European Union, in another contracting party to the Agreement on the European Economic Area or in Switzerland, must be adjusted on the basis of the comparative price levels, published by the Statistical Office of the European Union, for the State concerned in relation to the Member State that pays the family benefits?

144

Case C-166/20, Other Forms of Free Movement

BB – v – Lietuvos Respublikos sveikatos apsaugos ministerija (Ministry of Health of the Republic of Lithuania), reference lodged by the Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas (Lithuania) on 22 April 2020

BB – v – Lietuvos Respublikos sveikatos apsaugos ministerija (Ministry of Health of the Republic of Lithuania), reference lodged by the Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas (Lithuania) on 22 April 2020

- Should Article 10(b) of Directive 2005/36/EC, when interpreted together with the purpose of the directive specified in Article 1, be interpreted as being applicable in a situation where a person has

not obtained formal evidence of qualifications because he or she has potentially fulfilled the requirements necessary for obtaining the professional qualifications in several Member States of the European Union rather than in a single one? In such a situation, where a person has not acquired formal evidence of qualifications because he or she has potentially fulfilled the requirements necessary for obtaining the professional qualifications in several Member States of the European Union rather than in a single one, should Chapter I (General system for the recognition of evidence of training) of Title III of Directive 2005/36/EC be interpreted as obliging the institution recognising qualifications to assess the content of all the documents submitted by the person which can demonstrate professional qualifications and whether they comply with the requirements set in the host Member State for obtaining the professional qualifications and, if necessary, to apply compensation measures?

- In a situation such as that in the present case, where the applicant has potentially fulfilled the requirements necessary for obtaining the professional qualifications as a pharmacist for the purposes of Article 44 in Section 7 of Chapter III of Directive 2005/36/EC but those requirements have been fulfilled in several Member States of the European Union rather than in a single one and, therefore, the applicant does not hold the evidence attesting to professional qualifications that is laid down in point 5.6.2 of Annex V to Directive 2005/36/EC, should Articles 45 and 49 TFEU and Article 15 of the Charter be interpreted as obliging the competent authorities of the host Member State to assess the professional training of the applicant and to compare it with the professional training required in the host State, and also to assess the content of the documents submitted which can demonstrate professional qualifications and whether they comply with the requirements set in the host Member State for obtaining the professional qualifications, and, if necessary, to apply compensation

Case C-194/20, Work and Residence Permit

BY and others – v – City of Duisburg, reference lodged by the Verwaltungsgericht Düsseldorf (Germany) on 7 May 2020

The following questions are referred to the Court of Justice of the European Union for a preliminary ruling pursuant to Article 267 TFEU:

- Does the entitlement of Turkish children under the first sentence of Article 9 of Decision No 1/80 of the EEC-Turkey Association Council ('Decision No 1/80') also include a right of residence in the host

Member State without the need to fulfil further conditions?

2. If Question 1 is answered in the affirmative:
 1. Does an entitlement to residence under the first sentence of Article 9 of Decision No 1/80 require that the parents of the Turkish children benefiting from that provision have already acquired rights under Article 6(1) or Article 7 of Decision No 1/80?
 2. If Question 2(1) is answered in the negative: Is legal employment within the meaning of the first sentence of Article 9 of Decision No 1/80 to be interpreted in the same way as in Article 6(1) of Decision No 1/80?
 3. If Question 2(1) is answered in the negative: Can an entitlement to residence in respect of Turkish children under the first sentence of Article 9 of Decision No 1/80 already arise after one of the parents has been in legal employment in the host Member State for a period of (only) three months?
 4. If Question 2(1) is answered in the negative: Does the right of residence of Turkish children also entail, without the need to fulfil further conditions, a right of residence for one or both parents with custody?