

ECtHR 3 September 2020, application no. 57462/19 (Mahi), Freedom of Expression

Yacob Mahi – v – Belgium

An English summary is available on: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/pdf?library=ECHR&id=003-6778662-9058283&filename=Decision%20Mahi%20v.%20Belgium%20%3A%20disciplinary%20measure%20against%20a%20teacher%20because%20of%20his%20statements%2C%20particularly%20about%20the%202015%20Paris%20attacks%20.pdf>.

The full text of the judgment (in French) is available on: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%7B%22languageisocode%22:%5B%22FRE%22%5D,%22appno%22:%5B%2257462/19%22%5D,%22documentcollectionid%22:%5B%22ADMISSIBILITY%22%5D,%22itemid%22:%5B%22001-204590%22%5D%7D>.

ECtHR 20 October 2020, application no. 33139/13 (Napotnik – v – Romania), Gender Discrimination

Ms Oana-Cornelia Napotnik – v – Romania

No breach of diplomat's rights when she was recalled from a post abroad because she was pregnant. The case is available on: <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-205222>. The summary is available on: <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=002-12982>.

ECJ 23 September 2020, Case C-777/18 (Vas Megyei Kormányhivatal (Soins de santé transfrontaliers)), Free Movement, Social Insurance

WO – v – Vas Megyei Kormányhivatal, Hungarian case

Summary

In principle, healthcare received on initiative of an insured person, in another Member State than the Member State of residence, constitutes 'scheduled treatment' within the meaning of Article 20 of Regulation 883/04/EC, the reimbursement of which is subject to prior authorization. This can be different in 'individual circumstances'.

Questions

1. Must Article 20 of Regulation No 883/2004 or Article 26 of Regulation No 987/2009, laying down the procedure for implementing the former, be interpreted as meaning that healthcare received in a Member State other than the insured person's Member State of residence, on that person's own initiative, taken once it has been established that all the treatments received in several medical establishments in his or her Member State of residence are ineffective, comes within the definition of 'scheduled treatment' and, if so, whether those provisions must be interpreted as meaning that the insured person can apply for the reimbursement, by the competent institution, of the costs he or she has incurred for the scheduled treatment received during his or her stay in the other Member State, even if that person has not applied for prior authorisation for that purpose from that institution, at the very least when individual circumstances, relating in par-