

Case C-576/20, Social Insurance, Pensions

CC – v – Pensionsversicherungsanstalt, reference lodged by the Oberster Gerichtshof (Austria) on 4 November 2020

1. Is Article 44(2) 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 child-raising periods spent in other Member States from being taken into account by a Member State competent to grant an old-age pension – under whose legislation the applicant for a pension has pursued an activity as an employed or self-employed person throughout her working life, with the exception of those child-raising periods – solely on the ground that the applicant for a pension was not pursuing an activity as an employed or self-employed person at the date when, under the legislation of that Member State, the child-raising period started to be taken into account for the child concerned?
2. If the first question is answered in the negative: Is the first clause of Article 44(2) 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 meaning that, under its legislation, the Member State which is competent under Title II of Regulation (EC) No. 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems does not take child-raising periods into account generally, or that it does not take them into account only in a specific case?

Case C-577/20, Work and Residence Permit

A – v – Sosiaali-ja terveystien lupa-ja valvontavirasto, reference lodged by the orkein hallinto-oikeus (Finland) on 4 November 2020

1. Are the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty on European Union and Directive 2005/36/EC to be interpreted as meaning that the competent authority of the host Member State must assess an applicant's right to pursue a regulated profession in accordance with Articles 45 and 49 TFEU and the relevant case-law (in particular, judgment of 7 May 1991, C-340/89, Vlassopoulou, and judgment of 6 October 2015, C-298/14, Brouillard) even

though the conditions for the pursuit of a regulated profession are supposed to be standardised in Article 13(2) of Directive 2005/36/EC, and, under those conditions, the host Member State must permit the pursuit of a profession by an applicant who holds evidence of formal qualifications from a Member State in which the profession is not regulated, but who does not satisfy the requirement for the pursuit of the profession laid down in that provision of the directive?

2. If the first question referred is answered in the affirmative: In the light of the statements made in Case C-298/14, Brouillard (paragraph 55 of the judgment) concerning the exclusive criteria for assessing the equivalence of certificates, does EU law preclude the competent authority of the host Member State, in a situation such as that at issue in the present case, from also basing its assessment of the equivalence of training on information other than that obtained from the training provider or the authorities of the other Member State regarding the precise content of the training and the manner in which it is implemented?

Case C-587/20, Other Forms of Discrimination

Ligebehandlingsnævnet as representative of A – v – HK/Danmark and HK/Privat, reference lodged by the Østre Landsret (Denmark) on 9 November 2020

Must Article 3(1)(a) of the Employment Directive [Directive 2000/78/EC] be interpreted as meaning that a politically elected sector convenor of a trade union is covered by the scope of the directive in the circumstances described [in the request for a preliminary ruling]?

Case C-625/20, Social Insurance, Gender Discrimination

KM – v – Instituto Nacional de la Seguridad Social (INSS), reference lodged by the Juzgado de lo Social n.º 26 de Barcelona (Spain) on 19 November 2020

1. Is the Spanish rule on compatibility of benefits established in Article 163(1) of the [Ley General de la Seguridad Social] (General Law on Social Security), as interpreted by case-law, which prevents two permanent disability benefits awarded