then being transferred to the employer at the time of payment, constitute a sickness benefit within the meaning of Article 3(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004?

2. If Question 1 is answered in the negative: Must Article 45 TFEU and Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 be interpreted as precluding national legislation under which the granting of compensation for loss of earnings suffered by workers as a result of isolation ordered by the health authorities in the case of a positive COVID-19 test result (with the compensation being initially payable to the workers by their employer, and the entitlement to compensation vis-à-vis the Austrian Federal Government then being transferred to the employer to that extent) is subject to the condition that the isolation is ordered by an Austrian authority on the basis of provisions of national law relating to epidemics, with the result that such compensation is not paid to workers who, as frontier workers, are resident in another Member State and whose isolation ('quarantine') is ordered by the health authorities of their Member State of residence?

Case C-415/22, Social Insurance

JD – v – Acerta – Caisse d'assurances sociales ASBL, Institut national d'assurances sociales pour travailleurs indépendants (Inasti), Belgian State, reference lodged by the Tribunal du travail francophone de Bruxelles (Belgium) on 20 June 2022

Does the principle of EU law based on a single social security scheme applicable to workers, whether employed or self-employed, active or retired, preclude a Member State of residence from requiring, as in the present case, a retired official of the European Commission, who pursues an activity as a self-employed person, to be subject to its social security scheme and the payment of purely 'solidarity' social security contributions, where the retired official is subject to the compulsory social security scheme of the European Union and does not derive any benefits, be they contributory or non-contributory, from the national scheme to which he or she is subject by force?

Case C-477/22, Working Time, Miscellaneous

ARST S.p.A. – Azienda regionale sarda trasporti – v – Various employees, reference lodged by the Corte suprema di cassazione (Italy) on 15 July 2022

1. Must Article 3(a) of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport and amending Council Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 2135/98 and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85 be interpreted as meaning that the term "route" not exceeding 50 kilometres refers to the kilometres covered by the journey (line) identified by the transport undertaking for payment of the ticket, or to the total number of kilometres covered by the driver in the daily work shift, or to the maximum distance on the road reached by the vehicle in relation to the starting point (radius); or, in any event, by means of what other criterion should the kilometres of the route be calculated?
2. In any event, may the undertaking organising the transport be exempt from application of the regulation in respect of those vehicles it uses exclusively to cover journeys of less than 50 km, or is the undertaking's entire transport service subject to application of the regulation, by reason of the fact that it uses other vehicles to cover journeys exceeding 50 km?
3. Must Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport and amending Council Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 2135/98 and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85 be interpreted as meaning that "the total accumulated driving time during any two consecutive weeks" consists of the sum of the "driving times" for the two weeks – according to the definition in Article 4(j) above – or does it also include other activities and, in particular, the entire working shift worked by the driver during the two weeks, or all the 'other work' referred to in Article 6(5)?

Case C-496/22, Collective Redundancies

EI – v – SC Brink's Cash Solutions SRL, reference lodged by the Curtea de Apel București (Romania) on 22 July 2022

1. Do [the first subparagraph of] Article 1[(1)(b)] and Article 6 of Council Directive 98/59/EC on the

doi: 10.5553/EELC/187791072022007003023