Newsletter

Week XL - XLI: 30th September to 11th October 2024

Contact us
@ENDesk

Jacques René Zammit
Press Officer
+352 4303 3355

Monica Pizzo
Assistant
+352 4303 3366

Desk Email
Press.ENdesk@curia.europa.eu

***
***

Follow @EUCourtPress on X (formerly Twitter)
***

Download our app

***

All times are 9:30 unless otherwise stated.

Week XL: 30th September to 4th October

Wednesday 2nd October

General Court

Judgments in Cases T-797/22 Ordre néerlandais des avocats du barreau de Bruxelles and Others v Council, T-798/22 Ordre des avocats à la cour de Paris and Couturier v Council and T-828/22 ACE v Council

(*External relations – Common foreign and security policy – Restrictive measures – Ukraine)*

In 2022, in response to Russia's escalating aggression against Ukraine, the Council of the European Union adopted a series of restrictive measures designed to put pressure on Russia to end its war of aggression. The measures include a ban on the provision of legal advice.

Subject to certain exceptions and exemptions, these acts prohibit any person who may provide legal advice (including those practising within the EU) from providing such services to the Russian government and to legal persons, entities or bodies established in Russia. The prohibition is intended to make it more difficult for the Russian Government and Russian companies to obtain goods and services or capital in the EU, by depriving them of the technical and legal assistance necessary for such operations.

The Dutch Bar Association of the Brussels Bar, the Paris Bar Association and Julie Couturier (a lawyer registered with the Bar Association), as well as the trade association Avocats Ensemble (ACE), applied to the General Court of the European Union for the ban to be annulled.

In their view, the ban lacked a statement of reasons and infringed their fundamental rights (access to legal advice from a lawyer and interference with professional secrecy) as well as the principle of proportionality.

Furthermore, such a ban would infringe the right of lawyers to provide legal advice without any particular restrictions.

Background Documents T-797/22

Don't forget to check the diary on our website for details of other cases.

Background Documents T-798/22
Background Documents T-828/22

There will be one press release for these cases.

Friday 4th October

Judgments in Joined Cases C-541/20 to C-555/20 Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus, Hungary, Malta and Poland v Parliament and Council (Mobility Package)

(Transport)

Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania, the Republic of Cyprus, Hungary, Malta and Poland have brought actions before the Court of Justice for annulment of the 'Mobility Package', which was adopted by the EU legislature, i.e. the Parliament and the Council, in 2020.

The package encompasses several pieces of legislation:

1) Regulation (EU) 2020/1054 amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 as regards minimum requirements on maximum daily and weekly driving times, minimum breaks and daily and weekly rest periods and Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 as regards positioning by means of tachographs;
2) Regulation (EU) 2020/1055 amending Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009, (EC) No 1072/2009 and (EU) No 1024/2012 with a view to adapting them to developments in the road transport sector;
3) Directive (EU) 2020/1057 laying down specific rules with respect to Directive 96/71/EC and Directive 2014/67/EU for posting drivers in the road transport sector and amending Directive 2006/22/EC as regards enforcement requirements and Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012.

In particular, these Member States are challenging:

- the ban on drivers taking the normal weekly rest period or compensatory rest period on board the vehicle;
- the obligation for transport undertakings to organise their drivers' work in such a way that drivers are able to return, during working time, every three or four weeks to the undertaking's operational centre or to their place of residence, in order to start or spend at least their normal or compensatory weekly rest period there;
- bringing forward the date of entry into force of the obligation to install second-generation intelligent tachographs and, in general, the date of entry into force of Regulation 2020/1054 providing for the prohibition and obligations mentioned above;
- the obligation, for vehicles used for international transport, to return to an operational centre located in the Member State of establishment of the transport undertaking concerned every eight weeks;
- the obligation for transport undertakings to have at their disposal on a regular

and continuous basis a number of vehicles and drivers who are normally attached to an operational centre in their Member State of establishment, in both cases in proportion to the number of transport operations they carry out;
- the four-day waiting period during which, following a cabotage round in a host Member State, (non-resident) hauliers are not authorised to carry out cabotage operations with the same vehicle in the same Member State;
- the qualification of drivers of posted workers, so that they benefit from the working and employment conditions, in particular as regards pay, in the host Member State, in principle when they carry out cabotage operations, transport operations from one country to another, none of which is the Member State of establishment, or certain combined transport operations.

Background Documents C-541/20
Background Documents C-542/20
Background Documents C-543/20
Background Documents C-544/20
Background Documents C-545/20
Background Documents C-546/20
Background Documents C-547/20
Background Documents C-548/20
Background Documents C-549/20
Background Documents C-550/20
Background Documents C-551/20
Background Documents C-552/20
Background Documents C-553/20
Background Documents C-554/20
Background Documents C-555/20

There will be a press release for these cases.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-581/22 P thyssenkrupp v Commission

(Competition)

Thyssenkrupp, a German industrial group, and Tata Steel, a company headquartered in India, are active in the manufacture and supply of flat carbon steel and magnetic steel products. Their production centres are located in Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands respectively. The companies also have finishing plants in other Member States.

On September 25, 2018, the two companies notified the Commission under the Merger Regulation of their plans to acquire joint control of a newly created joint venture. The project mainly concerned metal-coated and rolled steel products for

packaging and hot-dip galvanised steel products used in the automotive sector.

Following discussions with the companies involved and requests for information from a number of market participants, including competitors and customers, the Commission declared the transaction incompatible with the internal market and the European Economic Area by decision of June 11, 2019 (see summary of the decision).

Thyssenkrupp brought an action for annulment of the Commission's decision before the General Court of the European Union. In its judgment of June 22, 2022, the General Court rejected all the arguments put forward by the company and confirmed the Commission's decision (T-584/19, see also press release 110/22).

Thyssenkrupp then appealed to the Court of Justice against the judgment of the General Court.

Background Documents C-581/22 P

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgments in Joined Cases C-29/23 P Ferriera Valsabbia and Valsabbia Investimenti v Commission and C-30/23 P Alfa Acciai v Commission and Case C-31/23 P Ferriere Nord v Commission

(Competition)

In 2002, the European Commission fined eight companies and an association of companies for an anti-competitive cartel on the Italian concrete reinforcing bar market between December 1989 and July 2000 (see Commission Decision of 17 December 2002).

In 2007, the General Court annulled this decision on the grounds that its legal basis was no longer in force at the time of its adoption, the ECSC Treaty having expired on July 23, 2002 (see judgments October 25, 2007, SP and Others v Commission: joint cases T-27/03, T-46/03, T-58/03, T-79/03, T-80/03, T-97/03, T-98/03, as well as T-45/03, T-77/03 and T-94/03 – press release n. 78/07).

Subsequently, on September 30, 2009, the Commission adopted a new decision, addressed to the same undertakings as those referred to in the 2002 decision and essentially repeating its content and conclusions. In particular, the fines imposed remained unchanged.

Confirmed in principle by the General Court (see judgments of December 9, 2014 T-472/09 and T-55/10, T-69/10, T-70/10, T-83/10, T-85/10, T-90/10, T-91/10, T-92/10, T-

489/09, T-490/09 and T-56/10), the 2009 decision was annulled by the Court of Justice in respect of five undertakings because of irregularities in the administrative procedure leading to its adoption (see Judgments September 21, 2017, Ferriera Valsabbia and Others v Commission, C-85/15 P, C-86/15 P, C-87/15 P, C-88/15 P and C-89/15 P).

Once this procedure had been resumed, on July 4, 2019 the Commission adopted a decision re-establishing the infringement that was the subject of the 2009 decision (see summary).

This decision was addressed to the five undertakings for which the 2009 decision had been annulled. In view of the length of the procedure, the fines were reduced by 50%.

In September 2019, three of these companies - Ferriera Valsabbia SpA and Valsabia investimenti SpA, Alfa Acciai SpA and Ferriere Nord SpA - appealed to have the 2019 decision annulled.

Having been unsuccessful before the General Court (see judgments Ferriera Valsabbia and Valsabbia Investimenti v Commission T-655/19, Alfa Acciai/Commission T-656/19 and Ferriere Nord/Commission T-667/19), they have appealed to the Court of Justice.

Background Documents C-29/23 P and C-30/23 P
Background Documents C-31/23 P

There will be one press release for these cases.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-240/23 Herbaria Kräuterparadies II

(Agriculture and Fisheries)

The request for a preliminary ruling of the Federal Administrative Court, Germany concerns the interpretation of different articles of Regulation (EU) 2018/848 on organic production and labelling of organic products as well as of Article 20 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

This reference for a preliminary ruling is made in proceedings between Herbaria Kräuterparadies GmbH, a company incorporated under German law ('Herbaria'), and the Land of Bavaria, Germany, concerning the possibility of using the organic production method in the labelling, advertising and marketing of a mixture of fruit juices and herbal extracts.

Herbaria is the manufacturer of 'Blutquick', a blend of fruit juices and herbal extracts containing, in addition to organic plant products, non-organic vitamins and iron

gluconate. Blutquick is presented and marketed as a food supplement. Its packaging contains the organic production logo of the European Union, the national organic label and a reference to the origin of the ingredients from 'controlled organic cultivation'.

Since 2012, Herbaria has disputed the decision of the Land of Bavaria prohibiting it from using the reference to the organic production method in the labelling, advertising and marketing of a mixture of fruit juice and herb extracts which contains, in addition to the organic products, non-plant vitamins and ferrous gluconate not coming from organic farming.

A first judgment of the Court of Justice confirmed the Land of Bavaria's interpretation that the organic production logo of the European Union and any reference to organic production could not be used in such a situation (C-137/13).

Herbaria accepted that decision and relies on a breach of equality between its product and a similar American product to which non-organic non-plant vitamins and ferrous gluconate are added, but which is recognised as originating from organic production in the United States of America and which, on that basis, may be marketed on the territory of the European Union with the organic production logo of the European Union by reason of the recognition of the United States as a non-EU country whose rules on production and control are equivalent.

The request by the referring court will allow the Court to clarify the use that must be made of the organic production logo of the European Union in the event of imports of products originating from organic farming.

Background Documents C-240/23

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-4/23 Mirin

(Citizenship of the Union)

A Romanian citizen was registered as female at birth in Romania.
After moving to the United Kingdom (UK), he acquired British nationality while retaining his Romanian nationality. It was in this country that, in 2017, he changed his first name and civil title from female to male and, in 2020, obtained legal recognition of his male gender identity.

In May 2021, on the basis of two documents obtained in the UK attesting to these changes, this citizen asked the Romanian administrative authorities to enter in his birth certificate the particulars relating to his change of forename, sex and personal

identification number so that it corresponded to the male sex.

He also asked them to issue him with a new birth certificate containing these new details. However, the Romanian authorities refused his requests while inviting him to follow a new legal procedure in Romania, aimed directly at obtaining approval for the change of sex.

Relying on his right to move and reside freely within the territory of the European Union, the citizen concerned asked a Bucharest court to order that his birth certificate be brought into line with his new forename and his gender identity, which had been definitively recognised in the UK.

The court asked the Court of Justice whether the national legislation on which the Romanian authorities' refusal was based complied with EU law and whether Brexit had any impact on the case.

Background Documents C-4/23

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-650/22 FIFA

(Freedom of movement for persons)

A former professional footballer is challenging the rules governing contractual relations between players and clubs. The rules in question, entitled 'Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players' (RSTP), were adopted by the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) – an association responsible for organising football competitions at world level.

These rules that are implemented both by FIFA and by its member national football associations apply, among other things, to a situation where there is a dispute between a player and a club as to a termination of a contract without just cause. In such cases, that player and any club wishing to employ him are jointly and severally liable for any compensation due to his former club.

The player and the new club are also liable to sporting and financial sanctions in case of non-compliance. Furthermore, the association to which the player's former club belongs may refuse to deliver an International Transfer Certificate to the new association where the player's new club is registered as long as the dispute with the former club is standing.

The professional football player had signed for the Russian football club Lokomotiv

Moscow only to see that contract terminated by this club one year later for an alleged breach "and termination of contract without just cause".

Lokomotiv Moscow applied to the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber for compensation and the player submitted a counterclaim seeking compensation of unpaid wages. The player claims that the search for a new club proved to be difficult because, under the RSTP, any new club would be held jointly and severally liable with himself to pay any compensation due to Lokomotiv Moscow.

He claims that a potential deal with Belgian club Sporting du Pays de Charleroi fell through because of the RSTP conditions and he sued FIFA and URBSFA (the governing body for Belgian football) before a Belgian court for damages and loss of earnings of €6 million.

Background Documents C-650/22

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-446/21 Schrems (Communication of data to the general public)

(Principles, objectives and tasks of the Treaties – Data protection)

Maximilian Schrems is challenging Meta Platforms Ireland's unlawful processing of his personal data on the Facebook social network before the Austrian courts. The data in question includes information about his sexual orientation.

Meta collects the personal data of Facebook users, including Mr Schrems, relating to the activities of those users both on and off that social network. This includes data relating to visits to the online platform and to third-party websites and applications. To this end, Meta uses 'cookies', 'social plugins' and 'pixels' inserted on the web pages concerned.

On the basis of the data at its disposal, Meta can also identify Mr Schrems' interest in sensitive subjects such as sexual orientation, which makes it possible to send him advertising targeted in that regard.

The question therefore arises whether Mr Schrems can no longer rely on the prohibition in principle laid down by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on the processing of such sensitive data by reason of the fact that he communicated his sexual orientation to Meta at the time of his registration.

Schrems can no longer rely on the prohibition in principle laid down by the General

GDPR on processing such sensitive data by reason of the fact that he disclosed the fact that he was homosexual at a public round table.

In this context, the Austrian Supreme Court asked the Court of Justice to interpret the GDPR (see also case C-498/16 and press release n. 7/18). With regard to the judgment of July 4, 2023, Meta Platforms and others (General terms and conditions of use of a social network) C-252/21 (see also press release n. 113/23, the Supreme Court withdrew some of its questions.

Background Documents C-446/21

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case Joined cases C-608/22 and C-609/22 Bundesamt für Fremdenwesen und Asyl e.a. (Afghan women)

(Area of Freedom, Security and Justice – Asylum policy)

Since the return of the Taliban regime to Afghanistan, the situation of women has deteriorated to the point that their very identity can be said to be denied.

That regime is characterised by an accumulation of acts and discriminatory measures which restrict, or even prohibit, *inter alia*, their access to health care and education, their gainful employment, their participation in public and political life, their freedom of movement and their right to take part in sports, which deprive them of protection against gender-based and domestic violence and require them to cover their entire body and face.

An Austrian court asked the Court of Justice whether such treatment can be classified as an act of persecution justifying the grant of refugee status.

It also asks whether, for the purposes of the individual assessment of the application for international protection, a Member State can conclude that there is a well-founded fear of persecution taking into account only the gender of the applicant.

Background Documents C-608/22 and C-609/22

There will be a press release for these cases.

Friday 4th October

Opinion in Case C-181/23 Commission v Malta (Citizenship by investment)

(Citizenship of the Union)

The Commission is seeking a declaration that by establishing and operating a citizenship investment programme, such as the Maltese Citizenship by Naturalisation for Exceptional Services by Direct Investment (2020), that offers naturalisation in the absence of a genuine link of the applicants with the country, in exchange for pre-determined payments or investments, the Republic of Malta has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 20 TFEU and Article 4(3) TEU.

Background Documents C-181/23

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in case C-21/23 Lindenapotheke

(Principles, objectives and tasks of the Treaties – Data protection)

This reference for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesgerichtshof (Federal Court of Justice, Germany) concerns the interpretation of different articles of the General Data Protection Regulation ('the GDPR') in relation to, first, the system of remedies established by that regulation and, second, the category of particularly sensitive data consisting of 'data concerning health'.

This reference is made in the context of a civil dispute between two pharmacy operators in Germany concerning the right to distribute medicinal products sold exclusively in pharmacies on the online sales platform 'Amazon-Marketplace'.

The claimant at first instance operates under the trade name 'Winthir Apotheke' and the defendant operates under the trade name 'Lindenapotheke'.

Lindenapotheke holds a mail order licence and markets its product range on its own online platform. In addition, in 2017 Lindenapotheke offered its product range, which includes medicines sold exclusively in pharmacies, on the 'Amazon-Marketplace' online sales platform. Winthir Apotheke brought an action against Lindenapotheke, requesting that Lindenapotheke be prohibited, subject to a fine, from marketing, for competition purposes, medicines subject to sale in pharmacies via the Amazon-Marketplace online sales platform, as long as the registration or purchase process via that online sales platform does not guarantee that the customer has given his prior consent to the collection, storage and use of his health data to a person or institution

authorised to process those data.

The request for a preliminary ruling was then made in the context of an action for an injunction, based on the prohibition, in national law, of acts of unfair competition, and brought by an undertaking with a view to putting an end to the online marketing of non-prescription medicines by one of its competitors.

The alleged act of unfair competition consists, according to that undertaking, of failure to comply with the requirements arising from the GDPR with regard to the processing of 'data concerning health'.

The Court is asked to define the outlines of the concept of 'data concerning health' that determine whether an enhanced protection regime is applicable.

Background Documents C-21/23

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-585/22 Staatssecretaris van Financiën (Interest on intra-group borrowings)

(Freedom of establishment – Free movement of capital – Freedom to provide services)

This request for a preliminary ruling from the Supreme Court of the Netherlands arises in the context of provisions of national law on corporation tax, specifically designed to tackle tax avoidance practices. Under that legislation, the contracting of a loan debt by a taxable person with a related entity – for the purposes of acquiring or extending an interest in another entity – is, in certain circumstances, presumed to be an artificial arrangement, designed to erode the Netherlands tax base. Consequently, that person is precluded from deducting the interest on the debt from its taxable profits unless it can rebut that presumption.

The national court invites the Court to clarify its case-law on, *inter alia*, the freedom of establishment laid down in Article 49 TFEU, specifically whether it is compatible with that freedom for the tax authorities of a Member State to refuse to a company belonging to a cross-border group the right to deduct from its taxable profits the interest it pays on such a loan debt.

Background Documents C-585/22

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-438/23 Protéines France and Others

(Principles, objectives and tasks of the Treaties – Consumer protection – Foodstuffs)

The association Protéines France, the European Vegetarian Union, the Association végétarienne de France and Beyond Meat Inc – four bodies that promote the distribution and consumption of vegetarian and vegan products – are challenging a French government decree designed to protect the transparency of information about foodstuffs on the market.

In their view, the decree, which would prohibit the use of names such as 'steak' or 'sausage' to describe processed products containing plant proteins, without or even with the addition of further details such as 'vegetable' or 'soya', infringes EU law (see Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011).

In order to obtain the annulment of the decree in question, these entities referred the matter to the Council of State, France.

The latter had doubts as to whether the decree could regulate or prohibit the use of the name 'sausage' and other names associated with products of animal origin to designate foodstuffs based on plant proteins and asked the Court of Justice for guidance.

Background Documents C-438/23

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-406/22 Ministerstvo vnitra České republiky, Odbor azylové a migrační politiky

(Area of Freedom, Security and Justice – Asylum policy)

In 2022 CV, a Moldovan national, applied for international protection in the Czech Republic. In support of his application, CV cited threats made against him in Moldova by individuals who had allegedly attacked him in the past and whom the police authorities had failed to identify.

He also said that he did not want to return to his region of origin because of Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

The Czech authorities rejected this request, taking into account in particular the fact

that Czech law had designated the Republic of Moldova, with the exception of Transnistria, as a safe country of origin. However, CV failed to demonstrate that this designation did not apply in its particular case.

When CV appealed against the rejection of its application, the Brno Regional Court, Czech Republic referred a number of questions to the Court of Justice concerning the interpretation of the Asylum Procedures Directive.

Background Documents C-406/22

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-548/21 Bezirkshauptmannschaft Landeck (Attempt to access personal data stored on a mobile phone)

(Telecommunications – Fundamental rights)

Austrian police seized the mobile phone of the recipient of a parcel after it was discovered during a drugs check at a mail distribution centre that the parcel contained 85 grams of cannabis.

The police then tried in vain to unlock the laptop in order to access the data stored in its memory. They did not have authorisation from the public prosecutor or a judge, did not document their attempts to unlock the phone and did not inform the person concerned.

The interested party challenged the seizure of his mobile phone before an Austrian court. It was only in the course of these proceedings that he learned of attempts to unlock his mobile phone.

The Austrian court wishes to know from the Court of Justice whether the Austrian legislation which, in its view, allows the police to proceed in such a way is compatible with EU law (see Directive (EU) 2016/680). It observes that the offence with which the person concerned is charged is punishable by a term of imprisonment of up to one year and therefore constitutes only a misdemeanour.

Background Documents C-548/21

There will be a press release for this case.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-237/22 P Mylan IRE Healthcare v Commission

(Public health)

From the Opinion of AG Emiliou

'Orphan medicinal products' are medicinal products for the treatment of diseases that are relatively uncommon (also known as rare diseases), which makes it difficult to develop and market them profitably.

To address the concerns that arise from the restricted availability of medicinal products to patients suffering from such diseases, the EU legislature has adopted a legislative framework to encourage production of those medicinal products. That framework, comprising in particular Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 and Regulation (EC) No 847/2000, offers several incentives to the pharmaceutical industry, including a 'reward' in the form of several years of market exclusivity.

To obtain designation as an orphan medicinal product (also referred to as 'OMP'), and benefit from such exclusivity, the product must provide, inter alia, a significant benefit compared to other authorised treatments.

At the same time, the marketing exclusivity is not absolute. A derogation can be granted when, *inter alia*, a similar medicinal product is safer, more effective or otherwise clinically superior to the designated OMP.

The present case primarily concerns two medicinal products: 'Tobi Podhaler – Tobramycin' ('Tobi Podhaler') and 'Tobramycin VVB and associated names' ('Tobramycin VVB'). Both products are indicated for the treatment of pulmonary infection caused by the bacterium Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis patients aged six years and older.

More specifically, Tobi Podhaler was designated as an OMP and was subsequently granted a marketing authorisation ('MA') and, therefore, market exclusivity. Mylan IRE Healthcare Ltd ('Mylan') subsequently became the holder of that MA.

However, during the period of that market exclusivity, another company, UAB VVB ('VVB'), obtained an MA for Tobramycin VVB, a product similar to Tobi Podhaler. To that end, VVB applied for, and was granted by the European Commission, a derogation from Tobi Podhaler's market exclusivity.

That decision was challenged before the General Court, but the action was dismissed.

By the present appeal, Mylan seeks to challenge what it claims is an erroneous interpretation of the criteria permitting a derogation from the OMP-related market exclusivity.

Background Documents C-237/22 P

The judgment can be sent upon request.

Friday 4th October

Judgment in Case C-727/22 Friends of the Irish Environment (Project Ireland 2040)

(Environment)

From the Opinion of AG Kokott

The SEA Directive (SEA stands for strategic environmental assessment) governs the environmental assessment in the procedure for the adoption of plans and programmes.

Although the Court has considered the SEA Directive on many occasions, there are still unresolved questions of considerable importance.

The present request for a preliminary ruling concerns two of them: first, the purport of an exemption from the scope of the directive for financial or budget plans and programmes and, second, the assessment of the effects on the environment of alternatives to the plan or programme ultimately adopted.

In particular, the question of the assessment of alternatives is also of interest in connection with other rules of EU environmental law which similarly provide for the consideration of alternatives.

Those questions arise in the context of an action brought by an environmental association against two measures forming part of Ireland's national development planning.

It is disputed whether one of these measures falls under the abovementioned exemption and whether, in the environmental assessment carried out in respect of the second measure, the effects on the environment of the alternatives were examined sufficiently.

Background Documents C-727/22

The judgment can be sent upon request.

Week XLI: 7th to 11th October

This week there will be a partial renewal of membership and entry into office of new Members of the Court of Justice.

Following this partial replacement of the Members of the Court of Justice, elections will be held for the posts of President, Vice-Presidents and Presidents of Chambers of the Court.

Press releases covering the partial renewal and the elections will be issued on the 7th and 8th of October.

HEARINGS OF NOTE*

Information Note concerning streaming on the Curia website

Please note the following new conditions for streaming on the website including the new length of availability of the video recordings:

In order to facilitate public access to its judicial activity, the Court of Justice of the European Union offers a system for broadcasting hearings.

The delivery of judgments of the Court of Justice and the reading of opinions of the Advocate Generals are broadcast live on this page. Broadcasting will be enabled at the start of the hearing, at the time indicated in the judicial calendar.

Certain hearings of the Court of Justice involving oral pleadings are, however, broadcast with a delay. This concerns, as a rule, hearings in cases referred to the full Court, to the Grand Chamber, or, exceptionally, where this is justified by the importance of the case, to a Chamber of five Judges. The video recordings of those hearings will remain available on this website for a maximum period of one month after the close of the hearing.

Court of Justice

Monday 30th September 2024: 14:30 – Case C-417/23 Slagelse Almennyttige Boligselskab, Afdeling Schackenborgvænge (Social policy) (**streamed on Curia**)

Tuesday 01st October 2024: **09:00** – Case C-600/23 Royal Football Club Seraing

(Fundamental rights – Charter of Fundamental Rights) (**streamed on Curia**)

General Court

Wednesday 02nd October 2024: 09.30 – Case T-230/23 Hitit Seramik v Commission

(Commercial policy)

Wednesday 02nd October 2024: 09.30 – Case T-263/23 Symrise v Commission (Competition)

Wednesday 02nd October 2024: 14.30 – Case T-231/23 Akgün Seramik and Others v Commission (Commercial policy)

Tuesday 08th October 2024: 09.30 – Case T-349/23 Semedo v Parliament (Staff Regulations of officials and Conditions of Employment of other servants)

* This is a non-exhaustive list and does not include all the hearings over the next two weeks.