

tives in the supervisory body of a company only to those workers who are employed in establishments of the company or in affiliated companies within the domestic territory?

Case C-569/15. Free Movement – Social Insurance

X –v– Staatssecretaris van Financiën, reference lodged by the Dutch *Hoge Raad* on 5 November 2015

Must Title II of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 be interpreted as meaning that a worker residing in the Netherlands who normally works in the Netherlands and who takes unpaid leave for three months is deemed to continue to be (also) employed in the Netherlands during that period if (i) the employment relationship continues during that period and (ii) for purposes of the application of the Dutch *Werkloosheidswet* (Law on unemployment) that period is considered to be a period of employment?

- a. What legislation does Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 designate as applicable if during the unpaid leave that worker is employed in another Member State?
- b. Is it still important in that regard that the person concerned was employed in the same other Member State twice in the following year and for periods of approximately one to two weeks during the subsequent three years, without any mention in the Netherlands of unpaid leave?

Case C-570/15. Free Movement – Social Insurance

X –v– Staatssecretaris van Financiën, reference lodged by the Dutch *Hoge Raad* on 5 November 2015

What standard or standards should be used to assess what legislation is designated by Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 as applicable in the case of a worker residing in Belgium who performs the bulk of his work for his Dutch employer in the Netherlands, and in addition performs 6.5 per cent of that work in Belgium in the year in question, at home and with clients, without there being a fixed pattern and without any agreement having been made with his employer with regard to the performance of work in Belgium?

Case C-614/15. Fixed Term Work

Rodica Popescu –v– Directia Sanitar Veterinara si pentru Siguranta Alimentelor Gorj, reference lodged by the Romanian *Curtea de Apel Craiova*

Is the fact that the activity of the staff specifically responsible for inspections in the veterinary health sector is intrinsically linked to the continuation of the activity of the type of establishments mentioned in paragraph [5] [of the order for reference] sufficient grounds for the repeated conclusion of fixed-term contracts, by way of derogation from the general rule adopted in order to transpose Directive 70/1999?

Does the retaining in national legislation of special provisions permitting the repeated conclusion, for a period such as that described [in the order for reference], of fixed-term employment contracts in the veterinary health inspection sector constitute a failure to fulfil an obligation of the State when transposing Directive 70/1999?

Case C-620/15. Free Movement – Social Insurance

A-Rosa Flussschif GmbH –v– Union de recouvrement des cotisations de sécurité sociale et d'allocations familiales d'Alsace, Sozialsicherungsanstalt des Kantons Graubünden, reference lodged by the French *Cour de cassation* on 23 November 2015

Is the effect of an E 101 certificate issued, in accordance with Articles 11(1) and Article 12a(1a) of Regulation (EEC) No 574/72 of 21 March 1972 fixing the procedure for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 by the institution designated by the competent authority of the Member State whose social security legislation remains applicable to the situation of the employee, binding, first, on the institutions and authorities of the host Member State and, secondly, on the courts of that Member State, where it is found that the conditions under which the employee carries out his activity clearly do not fall within the material scope of the exceptions set out in Article 14(1) and (2) of Regulation No 1408/71?