Dit artikel uit European Employment Law Cases is gepubliceerd door Boom juridisch en is bestemd voor anonieme bezoeker

ing recourse to successive fixed-term employment contracts in breach of the strict conditions relating to maximum duration and renewal laid down by Article 10a of that law, provided that the public employer establishes 'legitimate reasons' not otherwise specified in that law which justify the use of unlimited successive fixed-term employment contracts?

3. Again, if the answer to the first question is in the negative, does clause 5(1)(a) of the Framework Agreement impose the obligation, on the national court hearing a case between a public employer and a worker employed under successive fixed-term employment contracts concluded within the framework of various training, integration and retraining programmes, to examine the appropriateness of concluding successive fixed-term employment contracts in the light of the 'objective reasons' set out in the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union?
4. In such a case, can the 'legitimate reasons' put forward by the public employer be considered to be 'objective reasons' justifying the use of successive fixed-term employment contracts in breach of the conditions laid down by Article 10a, cited above, in order, on the one hand, to prevent and tackle abuse arising from the use of successive fixed-term employment contracts where the needs covered by those contracts are not of a temporary nature but are rather fixed and permanent needs in terms of social cohesion within an insecure population and, on the other, to take account of the specific objectives of those vocational reinsertion contracts concluded within the framework of that social employment policy established by the Belgian State and the Walloon Region and which is heavily dependent on public subsidies?

Cases C-492/19, C-493/19 and C-494/19, Free movement, Posting of workers and expatriates

OK, PL and QM, reference lodged by the Landesverwaltungsgericht Steiermark (Austria) lodged on 26 June 2019

1. Must Article 56 TFEU, Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services and Directive 2014/67/EU be interpreted as precluding a national provision which, for infringements of formal obligations in connection with the cross-border deployment of labour, such as a failure to make available documents relating to pay or a failure to report to the Central Coordination Office (ZKO notifications), provides for very high fines, in particular high minimum penalties, which are imposed cumulatively in respect of each worker concerned?
2. If the answer to Question 1 is in the negative: Must Article 56 TFEU, Directive 96/71 and Directive 2014/67 be interpreted as precluding the imposition of cumulative fines for infringements of formal obligations in connection with the cross-border deployment of labour which have no absolute upper limits?
3. Is Article 56 TFEU to be interpreted as precluding national legislation that requires a declaration of amendment to be provided to the Central Coordination Office in the event that the temporary activity in the host country is concluded prematurely and/or interrupted?
4. Is Article 56 TFEU to be interpreted as precluding national legislation which does not grant a reasonable period of time for the submission of a declaration of amendment?
5. Are Article 56 TFEU and Article 9 of Directive 2014/67 to be interpreted as precluding national legislation that provides that, for the purposes of the requirement to make available certain documents, it is not sufficient subsequently to submit appropriate and relevant documents within a reasonable period of time?
6. Are Article 56 TFEU and Article 9 of Directive 2014/67 to be interpreted as precluding national legislation that provides that foreign service providers are to submit documents that go beyond those specified in Article 9 of Directive 2014/67, are neither relevant nor appropriate and are not clearly defined under national law (such as, for example, pay statements, payslips, pay lists, tax statements, registrations and deregistrations, health insurance, schedules of notification and allocation of surcharges, documents relating to pay grades, certificates)?

Case C-511/19, Age discrimination

AB – v – Olympiako Athlitiko Kentro Athinon – Spyros Louis, reference lodged by the Areios Pagos (Greece) on 4 July 2019

a. Does the adoption by the Member State of legislation applicable to government, local authorities and public-law legal entities and to all bodies (private-law legal entities) in the broader public sector in general in their capacity as employer, such as that adopted under Article 34(1)(c), (3)(a) and (4) of Law 4024/2011 placing staff under a private-law contract of employment with the above bodies on reserve for a period not exceeding twenty-four (24)