

How EU law shapes opportunities for preliminary references on fundamental rights: discrimination and other examples.

Workshop, EUI, 24 February 2017

E. Muir, C. Kilpatrick and B. de Witte¹

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Background	2
3. Method.....	3
4. Case studies	4
5. Programme	5
6. Expected output	6
7. Participants	6
8. Organisation	7
Annex.A. Selection of cases brought by collective actors or with actor acting in support of the claim and having reached the CJEU (E.Muir/E.Braun)	8

¹ We are very grateful to Egelyn Braun (review of CJEU case law) and Marie Gérardy (review of Belgian procedural law in the three selected Belgian cases) for very valuable research assistance as well as to the VENI funding having made their support possible.

1. Introduction

This workshop will explore the impact of procedural provisions inserted in EU fundamental right legislation to facilitate access to court in support or on behalf of victims. We will investigate the interplay between:

- (i) ‘collective actors’ understood in the broad sense to cover civil society organisations and independent organisations such as equality bodies intended to represent individuals,
- (ii) the actual litigation of EU fundamental right law before domestic courts as it unfolds before the CJEU by way of preliminary references,
- (iii) and rules on access to domestic courts as influenced by EU legislation to activate the relevant EU legal framework.

These last set of rules indeed form a bridge between collective actors and actual litigation, their influence on legal opportunity structures for preliminary references are under-researched.

2. Background

EU legislation increasingly often provides for a set of procedural provisions intended to support actual enforcement of the relevant area of EU law. Central components of such procedural provisions are rules intended to facilitate access to court. These rules could be extremely useful to enhance law compliance where victims of breaches of EU law are particularly vulnerable, as is often the case with fundamental right breaches.

The most ancient and sophisticated set of procedural rules for the enforcement of EU fundamental rights can be found in EU equality legislation. Anti-discrimination law thus offers an ideal field to explore the ability of EU legislative intervention on fundamental right matters to trigger change at domestic level. Much literature has been devoted to substantive equal treatment rights created by EU law (ie. sex equality law and Art.19 TFEU grounds of discrimination) and increasing research is being devoted to the strategies developed by collective actors making use of the EU layer of rights. In contrast, the actual legal mechanisms through which domestic actors have been – or failed to be – empowered to go to court in order to enforce the said rights have been subject to less attention despite the innovative emphasis on collective actors.

More recently, distinct yet comparable procedural provisions have been inserted in other branches of EU law closely intertwined with fundamental right protection. A directive on the on the enforcement of posted workers’ rights contains for instance an article entitled ‘Defence of rights, facilitation of complaints, back-payments’²; another on the enforcement of the right

² Directive 2014/67 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services and amending Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 on administrative cooperation through the Internal Market Information System (‘the IMI Regulation’), OJ L 159, 8.5.2014, p. 11, Article 11.

of mobile EU workers and their families also includes a provision on ‘Defense of rights’³; the latest regulation on data protection also has a whole chapter on ‘Remedies, liabilities and penalties’.⁴ All these rules place emphasis on the role of collective actors in supporting litigation next to the alleged victim.

Lessons can be learnt from the past 10-15 years of transposing and using (or not) the procedural rules introduced in domestic legal orders by EU equality legislation as well as from examining more recent legislative developments. This is particularly important as rules on access to court are developing fast and could be further expanded in the context of EU migration and social legislation for instance where victims may also be particularly vulnerable or isolated. What is the practical impact of the procedural provisions inserted side by side with substantive rights in EU fundamental right legislation? Do they indeed have an impact on access to court and the litigation process? Does this influence the preliminary ruling procedure?

Research on access to court will also feed into a broader research agenda on the enforcement of EU law before domestic courts. Several general principles of EU law indeed influence access to court (see the major role played by the principles of primacy, direct effect, effectiveness and equivalence in shaping the conditions for access to court at domestic level). These general principles are well established and well studied; there are multiple and useful writings on the interplay between domestic and EU courts as well as legal orders. Now, again, what has been subject to less attention is the way EU legislation may itself influence the conditions for access to courts. Procedural provisions intended to facilitate the enforcement of a given policy are increasingly often inserted in specific EU instruments.⁵

3. Method

There would be several ways of tackling this research agenda (eg. checking if the EU provisions have been well transposed and how; looking into domestic rules and cases etc...). It is proposed for now to insist on rigorous, qualitative and contextual analysis. To that effect, the workshop will combine two types of approaches.

A first set of contributions will examine the procedural history of cases (a) having reached the CJEU by way of preliminary ruling, (b) in matters covered by the EU fundamental right legislation and (c) involving a collective actor (either bringing the case or supporting the claimant) as encouraged by most of the procedural provisions identified above. This will allow us to reflect on the actual mechanics of access to domestic court resulting in preliminary

³ Directive 2014/54 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers, OJ L 128, 30.4.2014, p. 8, Article 3.

⁴ Regulation 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1, Articles 7 et seq.

⁵ See M. Eliantonio & E. Muir, (2015). Special issue on the incidental proceduralisation of EU Law. *Review of European Administrative Law*, 8 (1).

questions to the CJEU and the possible influence of EU law thereupon. Further guidance on this is available in Annex B.

A second set of contributions will reflect more broadly on the dynamics of specific branches of EU law as well as their anchorage in domestic procedural law to shed light on the broader context in which rules on access to court operate. Such broader context may for instance explain why collective actors in certain countries make little use of their newly acquired litigation powers.

Questions that form part of our common research agenda are:

- Have EU rules requiring national law to facilitate access to court had an impact on access to court at domestic level?
 - o If not, why?
 - o If yes, which aspects of EU law have introduced change?
 - o Is the influence of EU law explicit?
 - o Do domestic rules comply/go beyond EU requirements on procedural aspects?
 - o Has EU law had spillover effects on domestic rules on access to court?
- Do collective actors engaging in litigation share common characteristics?
 - o Are they specialised in terms of expertise?
 - o Are they labeled as specialised entities or fundamental right institutions or other?
 - o If not, how do they relate to specialised entities such as data protection authorities, equality bodies and/or fundamental right institutes?
 - o Do they develop litigation strategies?
- Does the involvement of collective actors influence the outcome of cases or their ultimate impact?
 - o In terms of content, quality and diversity of legal arguments raised?
 - o In terms of decision to make use of the preliminary ruling procedure?
 - o In terms of actual compliance with rulings?

4. Case studies

As indicated above, EU anti-discrimination law provides a particularly fertile ground to start the analysis. It will thus be the focus of the first part of the workshop. A review of the CJEU case law involving collective actors as from 2000 (ie. when the relevant rules were first introduced in EU equality law and up until 1.3.2016) reveals that a number of countries stand out by the number of cases involving a collective actor and having led to a preliminary ruling by the CJEU as can be seen from Annex A.⁶ A first set of speakers will thus be invited to further examine the procedural history of Danish, Belgian, Italian and Bulgarian/Romanian cases that have been singled out in this preliminary quantitative analysis. A second set of speakers will be asked to shed light on the resonance of the procedural requirements

⁶ I am thus leaving out for now countries where such litigation may take place but with no referrals to the CJEU.

contained in EU equality legislation in other countries, such as France or Germany, from which hardly any preliminary rulings involving collective actors has emanated as well as from the more horizontal perspective of the Commission.

The second part of the workshop will be devoted to exploring the real or potential impact of procedural rules on access to court in other and more recent branches of EU law with strong fundamental right dimensions. Contributors will be invited to reflect on the relevance of the existing or possible future rules on access to court and collective actors in their field as well as to illustrate their point with specific cases involving collective actors when possible. Speakers will be invited to discuss EU data protection law and the protection against nationality discrimination in the context of EU free movement of workers and posted workers where strong parallels can be drawn with anti-discrimination. We will also investigate an area where there is a lack of such provisions (eg. EU migration or social law) and an area where collective actors play a very specific role, EU environmental law.

5. Programme

09.15-09.30 Welcome and introduction

PANEL A – The mechanics of the collective enforcement of EU anti-discrimination law

Chair, *Claire Kilpatrick* (EUI)

Discussant, *C. Favilli* (University of Florence)

09.30-09.50 Analysis of procedural history of selected Belgian cases before the CJEU, *E. Muir* (University of Maastricht & KU Leuven) & *S. Kolf* (College of Europe)

09.50-10.10 Analysis of procedural history of selected Bulgarian and Romanian cases before the CJEU, *L. Farkas* (EUI)

10.10-10.30 Discussion

10.30-10.50 Coffee (Sala della Conchiglia)

10.50-11.10 Analysis of procedural history of selected Danish cases before the CJEU, *J. Miller* (EUI) & *A. Atanasova* (KU Leuven)

11.10-11.30 Analysis of procedural history of selected Italian cases before the CJEU, *V. Passalacqua* (EUI)

11.30-11.50 Discussion

11.50-13.30 Lunch (Sala del Torrino)

PANEL B – Reception of EU ‘procedural’ anti-discrimination law in domestic legal systems

Chair, *Elise Muir* (UM & KUL)

Discussant, *K. Meuwissen* (KULeuven & European Network of National Human Rights Institutions)

- 13.30-13.50 Litigating anti-discrimination cases in Germany: what role for collective actors?, *M. Möschel* (CEU)
- 13.50-14.10 Litigating anti-discrimination cases in France: what role for collective actors?, *S. Latraverse* (Défenseur des droits)
- 14.10-14.30 The provisions of the anti-discrimination Directives on access to justice for collective actors: which added value?, *A. Oliveira* (European Commission)
- 14.30-15.00 Discussion
- 15.00-15.20 Coffee (Sala della Conchiglia)

PANEL C – The spread of collective actors to other fundamental right areas

Chair, *Bruno de Witte* (EUI)

Discussant, *M. Eliantonio* (University of Maastricht)

- 15.20-15.40 The role of collective actors in the enforcement of the rights of posted workers under EU, *M. Kullmann* (University of Maastricht)
- 15.40-16.00 The role of collective actors in the enforcement of the right to data protection under EU law, *O. Lynskey* (LSE)
- 16.00-16.20 The role of collective actors in the enforcement of the rights of third country nationals under EU law, *L. Tsourdi* (EUI)
- 16.20-16.50 Discussion
- 16.50-17.00 Conclusion & closing

6. Expected output

Speakers are kindly asked to send a written paper of around 3000 words to Laurence Duranel (Laurence.Duranel@EUI.eu) before 10 February 2017. The organisers will review the papers ahead of the workshop and may make suggestions and/or request clarifications so as to enhance the added value of the workshop.

Chairs and discussants will receive the papers ahead of the event. They will be expected to briefly comment (5-10 minutes maximum) and steer the discussion.

We would like to propose a collective publication in the form of an EUI Research Paper. For a comparable example see: C. Kilpatrick and B. de Witte, ‘Social Rights in Times of Crisis in the Eurozone: The Role of Fundamental Rights’ Challenges’ EUI Department of Law Research Paper No. 2014/05.

7. Participants

Participants, other than speakers and chairs/discussants, will be invited to identify and read the rules considered to transpose in one Member State EU requirements on access to court in one of the fields of EU law covered in the programme. They are expected to critically reflect

on the influence of EU law on these rules: what has been the influence of EU special procedural law on access to court in anti-discrimination cases?

One way of exploring possible answers to this question is by scanning through the relevant sections of the latest country reports (the one on gender and the general one) on EU equality law for your country study as available at <http://www.equalitylaw.eu/country>. See in particular the sections on the implementation of the rules on access to justice and equality bodies, implementation issues, controversial issues and latest developments.

Thoughts on the matter shall be submitted in the form of a ‘reaction paper’ by e-mail to Jeffrey Miller (Jeffrey.Miller@EUI.eu) by 16.30 on February 21.

8. Organisation

This event is co-organised by the European University Institute (Department of Law) and the University of Maastricht (Maastricht Centre for European Law); it is supported by the Veni programme of the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

The event is hosted by the EUI in Florence, speakers and discussants will be reimbursed on the basis of a second class plane ticket for those based abroad. Accommodation for up to two nights will be provided nearby.

Annex.A. Selection of cases brought by collective actors or with actor acting in support of the claim and having reached the CJEU (E.Muir/E.Braun)

Legislation	Case	Member State	Action brought by private applicant	Action brought by representative organization	Action brought by private applicant with the support of another entity (including intervening parties)
Directive 2004/113/EC					
	Case C-236/09 Test-Achats	Belgium		Consumer association - Association Belge des Consommateurs Test-Achats	
	Case C-318/13 X	Finland	X (natural person)		
Directive 2000/43/EC					
	Case C-54/07 Feryn	Belgium		Equality body - Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding	
	Case C-391/09 Malgožata Runevič-Vardyn and Łukasz Paweł Wardyn	Lithuania	Malgožata Runevič-Vardyn and Łukasz Paweł Wardyn (natural persons)		
<i>(also under Directive 2000/78/EC and Directive 2006/54/EC)</i>	Case C-415/10 Galina Meister v Speech Design Carrier Systems GmbH	Germany	Galina Meister (natural person)		
	Case C-310/10 Ministerul Justiției și Libertăților Cetățenești v Ștefan Agafiței and Others	Romania	Ștefan Agafiței and 30 others, all judges (natural persons)		
	Case C-571/10 Servet Kamberaj v Istituto per l'Edilizia sociale della Provincia autonoma di Bolzano (IPES), Giunta della Provincia autonoma di Bolzano, Provincia autonoma di Bolzano	Italy	Servet Kamberaj (natural person)		Intervening: Associations, NGOs - Associazione Porte Aperte/Offene Türen, Human Rights International, Associazione Volontarius, Fondazione Alexander Langer
	Case C-394/11 Valeri Hariev Belov v ChEZ Elektro Bulgaria AD and ChEZ Raspredelenie Bulgaria AD	Bulgaria	Valeri Hariev Belov (natural person)		
	Case C-83/14 CEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria AD v Komisa za zashtita ot diskiminatsia	Bulgaria	Company (legal person) - CEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria AD		
Directive 2000/78/EC					
	Case C-144/04 Mangold	Germany	Werner Mangold (natural person)		
	Case C-13/05 Sonia Chacón	Spain	Sonia Chacón Navas		



	Navas v Eurest Colectividades SA		(natural person)		
	Case C-411/05 Félix Palacios de la Villa v Cortefiel Servicios SA	Spain	Félix Palacios de la Villa (natural person)		
	Case C-267/06 Tadao Maruko v Versorgungsanstalt der deutschen Bühnen	Germany	Tadao Maruko (natural person)		
	Case C-303/06 S. Coleman v Attridge Law, Steve Law	United Kingdom	S. Coleman (natural person)		
	Case C-427/06 Birgit Bartsch v Bosch und Siemens Hausgeräte (BSH) Altersfürsorge GmbH	Germany	Birgit Bartsch (natural person)		
	Case C-388/07 The Queen, The Incorporated Trustees of the National Council on Ageing (Age Concern England) v Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform	United Kingdom		NGO - Age Concern England	
	Case C-555/07 Seda Kücükdeveci v Swedex GmbH & Co. KG	Germany	Seda Kücükdeveci (natural person)		
	Case C-88/08 David Hütter v Technische Universität Graz	Austria	David Hütter (natural person)		
	Case C-229/08 Colin Wolf v Stadt Frankfurt am Main	Germany	Colin Wolf (natural person)		
	Case C-341/08 Domnica Petersen v Berufungsausschuss für Zahnärzte für den Bezirk Westfalen-Lippe	Germany	Domnica Petersen (natural person)		
	Case C-449/08 G. Elbertsen v Minister van Landbouw, Natuur en Voedselkwaliteit	Netherlan ds	G. Elbertsen (natural person)		
	Case C-499/08 Ingeniørforeningen i Danmark, acting on behalf of Ole Andersen v Region Syddanmark	Denmark		Trade Union - Ingeniørforeningen i Danmark	
	Case C-147/08 Jürgen Römer v Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg	Germany	Jürgen Römer (natural person)		
	Case C-45/09 Gisela Rosenblatt v Oellerking Gebäudereinigungsges.mBh	Germany	Gisela Rosenblatt (natural person)		
	Case C-246/09 Susanne Bulicke v Deutsche Büro Service GmbH	Germany	Susanne Bulicke (natural person)		
	Joined Cases C-250/09 and C-268/09 Vasil Ivanov Georgiev v Tehnicheski universitet — Sofia, filial Plovdiv	Bulgaria	Vasil Ivanov Georgiev (natural person)		
	Case C-447/09 Reinhard Prigge and Others v Deutsche Lufthansa AG	Germany	Reinhard Prigge, Michael Fromm, Volker Lambach (natural persons)		



	Case C-109/09 Deutsche Lufthansa AG v Gertraud Kumpan	Germany	Gertraud Kumpan (natural person)		
	Case C-445/09 IMC Securities BV v Stichting Autoriteit Financiële Markten	Netherlands	Company (legal person)- IMC Securities BV		
	Joined Cases C-159/10 and C-160/10 Gerhard Fuchs (C-159/10), Peter Köhler (C-160/10) v Land Hessen	Germany	Gerhard Fuchs, Peter Köhler (natural persons)		
	Joined Cases C-297/10 and C-298/10 Sabine Hennigs (C-297/10) v Eisenbahn-Bundesamt and Land Berlin (C-298/10) v Alexander Mai	Germany	Sabine Hennigs, Alexander Mai (natural persons)		
<i>(also under Directive 2000/43/EC and Directive 2006/54/EC)</i>	Case C-415/10 Galina Meister v Speech Design Carrier Systems GmbH	Germany	Galina Meister (natural person)		
	Joined Cases C-124/11, C-125/11 and C-143/11 Bundesrepublik Deutschland v Karen Dittrich (C-124/11), Bundesrepublik Deutschland v Robert Klinke (C-125/11), and Jörg-Detlef Müller v Bundesrepublik Deutschland (C-143/11)	Germany	Karen Dittrich, Robert Klinke, Jörg-Detlef Müller (natural persons)		
	Case C-132/11 Tyrolean Airways Tiroler Luftfahrt Gesellschaft mbH v Betriebsrat Bord der Tyrolean Airways Tiroler Luftfahrt Gesellschaft mbH	Austria		Works Council - Betriebsrat Bord der Tyrolean Airways Tiroler Luftfahrt Gesellschaft mbH	
	Case C-141/11 Torsten Hörnfeldt v Posten Meddelande AB	Sweden	Torsten Hörnfeldt (natural person)		
	Case C-152/11 Johann Odar v Baxter Deutschland GmbH	Germany	Johann Odar (natural person)		
	Joined Cases C-335/11 and C-337/11 HK Danmark, acting on behalf of Jette Ring, v Dansk almennyttigt Boligselskab (C-335/11), and HK Danmark, acting on behalf of Lone Skouboe Werge, v Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening, acting on behalf of Pro Display A/S, in liquidation (C-337/11)	Denmark		Trade Union – HK Danmark	
	Case C-476/11 HK Danmark v Experian A/S	Denmark		Trade Union – HK Danmark	Intervening: Ministry of Employment - Beskæftigelsesministeriet
	Case C-546/11 Dansk Jurist- og Økonomforbund, acting on behalf of Erik Toftgaard, v Indenrigs- og Sundhedsministeriet	Denmark		Danish Union of jurists and economists - Dansk Jurist- og Økonomforbund	Intervening: Associations, NGOs - Centralorganisationernes Fællesudvalg (CFU), Kommunale



					Tjenestemænd og Overenskomstansatte (KTO), Personalestyrelsen, Kommunernes Landsforening (KL), Danske Regioner
	Case C-81/12 Asociația ACCEPT v Consiliul Național pentru Combaterea Discriminării	Romania		NGO for LGBT rights - Asociația Accept	
	Case C-267/12 Frédéric Hay v Crédit agricole mutuel de Charente-Maritime et des Deux-Sèvres	France	Frédéric Hay (natural person)		
(also under Directive 2006/54/EC)	Case C-363/12 Z. v A Government department, The Board of management of a community school	Ireland	Z (natural person)		
	Joined Cases C-501/12 to C-506/12, C-540/12 and C-541/12 Thomas Specht (C-501/12), Jens Schombera (C-502/12), Alexander Wieland (C-503/12), Uwe Schönefeld (C-504/12), Antje Wilke (C-505/12) and Gerd Schini (C-506/12) v Land Berlin and Rena Schmeel (C-540/12) and Ralf Schuster (C-541/12) v Bundesrepublik Deutschland	Germany	Thomas Specht, Jens Schombera, Alexander Wieland, Uwe Schönefeld, Antje Wilke, Gerd Schini, Rena Schmeel, Ralf Schuster (natural persons)		
	Case C-429/12 Siegfried Pohl v ÖBB-Infrastruktur AG	Austria	Siegfried Pohl (natural person)		
	Case C-610/12 Johannes Peter v Bundeseisenbahnvermögen		Johannes Peter (natural person)		
	Case C-354/13 Fag og Arbejde (FOA), acting on behalf of Karsten Kaltoft, v Kommunernes Landsforening (KL)	Denmark		Trade Union - Fag og Arbejde	
	Case C-416/13 Mario Vital Pérez v Ayuntamiento de Oviedo	Spain	Mario Vital Pérez (natural person)		
	Case C-417/13 ÖBB Personenverkehr AG v Gotthard Starjakob	Austria	Gotthard Starjakob (natural person)		
	Case C-515/13 Ingeniørforeningen i Danmark, acting on behalf of Poul Landin, v Tekniq, acting on behalf of ENCO A/S — VVS	Denmark		Trade Union - Ingeniørforeningen i Danmark	
	Case C-529/13 Georg Felber v Bundesministerin für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur	Austria	Georg Felber (natural person)		
	Case C-530/13 Leopold Schmitzer v Bundesministerin für Inneres	Austria	Leopold Schmitzer (natural person)		

	Case C-20/13 Daniel Unland v Land Berlin	Germany	Daniel Unland (natural person)		
<i>(also under Directive 2006/54/EC)</i>	Joined Cases C-22/13, C-61/13 to C-63/13 and C-418/13 Raffaella Mascolo (C-22/13), Alba Forni (C-61/13) and Immacolata Racca (C-62/13) v Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, Fortuna Russo v Comune di Napoli (C-63/13) and Carla Napolitano and Others v Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (C-418/13)	Italy	Raffaella Mascolo, Alba Forni, Immacolata Racca, Fortuna Russo, Carla Napolitano, Salvatore Perrella, Gaetano Romano, Donatella Cittadino, Gemma Zangar (natural persons)		Intervening: Trade Unions (C-63/13) - Federazione Gilda-Unams, Federazione Lavoratori della Conoscenza (FLC CGIL), Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL)
<i>(also under Directive 2006/54/EC)</i>	Case C-89/13 Luigi D'Aniello and Others v Poste Italiane SpA	Italy	Luigi D'Aniello and Others (natural persons)		
	Case C-262/14 Sindicatul Cadrelor Militare Disponibilizate în rezervă și în retragere (SCMD) v Ministerul Finanțelor Publice	Romania		Military Staff Union - Sindicatul Cadrelor Militare Disponibilizate în rezervă și în retragere (SCMD)	
	Case C-432/14 O v Bio Philippe Auguste SARL	France	O (natural person)		
Council Directive 76/207/EEC					
	Case C-476/99 H. Lommers v Minister van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij	Netherlands	H. Lommers (natural person)		
	Case C-109/00 Tele Danmark A/S v Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund i Danmark (HK)	Denmark		Trade Union - Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund i Danmark (HK), acting on behalf of Ms Brandt-Nielsen	
	Case C-187/00 Helga Kutz-Bauer v Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg	Germany	Helga Kutz-Bauer (natural person)		
	Case C-186/01 Alexander Dory v Bundesrepublik Deutschland	Germany	Alexander Dory (natural person)		
	Case C-320/01 Wiebke Busch v Klinikum Neustadt GmbH & Co. Betriebs-KG	Germany	Wiebke Busch (natural person)		
	Case C-342/01 María Paz Merino Gómez v Continental Industrias del Caucho SA	Spain	María Paz Merino Gómez (natural person)		
	Case C-77/02 Erika Steinicke v Bundesanstalt für Arbeit	Germany	Erika Steinicke (natural person)		
	Case C-196/02 Vasiliki Nikoloudi v Organismos Tilepikoinonion Ellados AE	Greece	Vasiliki Nikoloudi (natural person)		
	Case C-284/02 Land Brandenburg v Ursula Sass	Germany	Ursula Sass (natural person)		
	Case C-313/02 Nicole	Austria	Nicole Wippel (natural person)		



	Wippel v Peek & Cloppenburg GmbH & Co. KG		person)		
	Case C-319/03 Serge Briheche v Ministre de l'Intérieur, Ministre de l'Éducation nationale and Ministre de la Justice	France	Serge Briheche (natural person)		
	Case C-207/04 Paolo Vergani v Agenzia delle Entrate, Ufficio di Arona	Italy	Paolo Vergani (natural person)		
	Case C-294/04 Carmen Sarkatzis Herrero v Instituto Madrileño de la Salud (Imسالud)	Spain	Carmen Sarkatzis Herrero (natural person)		
	Case C-506/06 Sabine Mayr v Bäckerei und Konditorei Gerhard Flöckner OHG	Austria	Sabine Mayr (natural person)		
	Case C-116/06 Sari Kiiski v Tampereen kaupunki	Finland	Sari Kiiski (natural person)		
	Case C-460/06 Nadine Paquay v Société d'architectes Hoet + Minne SPRL	Belgium	Nadine Paquay (natural person)		
	Case C-63/08 Virginie Pontin v T-Comalux S.A.	Luxembourg	Virginie Pontin (natural person)		
	Case C-104/09 Pedro Manuel Roca Álvarez v Sesa Start España ETT SA	Spain	Pedro Manuel Roca Álvarez (natural person)		
	Case C-356/09 Pensionsversicherungsanstalt v Christine Kleist	Austria	Christine Kleist (natural person)		
	Case C-232/09 Dita Danosa v LKB Līzings SIA	Latvia	Dita Danosa (natural person)		
<i>(also under Directive 2002/73/EC)</i>	Case C-104/10 Patrick Kelly v National University of Ireland (University College, Dublin)	Ireland	Patrick Kelly (natural person)		
<i>(also under Directive 2002/73/EC)</i>	Case C-614/11 Niederösterreichische Landes-Landwirtschaftskammer v Anneliese Kuso	Austria	Anneliese Kuso (natural person)		
<i>(also under Directive 2002/73/EC)</i>	Case C-7/12 Nadežda Riežniece v Zemkopības ministrija and Lauku atbalsta dienests	Latvia	Nadežda Riežniece (natural person)		
	Case C-5/12 Marc Betriu Montull v Instituto Nacional de la Seguridad Social (INSS)	Spain	Marc Betriu Montull (natural person)		
Directive 2002/73/EC					
<i>(also under Council Directive 76/207/EEC)</i>	Case C-104/10 Patrick Kelly v National University of Ireland (University College, Dublin)	Ireland	Patrick Kelly (natural person)		
<i>(also under Council Directive 76/207/EEC)</i>	Case C-614/11 Niederösterreichische Landes-	Austria	Anneliese Kuso (natural person)		



	Landwirtschaftskammer v Anneliese Kuso				
<i>(also under Council Directive 76/207/EEC)</i>	Case C-7/12 Nadežda Riežniece v Zemkopības ministrija and Lauku atbalsta dienests	Latvia	Nadežda Riežniece (natural person)		
Directive 2006/54/EC					
	Case C-486/08 Zentralbetriebsrat der Landeskrankenhäuser Tirols v Land Tirol	Austria		Works Council for hospital workers (legal person) - Zentralbetriebsrat der Landeskrankenhäuser Tirols	
<i>(also under Directive 2000/43/EC and Directive 2000/78/EC)</i>	Case C-415/10 Galina Meister v Speech Design Carrier Systems GmbH	Germany	Galina Meister (natural person)		
	Case C-385/11 Isabel Elbal Moreno v Instituto Nacional de la Seguridad Social (INSS) and Tesorería General de la Seguridad Social (TGSS)	Spain	Isabel Elbal Moreno (natural person)		
	Joined Cases C-512/11 and C-513/11 Terveys- ja sosiaalialan neuvottelujärjestö (TSN) ry v Terveyspalvelualan Liitto ry (C-512/11) and Ylemmät Toimihenkilöt (YTN) ry v Teknologiateollisuus ry and Nokia Siemens Networks Oy (C-513/11)	Finland		Trade Union for the health and social sector - Terveys- ja sosiaalialan neuvottelujärjestö (TSN) ry, Trade Union for senior officials - Ylemmät Toimihenkilöt (YTN) ry	
	Case C-167/12 C.D. v S.T.	United Kingdom	C.D., S.T. (natural persons)		
<i>(also under Directive 2000/78/EC)</i>	Case C-363/12 Z. v A Government department, The Board of management of a community school	Ireland	Z (natural person)		
	Case C-595/12 Loredana Napoli v Ministero della Giustizia - Dipartimento dell'Amministrazione penitenziaria	Italy	Loredana Napoli (natural person)		
	Case C-318/13 X	Finland	X (natural person)		
<i>(also under Directive 2000/78/EC)</i>	Joined Cases C-22/13, C-61/13 to C-63/13 and C-418/13 Raffaella Mascolo (C-22/13), Alba Forni (C-61/13) and Immacolata Racca (C-62/13) v Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, Fortuna Russo v Comune di Napoli (C-63/13) and Carla Napolitano and Others v Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (C-418/13)	Italy	Raffaella Mascolo, Alba Forni, Immacolata Racca, Fortuna Russo, Carla Napolitano, Salvatore Perrella, Gaetano Romano, Donatella Cittadino, Gemma Zangar (natural persons)		Intervening: Trade Unions (C-63/13) - Federazione Gilda-Lavoratori della Conoscenza (FLC CGIL), Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL)
<i>(also under</i>	Case C-89/13 Luigi D'Aniello	Italy	Luigi D'Aniello and		



Directive 2000/78/EC)	and Others v Poste Italiane SpA		Others (natural persons)		
	Case C-222/14 Konstantinos Maïstrellis v Ypourgos Dikaiosynis, Diafaneias kai Anthropinon Dikaiomaton	Greece	Konstantinos Maïstrellis (natural person)		
	Case C-407/14 María Auxiliadora Arjona Camacho v Securitas Seguridad España SA	Spain	María Auxiliadora Arjona Camacho (natural person)		
	Case C-65/14 Charlotte Rosselle v Institut national d'assurance maladie-invalidité (INAMI) and Union nationale des mutualités libres (UNM)	Belgium	Charlotte Rosselle (natural person)		Intervening: Equality body - Institut pour l'égalité des femmes et des hommes (IEFH)