

(b) If so, is it justified in order to avoid a deterioration in the remuneration status of civil servants (who clearly also include new civil servants) who do not have suitable eligible periods before the age of 18 even though eligibility also covers other periods after the age of 18?

6. If Question 4(a) is answered in the affirmative and Question 4(b) is answered in the negative and, at the same time, Question 3 is answered in the affirmative or Question 5(a) is answered in the affirmative and Question 5(b) in the negative:

Do the discriminatory characteristics of the new rules which then exist mean that the unequal treatment of old civil servants is no longer justified as a transitional phenomenon?

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation (OJ 2000 L 303, p. 16).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the  
Verwaltungsgerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 8 October  
2013 — Kornhuber and Others**

(Case C-531/13)

(2014/C 15/05)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Verwaltungsgerichtshof

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicants:* Marktgemeinde Straßwalchen, Heinrich Kornhuber, Helga Kornhuber, Karoline Pöckl, Heinz Kornhuber, Marianne Kornhuber, Wolfgang Kornhuber, Andrea Kornhuber, Alois Herzog, Elfriede Herzog, Katrin Herzog, Stefan Asen, Helmut Zopf, Ingrid Zopf, Silvia Zopf, Daniel Zopf, Maria Zopf, Anton Zopf sen., Paula Loibichler, Theresa Baumann, Josep Schindlauer, Christine Schindlauer, Barbara Schindlauer, Bernhard Schindlauer, Alois Mayrhofer, Daniel Mayrhofer, Georg Rindberger, Maria Rindlberger, Georg Rindlberger sen., Max Herzog, Romana Herzog, Michael Herzog, Markus Herzog, Marianne Herzog, Max Herzog sen., Helmut Lettner, Maria Lettner, Anita Lettner, Alois Lettner sen., Christian Lettner, Sandra Lettner, Anton Nagelseder, Amalie Nagelseder, Josef Nagelseder, Gabriele Schachinger, Thomas Schachinger, Andreas Schinagl, Michaela Schinagl, Lukas Schinagl, Michael Schinagl, Maria Schinagl, Josef Schinagl, Johann Mayr, Christine Mayr, Martin Mayr, Christian Mayr, Johann Mayr sen., Gerhard Herzog, Anton Mayrhofer, Siegfried Zieher

*Defendant authority:* Bundesminister für Wirtschaft, Familie und Jugend

*Intervening party:* Rohöl-Aufsuchungs AG

**Questions referred**

1. Does the trial extraction of natural gas, for a limited period and in a limited quantity, which is carried out in the context of an exploratory drilling operation designed to establish whether the permanent extraction of natural gas would be economically viable constitute an 'extraction of ... natural gas for commercial purposes' within the meaning of Annex I, no 14, to Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, <sup>(1)</sup> as amended by Directive 2009/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (Directive 85/337)? <sup>(2)</sup>

If the reply to Question 1 is in the affirmative, the following further questions arise:

2. Does Annex I, no 14, to Directive 85/337 preclude a provision of national law which, with regard to the extraction of natural gas, does not relate the threshold figures in Annex I, no 14, to Directive 85/337 to extraction ('Gewinnung') as such, but to 'extraction per probe' ('Förderung pro Sonde')?

3. Is Directive 85/337 to be interpreted as meaning that, in a situation such as that in the main proceedings, in which an application is being made for authorisation for the trial extraction of natural gas in the context of an exploratory drilling operation, the authority, in order to determine whether there is an obligation to carry out an environmental impact assessment, must examine, as to their cumulative effect, only all projects of the same kind, specifically, all drilling sites which have been opened in the municipal district?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 1985 L 175, p. 40.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ 2009 L 140, p. 114.

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Fővárosi  
Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary) lodged  
on 9 October 2013 — Sofia Zoo v Országos  
Környezetvédelmi, Természetvédelmi és Vízügyi  
Főfelügyelőség**

(Case C-532/13)

(2014/C 15/06)

*Language of the case: Hungarian*

**Referring court**

Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság