Appeal brought on 26 January 2015 by Cantina Broglie 1 Srl against the judgment of the General Court (Seventh Chamber) delivered on 27 November 2014 in Case T-153/11 *Cantina Broglie 1* v *OHIM*

(Case C-33/15 P)

(2015/C 429/10)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Appellant: Cantina Broglie 1 Srl (represented by: A. Rizzoli, avvocato)

Other parties to the proceedings: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) and Camera di Commercio, Industria, Artigianato e Agricoltura di Verona

By order of 15 October 2015 the Court (Ninth Chamber) dismissed the appeal and ordered Cantina Broglie 1 Srl to bear its own costs.

Appeal brought on 26 January 2015 by Cantina Broglie 1 Srl against the judgment of the General Court (Seventh Chamber) delivered on 27 November 2014 in Case T-154/11 *Cantina Broglie 1* v *OHIM*

(Case C-34/15 P)

(2015/C 429/11)

Language of the case: Italian

Parties

Appellant: Cantina Broglie 1 Srl (represented by: A. Rizzoli, avvocato)

Other parties to the proceedings: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) and Camera di Commercio, Industria, Artigianato e Agricoltura di Verona

By order of 15 October 2015 the Court (Ninth Chamber) dismissed the appeal and ordered Cantina Broglie 1 Srl to bear its own costs.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landessozialgericht Rheinland-Pfalz, Mainz (Germany) lodged on 22 September 2015 — Alphonse Eschenbrenner v Bundesagentur für Arbeit

(Case C-496/15)

(2015/C 429/12)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landessozialgericht Rheinland-Pfalz, Mainz

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Alphonse Eschenbrenner

Defendant: Bundesagentur für Arbeit

Questions referred

1. Is it compatible with the rules of primary and/or secondary EU law (in particular Article 45 TFEU (formerly Article 39 EC) and Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 ([1])), in the case of an employee who pursues an occupational activity in Germany, who is resident in another Member State and not subject to income tax liability in Germany, and for whom insolvency benefit, under the provisions applicable to him, is not taxable, that, in the event of his employer's insolvency, the remuneration from employment used to calculate his insolvency benefit is subject to the notional taxation that would be charged as a deduction on his remuneration from employment were he subject to income tax liability in Germany, if he no longer has the possibility of asserting a claim against his employer for his residual gross remuneration?

2. If Question 1 is answered in the negative, can it be considered compatible with the rules of primary and/or secondary EU law if, in the circumstances described, the employee retains the possibility of asserting a claim against his employer for his residual gross remuneration?

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union Text with EEA relevance, OJ 2011 L 141, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Rechtbank van Koophandel Brussel (Belgium) lodged on 5 October 2015 — Uber Belgium BVBA v Taxi Radio Bruxellois NV, Other parties: Uber NV and Others

(Case C-526/15)

(2015/C 429/13)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Rechtbank van Koophandel Brussel

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Uber Belgium BVBA

Defendant: Taxi Radio Bruxellois NV

Other parties to the proceedings: Uber NV and Others, Brusselse Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, Belgische Federatie van Taxis, Nationale Groepering van Ondernemingen met Taxi- and Locatievoertuigen met Chauffeur VZW