

2. If Question 1 is answered in the affirmative:

Is Point 7(c) of Annex I to the EIA Directive more specific than Point 7(b) of Annex I to that directive and does it for that reason take priority in application?

3. If Question 1 or Question 2 is answered in the negative:

Does the term 'express road' in Point 7(b) of Annex I to the EIA Directive presuppose that the road section in question is a main international traffic artery within the meaning of the European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries?

4. If Questions 1, 2 or 3 are answered in the negative:

Does the term 'construction' in Point 7(b) of Annex I to the EIA Directive apply to road-widening under which the existing route of the road does not undergo any significant alteration?

5. If Question 4 is answered in the affirmative:

Does the term 'construction' in Point 7(b) of Annex I to the EIA Directive presuppose a minimum length with regard to the road section in question? If so, must this involve a continuous section of road? If so, is the minimum length more than a continuous length of 2,6 kilometres or, where the lengths of multiple separate sections of road are to be added together, more than a total of 4,4 kilometres?

6. If Question 5 is answered in the negative:

Does the second reference in Point 7(b) of Annex I to the EIA Directive (construction of express roads) apply to a road-widening measure within a built-up area within the meaning of the European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2012 L 26, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesarbeitsgericht (Germany) lodged on 15 December 2015 — Jan Šalplachta

(Case C-670/15)

(2016/C 090/09)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Bundesarbeitsgericht

Party to the main proceedings

Applicant: Jan Šalplachta

Question referred

Does the right of a natural person to effective access to justice in a cross-border dispute within the meaning of Articles 1 and 2 of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes ⁽¹⁾ require that legal aid granted by the Federal Republic of Germany must extend to the costs incurred by the applicant for the translation of the declaration and supporting documents annexed to the legal aid application, where the applicant, at the same time as bringing the action, applies for legal aid to the court hearing the case, which is also the competent receiving authority within the meaning of Article 13(1)(b) of the directive, and he has himself arranged for the translation to be made?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2003 L 26, p. 41, corrigendum OJ 2003 L 32, p. 1.