4. Can the rules set out in a network statement be deemed discriminatory if they are not consistent with the EU legislation to which the Railway Administration is obliged to adhere?

(¹) Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area (OJ 2012 L 343, p. 32).

## Request for a preliminary ruling from the Korkein hallinto-oikeus (Finland) lodged on 4 November 2020 - A

(Case C-577/20)

(2021/C 62/14)

Language of the case: Finnish

## Referring court

Korkein hallinto-oikeus

## Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: A

Other party: Sosiaali- ja terveysalan lupa- ja valvontavirasto

## Questions referred

- 1. Are the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty on European Union and Directive 2005/36/EC (¹) to be interpreted as meaning that the competent authority of the host Member State must assess an applicant's right to pursue a regulated profession in accordance with Articles 45 and 49 TFEU and the relevant case-law (in particular, judgment of 7 May 1991, C-340/89 (²), Vlassopoulou, and judgment of 6 October 2015, C-298/14 (³), Brouillard) even though the conditions for the pursuit of a regulated profession are supposed to be standardised in Article 13(2) of Directive 2005/36/EC, and, under those conditions, the host Member State must permit the pursuit of a profession by an applicant who holds evidence of formal qualifications from a Member State in which the profession is not regulated, but who does not satisfy the requirement for the pursuit of the profession laid down in that provision of the directive?
- 2. If the first question referred is answered in the affirmative: In the light of the statements made in Case C-298/14, Brouillard (paragraph 55 of the judgment) concerning the exclusive criteria for assessing the equivalence of certificates, does EU law preclude the competent authority of the host Member State, in a situation such as that at issue in the present case, from also basing its assessment of the equivalence of training on information other than that obtained from the training provider or the authorities of the other Member State regarding the precise content of the training and the manner in which it is implemented?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Düsseldorf (Germany) lodged on 17 November 2020 — EZ v Iberia Lineas Aereas de Espana, Sociedad Unipersonal

(Case C-606/20)

(2021/C 62/15)

Language of the case: German

 <sup>(</sup>¹) Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications (OJ 2005 L 255, p. 22).
(²) Judgment of the Court of 7 May 1991 (Case C-340/89, Irène Vlassopoulou v Ministerium für Justiz, Bundes- und

<sup>(2)</sup> Judgment of the Court of 7 May 1991 (Case C-340/89, Irène Vlassopoulou v Ministerium für Justiz, Bundes- und Europaangelegenheiten Baden-Württemberg, ECLI:EU:C:1991:193).

<sup>(3)</sup> Judgment of the Court (Second Chamber) of 6 October 2015 (Case C-298/14, Alain Laurent Brouillard v Jury du concours de recrutement de référendaires près la Cour de cassation and Belgian State, ECLI:EU:C:2015:652).