

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt (Germany) lodged on 30 July 2019
— RJ v Stadt Offenbach am Main**

(Case C-580/19)

(2019/C 372/19)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: RJ

Defendant: Stadt Offenbach am Main

Questions referred

1. Is Article 2 of Directive 2003/88/EC ⁽¹⁾ to be interpreted as meaning that periods of stand-by time during which an employee is subject to the obligation to reach the city boundary of his place of employment in uniform with the operational vehicle within twenty minutes are to be regarded as working time, even though the employer has not prescribed a place for the employee to stay, but the employee is nevertheless significantly restricted in his choice of location and in the opportunities to devote himself to his personal and social interests?
2. If the first question referred is answered in the affirmative:

In a situation such as that of the first question referred, is Article 2 of Directive 2003/88/EC to be interpreted as meaning that, when defining the concept of working time, account is also to be taken of whether and to what extent a service call-out is usually to be expected during stand-by duty which is to be spent at a place not prescribed by the employer?

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time (OJ 2003 L 299, p. 9).

**Appeal brought on 22 August 2019 by Csanád Szegedi against the judgment of the General Court
(Sixth Chamber) delivered on 27 June 2019 in Case T-135/18 Csanád Szegedi v European Parliament**

(Case C-628/19 P)

(2019/C 372/20)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Parties

Appellant: Csanád Szegedi (represented by: K. Bodó, ügyvéd)

Other party to the proceedings: European Parliament