

Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 5 June 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Galicia — Spain) — Grupo Norte Facility SA v Angel Manuel Moreira Gómez

(Case C-574/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Social policy — Directive 1999/70/EC — Framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP — Clause 4 — Principle of non-discrimination — Definition of ‘employment conditions’ — Comparability of situations — Justification — Definition of ‘objective grounds’ — Compensation in the event of termination of a permanent employment contract on objective grounds — Lesser amount of compensation paid on expiry of a fixed-term ‘relief’ employment contract)

(2018/C 268/05)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Galicia

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Grupo Norte Facility SA

Respondent: Angel Manuel Moreira Gómez

Operative part of the judgment

Clause 4(1) of the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded on 18 March 1999, which is annexed to Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP, must be interpreted as not precluding national legislation under which the compensation paid to workers employed under fixed-term contracts entered into in order to cover working hours no longer covered as a result of a worker taking partial retirement, such as the relief contract at issue in the main proceedings, on expiry of the term for which those contracts were concluded, is less than the compensation awarded to permanent workers on termination of their employment contract on objective grounds.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 30, 30.1.2017.

Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 6 June 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the College van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven — Netherlands) — M.N.J.P.W. Nooren, J.M.F.D.C. Nooren, the heirs of M.N.F.M. Nooren v Staatssecretaris van Economische Zaken

(Case C-667/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Common agricultural policy — EAFRD financing — Regulation (EC) No 1122/2009 — Support for rural development — Non-compliance with cross-compliance rules — Reductions and exclusions — Aggregation of reductions)

(2018/C 268/06)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

College van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: M.N.J.P.W. Nooren, J.M.F.D.C. Nooren, the heirs of M.N.F.M. Nooren

Defendant: Staatssecretaris van Economische Zaken

Operative part of the judgment

Articles 70 to 72 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1122/2009 of 30 November 2009 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 as regards cross-compliance, modulation and the integrated administration and control system, under the direct support schemes for farmers provided for by that Regulation, as well as for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards cross-compliance under the support scheme provided for the wine sector, read in conjunction with Articles 23 and 24 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19 January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, must be interpreted as meaning that, in a situation such as that in the main proceedings, in which there have been found to be multiple instances of non-compliance within the same area, the reduction of the total amount of direct payments that have been, or are to be, granted that is applicable to instances of negligent non-compliance, on the one hand, and the reduction that is applicable to instances of intentional non-compliance, on the other hand, must be aggregated, with the total amount of reductions for one calendar year having to be fixed in compliance with the principle of proportionality and without exceeding the total amount referred to in Article 23(1) of Regulation No 73/2009.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 78, 13.3.2017.

Judgment of the Court (Second Chamber) of 7 June 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Conseil d'État — Belgium) — Inter-Environnement Bruxelles ASBL and Others v Brussels Capital Region

(Case C-671/16) ⁽¹⁾

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Environment — Directive 2001/42/EC — Article 2(a) — Concept of 'plans and programmes' — Article 3 — Assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment — Regional town planning regulations relating to the European Quarter, Brussels (Belgium))

(2018/C 268/07)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Conseil d'État

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Inter-Environnement Bruxelles ASBL, Groupe d'animation du quartier européen de la ville de Bruxelles ASBL, Association du quartier Léopold ASBL, Brusselse Raad voor het Leefmilieu ASBL, Pierre Picard, David Weytsman

Defendant: Brussels Capital Region

Operative part of the judgment

On a proper construction of Article 2(a), Article 3(1), and Article 3(2)(a) of Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, regional town planning regulations, such as those at issue in the main proceedings, laying down certain requirements for the completion of building projects, fall under the definition of 'plans and programmes' which are likely to have significant environmental effects within the meaning of that directive and must, consequently, be subjected to an environmental impact assessment.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 78, 13.3.2017.