Order of the Court (Sixth chamber) of 22 March 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Juzgado Contencioso-Administrativo No 2 de Zaragoza — Spain) — Pilar Centeno Meléndez v Universidad de Zaragoza

(Case C-315/17) ([1])

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Directive 1999/70/EC — Framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP — Clause 4 — Principle of non-discrimination — Rules for horizontal career progression — Grant of remuneration supplement — National legislation excluding non-established civil servants — Definition of 'employment conditions' and 'objective reasons')

(2018/C 190/03)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Juzgado Contencioso-Administrativo No 2 de Zaragoza

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Pilar Centeno Meléndez

Defendant: Universidad de Zaragoza

Operative part of the order

Clause 4(1) of the Framework Agreement on fixed-term work, concluded on 18 March 1999, which is set out in the Annex 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 precluding national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which restricts participation in the regime for horizontal career progression of administrative and technical staff of the University of Zaragoza (Spain) and, accordingly, receipt of the remuneration supplement ensuing from participation in that regime to career civil servants and permanent contract agents, to the exclusion, in particular, of individuals employed as non-established civil servants.

([1]) OJ C 269, 14.8.2017.

Order of the Court (Sixth Chamber) of 16 January 2018 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Varhoven kasatsionen sad — Bulgaria) — PM v AH

(Case C-604/17) ([1])

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Article 99 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice — Area of freedom, security and justice — Judicial cooperation in civil matters — Jurisdiction in matters of parental responsibility — Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Jurisdiction of a court of a Member State to hear and determine an action relating to parental responsibility where the child is not resident in the territory of that State — Jurisdiction in matters relating to maintenance obligations — Regulation (EC) No 4/2009)

(2018/C 190/04)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Varhoven kasatsionen sad

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: PM

Defendant: AH

Operative part of the order

Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000, must be interpreted as meaning that a court of a Member State with jurisdiction, under Article 3(1)(b) of that regulation, to hear and determine an application for divorce between two spouses who are nationals of that Member State does not have jurisdiction to rule on rights of custody and rights of access in respect of the spouses' child in the case where, at the time when the court is seised, that child is habitually resident in another Member State, that the conditions for such jurisdiction, under Article 12 of that regulation, are not satisfied by that court, and that, on account of the circumstances of the main proceedings, it follows that neither does that court have such jurisdiction under Articles 9, 10 or 15 of that regulation. Furthermore, that court does not satisfy the conditions, laid down in Article 3(d) of Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations, for having jurisdiction to rule on an application relating to maintenance.

([1]) OJ C 22, 22.1.2018.

Appeal brought on 21 November 2017 by Grupo Osborne S.A. against the judgment of the General Court (Seventh Chamber) delivered on 20 September 2017 in Case T-350/13, Jordi Nogués v EUIPO — Grupo Osborne (BADTORO)

(Case C-651/17 P)

(2018/C 190/05)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Appellant: Grupo Osborne S.A. (represented by: J.M. Iglesias Monravá, abogado)

Other parties to the proceedings: Jordi Nogués S.L. and European Union Intellectual Property Office

By order of 12 April 2018, the Court of Justice (Sixth Chamber) dismissed the appeal and ordered Grupo Osborne S.A. to bear its own costs.

Appeal brought on 21 November 2017 by Grupo Osborne S.A. against the judgment of the General Court (Seventh Chamber) delivered on 20 September 2017 in Case T-386/15, Jordi Nogués v EUIPO — Grupo Osborne (BADTORO)

(Case C-652/17 P)

(2018/C 190/06)

Language of the case: Spanish

Parties

Appellant: Grupo Osborne S.A. (represented by: J.M. Iglesias Monravá, abogado)

Other parties to the proceedings: Jordi Nogués S.L. and European Union Intellectual Property Office