

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* WN

*Defendant:* Land Niedersachsen

**Question referred**

Are Article 45(2) TFEU and Article 7(1) of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union <sup>(1)</sup> to be interpreted as precluding a provision such as that in Paragraph 16(2) of the Tarifvertrag für den Öffentlichen Dienst der Länder (the Collective Agreement for the public sector of the Länder; 'the TV-L'), pursuant to which the relevant professional experience acquired with the last previous employer has a privileged position in the case where an employee is allocated to the steps of a collective pay structure following re-employment as a result of that professional experience being fully acknowledged pursuant to the second sentence of Paragraph 16(2) of the TV-L, whereas only a maximum of three years of relevant professional experience acquired with other employers is taken into account pursuant to the third sentence of Paragraph 16(2) of the TV-L, if that privileged position is required under EU law by clause 4.4 of the framework agreement on fixed-term contracts concluded on 18 March 1999, which is contained 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?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2011 L 141, p. 1.

---

**Appeal brought on 17 December 2018 by Pracsis SPRL, Conceptexpo Project against the order of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 3 October 2018 in Case T-33/18, Pracsis and Conceptexpo Project v Commission and EACEA**

**(Case C-794/18 P)**

(2019/C 182/04)

*Language of the case: French*

**Parties**

*Appellants:* Pracsis SPRL, Conceptexpo Project (represented by: J.-N. Louis, avocat)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Commission, Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)

By order of 11 April 2019, the Court (Seventh Chamber) dismissed the appeal as being, in part, manifestly inadmissible and, in part, manifestly unfounded.

---