

**Questions referred**

1. Must Article 65(2) and (5) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> be interpreted as meaning that a wholly unemployed person who has transferred his place of residence from the competent Member State to another Member State while receiving a benefit as referred to in Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, and/or before his employment relationship has been terminated, is entitled to unemployment benefit under the legislation of the Member State in which he resides?
2. Are the reasons for which the unemployed person has transferred his residence to a Member State other than the competent Member State, for example, on family grounds, relevant in that regard?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ 2004 L 166, p. 1).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Oberster Gerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 7 July 2020 —  
UE, HC v Vorarlberger Landes- und Hypothekenbank AG**

**(Case C-301/20)**

(2020/C 313/16)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Oberster Gerichtshof

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellants:* UE, HC

*Respondent:* Vorarlberger Landes- und Hypothekenbank AG

*Intervening party:* Verlassenschaft des VJ

**Question referred**

1. Is Article 70(3) of Regulation (EU) No 650/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and acceptance and enforcement of authentic instruments in matters of succession and on the creation of a European Certificate of Succession ('the EU Succession Regulation') <sup>(1)</sup> to be interpreted as meaning that a copy of the certificate issued for an indefinite duration without indicating an expiry date, contrary to that provision,
  - a. is valid and effective indefinitely, or
  - b. is valid only for a period of six months from the date of issue of the certified copy, or
  - c. is valid only for a period of six months from another date, or
  - d. is invalid and unsuitable for use within the meaning of Article 63 of the EU Succession Regulation?
2. Is Article 65(1) of the EU Succession Regulation, read in conjunction with Article 69(3) thereof, to be interpreted as meaning that the certificate produces effects in favour of all persons who are mentioned on the certificate by name as heirs, legatees, executors of wills or administrators of the estate, with the result that even those who have not applied for the issue of the certificate themselves can use that certificate pursuant to Article 63 of the EU Succession Regulation?

3. Must Article 69 of the EU Succession Regulation, read in conjunction with Article 70(3) thereof, be interpreted as meaning that the legitimising effect of the certified copy of a certificate of succession must be recognised if it was still valid when it was first submitted but expired before the requested decision of the authority, or does that provision not preclude national law if the latter requires the certificate to be valid even at the time of the decision?

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ 2012 L 201, p. 107.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Cour d'appel de Paris (France) lodged on 9 July 2020 —  
A. — Other party: Autorité des marchés financiers**

**(Case C-302/20)**

(2020/C 313/17)

*Language of the case: French*

**Referring court**

Cour d'appel de Paris

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* A.

*Other party:* Autorité des marchés financiers

**Questions referred**

1. In the first place,

- (a) Is the first subparagraph of Article 1(1) of Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003 on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse), (<sup>1</sup>) in conjunction with Article 1(1) of Commission Directive 2003/124/EC of 22 December 2003 implementing Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the definition and public disclosure of inside information and the definition of market manipulation, (<sup>2</sup>) to be interpreted as meaning that information relating to the forthcoming publication of a press article relaying a market rumour about an issuer of financial instruments can satisfy the requirement of precision laid down in those articles for classification as inside information?
- (b) Does the fact that the press article, the forthcoming publication of which constitutes the information at issue, mentions — as a market rumour — the price of a public takeover bid affect the assessment of the precise nature of the information at issue?
- (c) Are the reputation of the journalist who authored the article and of the media outlet which published it and the genuinely significant (*ex post*) effect of that publication on the price of the securities to which the published article relates relevant factors for the purposes of assessing the precise nature of the information at issue?

2. In the second place, if the first question is answered to the effect that information such as that at issue can satisfy the necessary requirement of precision:

- (a) Is Article 21 of Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on market abuse (market abuse regulation) and repealing Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Directives 2003/124/EC, 2003/125/EC and 2004/72/EC (<sup>3</sup>) to be interpreted as meaning that the disclosure by a journalist, to one of his usual sources, of information relating to the forthcoming publication of an article authored by him relaying a market rumour is made *for the purpose of journalism*?