

**Action brought on 27 July 2020 — European Commission v Portuguese Republic****(Case C-345/20)**

(2020/C 329/09)

*Language of the case: Portuguese***Parties***Applicant:* European Commission (represented by: W. Mölls and C. Vrignon, acting as Agents)*Defendant:* Portuguese Republic**Form of order sought**

The Commission claims that the Court of Justice should:

- declare that, in failing to carry out the interconnection of its national electronic register to the new version of the European Register of Road Transport Undertakings (ERRU), the Portuguese Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Articles 3 and 4 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/480 of 1 April 2016 establishing common rules concerning the interconnection of national electronic registers on road transport undertakings and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1213/2010; <sup>(1)</sup>
- order the Portuguese Republic to pay the costs.

**Plea in law and main arguments**

The interconnection of national electronic registers to the new version of the ERRU, which the Member States are required to carry out in accordance with the procedures and technical requirements laid down in Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/480, as required under Article 3 of that regulation, was to have taken place by no later than 30 January 2019.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2016 L 87, p. 4.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Corte costituzionale (Italy) lodged on 30 July 2020 — O.D., R.I.H.V., B.O., F.G., M.K.F.B., E.S., N.P. and S.E.A. v Istituto nazionale della previdenza sociale (INPS)****(Case C-350/20)**

(2020/C 329/10)

*Language of the case: Italian***Referring court**

Corte costituzionale

**Parties to the main proceedings***Applicants:* O.D., R.I.H.V., B.O., F.G., M.K.F.B., E.S., N.P. and S.E.A.*Defendant:* Istituto nazionale della previdenza sociale (INPS)

**Question referred**

Is Article 34 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, proclaimed at Nice on 7 December 2000 and adjusted at Strasbourg on 12 December 2007, to be interpreted as applying to childbirth and maternity allowances under Article 3(1)(b) and (j) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems,<sup>(1)</sup> referred to in Article 12(1)(e) of Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit,<sup>(2)</sup> and is EU law therefore to be interpreted as precluding national legislation which fails to extend the abovementioned benefits, which are already granted to foreign nationals holding a long-term resident's EU residence permit, to foreign nationals who hold a single permit under that directive?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2004 L 166, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State (OJ 2011 L 343, p. 1).

---

**Appeal brought on 7 August 2020 by Agrochem-Maks d.o.o. against the judgment of the General Court (Fourth Chamber) delivered on 28 May 2020 in Case T-574/18, Agrochem-Maks v Commission**

**(Case C-374/20 P)**

(2020/C 329/11)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Agrochem-Maks d.o.o. (represented by: S. Pappas and A. Pappas, avocats)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Commission, Kingdom of Sweden

**Form of order sought**

The appellant claims that the Court should:

- set aside the judgment under appeal;
- refer the case back to the General Court;
- order the Commission to bear its own costs and pay the costs of the appellant in the present proceedings.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

The General Court misinterpreted and misapplied the requirements of the procedure regarding requests for additional information in the context of the renewal of the approval of the active substance.

The General Court committed an error of law by holding that the complaint (relating to the seven non-finalised issues) that the existence of disagreements between EFSA's assessments and that of the rapporteur Member State requires in-depth reasoning on that question must be rejected as unfounded in relation to the fourth issue and as ineffective with relation to the other issues.

The General Court committed an error of law by failing to take into account all the relevant elements in order to examine the appellant's legitimate expectations.