Questions referred

In assessing whether there has been a cessation of protection or assistance from UNRWA ([1]) within the meaning of the second sentence of Article 12(1) (a) of the QD ([2]) to an UNRWA-registered stateless Palestinian in respect of the assistance afforded to disabled persons:

1. Is the assessment purely an historic exercise of considering the circumstances which are said to have forced an applicant to leave the UNRWA area of operations when he did, or is it also an ex nunc, forward-looking assessment of whether the applicant can avail himself of such protection or assistance presently?
2. If the answer to Question 1 is that assessment includes a forward-looking assessment, is it legitimate to rely analogically on the cessation clause in Article 11, so that where historically the applicant can show a qualifying reason as to why he or she left the UNRWA area, the evidential burden falls upon the Member State to show that such reason no longer holds?
3. In order for there to be justifiable objective reasons for the departure of such a person related to UNRW[A]'s provision of protection or assistance, is it necessary to establish intentional infliction of harm or deprivation of assistance (by act or omission) on the part of UNRWA or the state in which it operates?
4. Is it relevant to take into account the assistance provided to such persons by civil society actors such as NGOs?

([1]) United Nations Relief and Works Association.
([2]) Council Directive 2004/83/EC of 29 April 2004 on minimum standards for the qualification and status of third country nationals or stateless persons as refugees or as persons who otherwise need international protection and the content of the protection granted (the Qualification Directive; hereafter: 'QD')(OJ 2004, L 304, p. 12).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Úřad pro přístup k dopravní infrastruktuře (Czech Republic) lodged on 23 September 2020 — CityRail a.s. v Správa železnic, státní organizace

(Case C-453/20)

(2021/C 62/13)

Language of the case: Czech

Referring court

Úřad pro přístup k dopravní infrastruktuře

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: CityRail a.s.

Defendant: Správa železnic, státní organizace

Questions referred

1. Does the *place of loading and unloading for the transport of goods*, including related tracks, constitute part of railway infrastructure as defined by Article 3(3) of Directive 2012/34? ([1])
2. Is it in accordance with Directive 2012/34 that an infrastructure manager may at any time change prices for the use of railway infrastructure or service facilities to the detriment of freight forwarders?
3. Is Directive 2012/34 binding for Správa železnic, státní organizace (the Railway Administration) pursuant to Article 288 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

4. Can the rules set out in a network statement be deemed discriminatory if they are not consistent with the EU legislation to which the Railway Administration is obliged to adhere?

(1) Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area (OJ 2012 L 343, p. 32).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Korkein hallinto-oikeus (Finland) lodged on 4 November 2020 — A

(Case C-577/20)

(2021/C 62/14)

Language of the case: Finnish

Referring court

Korkein hallinto-oikeus

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: A

Other party: Sosiaali- ja terveysalan lupa- ja valvontavirasto

Questions referred

1. Are the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty on European Union and Directive 2005/36/EC [1] to be interpreted as meaning that the competent authority of the host Member State must assess an applicant's right to pursue a regulated profession in accordance with Articles 45 and 49 TFEU and the relevant case-law (in particular, judgment of 7 May 1991, C-340/89 [2], *Vlassopoulou,* and judgment of 6 October 2015, C-298/14 [3], *Brouillard*) even though the conditions for the pursuit of a regulated profession are supposed to be standardised in Article 13(2) of Directive 2005/36/EC, and, under those conditions, the host Member State must permit the pursuit of a profession by an applicant who holds evidence of formal qualifications from a Member State in which the profession is not regulated, but who does not satisfy the requirement for the pursuit of the profession laid down in that provision of the directive?

2. If the first question referred is answered in the affirmative: In the light of the statements made in Case C-298/14, *Brouillard* (paragraph 55 of the judgment) concerning the exclusive criteria for assessing the equivalence of certificates, does EU law preclude the competent authority of the host Member State, in a situation such as that at issue in the present case, from also basing its assessment of the equivalence of training on information other than that obtained from the training provider or the authorities of the other Member State regarding the precise content of the training and the manner in which it is implemented?

(1) Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications (OJ 2005 L 255, p. 22).
(2) Judgment of the Court of 7 May 1991 (Case C-340/89, Irène Vlassopoulou v Ministerium für Justiz, Bundes- und Europaangelegenheiten Baden-Württemberg, ECLI:EU:C:1991:193).
(3) Judgment of the Court (Second Chamber) of 6 October 2015 (Case C-298/14, Alain Laurent Brouillard v Jury du concours de recrutement de référendaires près la Cour de cassation and Belgian State, ECLI:EU:C:2015:652).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Düsseldorf (Germany) lodged on 17 November 2020 — EZ v Iberia Lineas Aereas de Espana, Sociedad Unipersonal

(Case C-606/20)

(2021/C 62/15)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landgericht Düsseldorf