

2. Must Clause 4(1) of the framework agreement on fixed-term contracts concluded on 18 March 1999 between the general cross-industry organisations (ETUC, UNICE and CEEP) annexed to Council Directive 1999/70 of 28 June 1999 be interpreted as meaning that both (i) the fact that the period in question has already been taken into account to enable the individual to become a career civil servant and (ii) the design of the civil service career progression arrangements established in national legislation, are objective grounds that justify why a period of service as an interim civil servant undertaken by a permanent civil servant before he or she obtained permanent status should not be taken into account for the purposes of consolidating the individual's personal grade?

(<sup>1</sup>) Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP (OJ 1999 L 175, p. 43).

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunalul Ilfov (Romania) lodged on 26 March 2021 —  
SR v EW**

(Case C-196/21)

(2021/C 263/08)

*Language of the case: Romanian*

**Referring court**

Tribunalul Ilfov

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Appellant-applicant: SR*

*Appellant-defendant: EW*

*Interveners: FB, CX, IK*

**Question referred**

Where a court decides to summon interveners in civil proceedings, is the 'applicant', within the meaning of Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007, (<sup>1</sup>) the court in the Member State which decides to summon the interveners or the litigant in the proceedings pending before that court?

(<sup>1</sup>) Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1348/2000 (OJ 2007 L 324, p. 79).

---

**Appeal brought on 30 March 2021 by Foundation for the Protection of the Traditional Cheese of Cyprus named Halloumi against the judgment of the General Court (Second Chamber) delivered on 20 January 2021 in Case T-328/17 RENV, Foundation for the Protection of the Traditional Cheese of Cyprus named Halloumi v EUIPO — M. J. Dairies (BBQLOUMI)**

(Case C-201/21 P)

(2021/C 263/09)

*Language of the case: English*

**Parties**

*Appellant: Foundation for the Protection of the Traditional Cheese of Cyprus named Halloumi (represented by: S. Malynicz QC, S. Baran, Barrister, V. Marsland, Solicitor)*

*Other parties to the proceedings: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), M. J. Dairies EOOD*

By order of 21 May 2021 of the Vice-President, the Court of Justice held that the appeal is dismissed as inadmissible and that Foundation for the Protection of the Traditional Cheese of Cyprus named Halloumi shall bear its own costs.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Raad voor Vreemdelingenbetwistingen (Belgium) lodged on 9 April 2021 — X, acting in her own name and as legal representative of her minor children, Y and Z v Belgische Staat**

**(Case C-230/21)**

(2021/C 263/10)

*Language of the case: Dutch*

**Referring court**

Raad voor Vreemdelingenbetwistingen

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* X, acting in her own name and as legal representative of her minor children, Y and Z

*Defendant:* Belgische Staat

**Questions referred**

1. Should EU law, in particular Article 2(f), read in conjunction with Article 10(3)(a), of Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification<sup>(1)</sup> be interpreted as meaning that a refugee who is an ‘unaccompanied minor’, and who resides in a Member State, must be ‘unmarried’ under her national law in order to enjoy the right to family reunification with relatives in the direct ascending line?
2. If so, can a refugee minor whose marriage contracted abroad is not recognised for public policy reasons be regarded as an ‘unaccompanied minor’ within the meaning of Articles 2(f) and 10(3) of Directive 2003/86/EC?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ 2003 L 251, p. 12.

---

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Ravensburg (Germany) lodged on 14 April 2021 — SA and Others v Daimler AG**

**(Case C-240/21)**

(2021/C 263/11)

*Language of the case: German*

**Referring court**

Landgericht Ravensburg

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicants:* SA, FT, LH, IL, TN

*Defendant:* Daimler AG