

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Oberster Gerichtshof (Austria) lodged on 21 June 2022 —
DocLX Travel Events GmbH v Verein für Konsumenteninformation**

(Case C-414/22)

(2022/C 359/48)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Oberster Gerichtshof

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant on a point of law: DocLX Travel Events GmbH

Respondent in the appeal on a point of law: Verein für Konsumenteninformation

Questions referred

1. Must Article 12(2) of Directive (EU) 2015/2302 ⁽¹⁾ be interpreted as meaning that the traveller — irrespective of the time of his or her declaration of termination — is in any event entitled to terminate a package free of charge if the unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances significantly affecting the package did in fact occur at the time of the (scheduled) start of the package?
2. Must Article 12(2) of Directive 2015/2302 be interpreted as meaning that the traveller is already entitled to terminate a package free of charge if the occurrence of unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances was to be expected at the time of the declaration of termination?

⁽¹⁾ Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on package travel and linked travel arrangements, amending Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 and Directive 2011/83/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 90/314/EEC (OJ 2015 L 326, p. 1).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal du travail francophone de Bruxelles (Belgium)
lodged on 20 June 2022 — JD v Acerta — Caisse d'assurances sociales ASBL, Institut national
d'assurances sociales pour travailleurs indépendants (Inasti), Belgian State**

(Case C-415/22)

(2022/C 359/49)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Tribunal du travail francophone de Bruxelles

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: JD

Defendants: Acerta — Caisse d'assurances sociales ASBL, Institut national d'assurances sociales pour travailleurs indépendants (Inasti), Belgian State

Question referred

Does the principle of EU law based on a single social security scheme applicable to workers, whether employed or self-employed, active or retired, preclude a Member State of residence from requiring, as in the present case, a retired official of the European Commission, who pursues an activity as a self-employed person, to be subject to its social security scheme and the payment of purely 'solidarity' social security contributions, where the retired official is subject to the compulsory social security scheme of the European Union and does not derive any benefits, be they contributory or non-contributory, from the national scheme to which he or she is subject by force?