

Question referred

Are national provisions (Articles 2 and 8 of Decree-Law No 61/2000) which impose an obligation on employers to send a copy of part-time employment contracts within 30 days of their conclusion to the competent provincial department of the Labour Inspectorate, which imposes a fine of EUR 15 per employee concerned and per day of delay for failure to do so, and which do not set an upper limit for the administrative fine, compatible with Community law provisions and Directive 97/81/EC of 15 December 1997 ⁽¹⁾?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1998 L 14, p. 9.

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Landesgericht Bozen (Italy) lodged on 1 February 2007 — Ruth Volgger, Othmar Michaeler and Subito GmbH v Labour Inspectorate of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano (now the employment protection office) and Autonomous Province of Bolzano

(Case C-56/07)

(2007/C 95/30)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landesgericht Bozen

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Ruth Volgger, Othmar Michaeler and Subito GmbH

Defendants: Labour Inspectorate of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano (now the employment protection office) and Autonomous Province of Bolzano

Question referred

Are national provisions (Articles 2 and 8 of Decree-Law No 61/2000) which impose an obligation on employers to send a copy of part-time employment contracts within 30 days of their conclusion to the competent provincial department of the Labour Inspectorate, which imposes a fine of EUR 15 per employee concerned and per day of delay for failure to do so, and which do not set an upper limit for the administrative fine, compatible with Community law provisions and Directive 97/81/EC of 15 December 1997 ⁽¹⁾?

⁽¹⁾ OJ 1998 L 14, p. 9.

Action brought on 7 February 2007 — Commission of the European Communities v Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg

(Case C-57/07)

(2007/C 95/31)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Commission of the European Communities (represented by: M. Condou-Durande, Agent)

Defendant: Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg

Form of order sought

- declare that, by failing to adopt the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification ⁽¹⁾, or in any event, by failing to notify the Commission of such measures, the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg has failed to fulfil its obligations under that directive;
- order the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The period for transposing Directive 2003/86/EC expired on 3 October 2005.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 2003 L 251, p. 12.

Action brought on 8 February 2007 — Commission of the European Communities v Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg

(Case C-61/07)

(2007/C 95/32)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Commission of the European Communities (represented by: U. Wölker and J.-B. Laignelot, Agents)

Defendant: Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg