

**Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 20 June 2019 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Curtea de Apel București — Romania) — Grup Servicii Petroliere SA v Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală de Soluționare a Contestațiilor, Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală de Administrare a Marilor Contribuabili**

(Case C-291/18) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Common system of value added tax (VAT) — Directive 2006/112/EC — Article 148(a) and (c) — Exemptions related to international transport — Supply of offshore jackup drilling rigs — Concept of ‘vessels used for navigation on the high seas’ — Scope)*

(2019/C 270/13)

*Language of the case: Romanian*

**Referring court**

Curtea de Apel București

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Grup Servicii Petroliere SA

*Defendants:* Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală de Soluționare a Contestațiilor, Agenția Națională de Administrare Fiscală — Direcția Generală de Administrare a Marilor Contribuabili

**Operative part of the judgment**

Article 148(a) and (c) of Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax must be interpreted as meaning that the expression ‘vessels used for navigation on the high seas’ contained in that provision does not apply to the supply of floating structures, such as the offshore jackup drilling rigs of the type at issue in the main proceedings, which are used predominantly in a stationary position to exploit hydrocarbon deposits at sea.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 259, 23.7.2018.

---

**Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 20 June 2019 (request for a preliminary ruling from the arbeidsrechtbank Antwerpen — Belgium) — Tine Vandenbon, Jamina Hakelbracht, Instituut voor de Gelijkheid van Vrouwen en Mannen v WTG Retail BVBA**

(Case C-404/18) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Social policy — Directive 2006/54/EC — Equal treatment of men and women — Access to employment and working conditions — Article 24 — Protection against retaliatory measures — Rejection of a candidate due to her pregnancy — Employee intervening in favour of that candidate — Dismissal of that employee)*

(2019/C 270/14)

*Language of the case: Dutch*

**Referring court**

Arbeidsrechtbank Antwerpen

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicants:* Tine Vandebon, Jamina Hakelbracht, Instituut voor de Gelijkheid van Vrouwen en Mannen

*Defendant:* WTG Retail BVBA

**Operative part of the judgment**

Article 24 of Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation must be interpreted as meaning that it precludes national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, under which, in a situation where a person who believes to be discriminated against on grounds of sex has lodged a complaint, an employee who has supported that person in that context is protected from retaliatory measures taken by the employer solely if that employee has intervened as a witness in the context of the investigation of that complaint and that that employee's witness statement satisfies formal requirements laid down by that legislation.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ C 311, 3.9.2018.

---

**Appeal brought on 15 April 2019 by Associazione Nazionale GranoSalus — Liberi Cerealicoltori & Consumatori (Associazione GranoSalus) against the order of the General Court (First Chamber) delivered on 14 February 2019 in Case T-125/18, Associazione GranoSalus v Commission**

**(Case C-313/19 P)**

(2019/C 270/15)

*Language of the case: Italian*

**Parties**

*Appellant:* Associazione Nazionale GranoSalus — Liberi Cerealicoltori & Consumatori (Associazione GranoSalus) (represented by: G. Dalfino, lawyer)

*Other party to the proceedings:* European Commission

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

1. The appeal against the order of the General Court is based on the infringement of the fourth paragraph of Article 263 TFEU and of Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, read in conjunction with Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights.
2. The appellant, first of all, claims infringement of the fourth paragraph of Article 263 TFEU, in so far as the General Court disregarded the fact that Associazione GranoSalus has standing to bring an action by virtue of the fact that its members have individual standing, since the contested Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2324 'is of direct and individual concern to them' as a 'regulatory act which is of direct concern to them and does not entail implementing measures'.

In that regard, the association claims that the General Court erred in applying the provision in question, in so far as it considered that the condition of individual concern was not met because 'some of the applicant's members are allegedly affected by the contested act in their general capacity as consumers and citizens of the EU' (paragraph 57 of the order).