

Operative part of the judgment

1. Article 3(3)(f) of Directive 2011/83/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on consumer rights, amending Council Directive 93/13/EEC and Directive 1999/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 85/577/EEC and Directive 97/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council must be interpreted as meaning that a contract between an architect and a consumer, according to which the former commits to establishing only, for the latter, a project for the construction of a single-family house and, in that context, to preparing plans, is not a contract for the construction of a new building, within the meaning of that provision.
2. Article 2(3) and (4) and Article 16(c) of Directive 2011/83 must be interpreted as meaning that a contract between an architect and a consumer, according to which the former commits to establishing for the latter, in accordance with the latter's specifications and wishes, a project for the construction of a single-family house and, in that context, to preparing plans, is not a contract for the supply of goods made to the consumer's specifications or clearly personalised, within the meaning of that provision.

(¹) OJ C 172, 20.5.2019

Judgment of the Court (Tenth Chamber) of 30 April 2020 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Miskolci Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság — Hungary) — UO v Készenléti Rendőrség

(Case C-211/19) (¹)

(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Social policy — Protection of the safety and health of workers — Directive 2003/88/EC — Scope — Derogation — Article 1(3) — Directive 89/391/EEC — Article 2(2) — Activities of rapid intervention police officers)

(2020/C 240/29)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Miskolci Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: UO

Defendant: Készenléti Rendőrség

Operative part of the judgment

Article 1(3) of Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time must be interpreted as meaning that Article 2(1) and (2) of that directive applies to members of law enforcement agencies carrying out surveillance functions at the external borders of a Member State in the event of an influx of third-country nationals to those borders, except where it appears, having regard to all relevant circumstances, that the tasks carried out are being performed in the context of exceptional events, the gravity and scale of which require the adoption of measures indispensable for the protection of the life, health and safety of the community at large, measures the proper implementation of which would be jeopardised if all the rules laid down in that directive were to be observed, this being a matter for the referring court to determine.

(¹) OJ C 187, 3.6.2019.