

**Questions referred**

1. Do the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> confer upon the competent authority a discretion to determine the time at which a particular slaughter of animals takes place, in view of its obligation to appoint an official veterinarian for the purposes of carrying out supervision in relation to the slaughter of animals, or is it obliged to appoint such a veterinarian at the time that the slaughter will take place, as determined by the slaughterer?
2. Do the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 confer upon the competent authority a discretion to refuse to appoint an official veterinarian for the carrying out of veterinary supervision of the lawful slaughter of animals when it is informed that the slaughter of animals will take place at a particular time, at a licensed slaughterhouse?

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption (OJ 2004 L 139, p. 206).

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from High Court of Ireland (Ireland) made on 16 July 2013 — Lisa Kelly v Minister for Social Protection**

(Case C-403/13)

(2013/C 274/24)

*Language of the case: English*

**Referring court**

High Court of Ireland

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* Lisa Kelly

*Defendant:* Minister for Social Protection

**Questions referred**

1. Where an employee resident in Member State A and who has been in insurable employment in that State for just short of three years spends the last six months of her insurable employment in Member State B, should that person's subsequent claim for social security payments on account of illness be governed by (i) the law of Member

State B for the purposes of Article 11(3)(a) of Regulation 883/2004/EC <sup>(1)</sup>? or, (ii) by the law of the Member State A where she is resident for the purposes of Article 11(3)(e)?

2. Is it relevant to a consideration of Question 1 that if the law of Member State B is held to be the governing law, then the employee in question is ineligible for any social security payments, whereas this would not be the case if the law of the Member State where she is resident (Member State A) were held to apply?

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems  
OJ L 166, p. 1

**Reference for a preliminary ruling from Supreme Court of the United Kingdom (United Kingdom) made on 16 July 2013 — R on the application of ClientEarth v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs**

(Case C-404/13)

(2013/C 274/25)

*Language of the case: English*

**Referring court**

Supreme Court of the United Kingdom

**Parties to the main proceedings**

*Applicant:* ClientEarth

*Defendant:* Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

**Questions referred**

1. Where, under the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC) <sup>(1)</sup> ('the Directive'), in a given zone or agglomeration conformity with the limit values for nitrogen dioxide was not achieved by the deadline of 1 January 2010 specified in annex XI of the Directive, is a Member State obliged pursuant to the Directive and/or article 4 TEU to seek postponement of the deadline in accordance with article 22 of the Directive?
2. If so, in what circumstances (if any) may a Member State be relieved of that obligation?