

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal de première instance de Liège (Belgium) lodged on 3 April 2018 — Pauline Stiernon, Marion Goraguer, Muriel Buccarello, Clémentine Vasseur, Manon Piroton, Anissa Quotb v Etat belge, SPF Santé publique, Communauté française de Belgique

(Case C-237/18)

(2018/C 190/20)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Tribunal de première instance de Liège

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Pauline Stiernon, Marion Goraguer, Muriel Buccarello, Clémentine Vasseur, Manon Piroton, Anissa Quotb

Defendants: Etat belge, SPF Santé publique, Communauté française de Belgique

Question referred

Inasmuch as Royal Order of 02/07/2009 establishing the list of allied health professions does not list psychomotor therapy as an allied health profession, although an undergraduate degree in psychomotor therapy has been established in Belgium, thereby restricting the freedom of movement of persons, the freedom to choose an occupation and the right to engage in work, does [that Royal Order] infringe Articles 20, 21 and 45 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 15 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights?

Appeal brought on 4 April 2018 by Larko Geniki Metalleftiki kai Metallourgiki AE against the judgment of the General Court (Sixth Chamber) delivered on 1 February 2018 in Case T-423/14, Larko v Commission

(Case C-244/18 PP)

(2018/C 190/21)

Language of the case: Greek

Parties

Appellant: Larko Geniki Metalleftiki kai Metallourgiki AE (represented by: I. Dryllerakis, I. Soufleros, E. Triantafyllou, G. Psaroudakis, E. Rantos and N. Korogiannakis, lawyers)

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission

Form of order sought

- Grant the appeal.
- Refer the case back to the General Court for reassessment, reserving the costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of its appeal, the appellant relies on the following four grounds of appeal:

1. **First ground of appeal, alleging infringement of Article 107(1) TFEU in respect of the conclusion that Measure No 3 conferred an advantage on the appellant, misapplying the private investor principle.**