



CONSILIUL NATIONAL  
pentru COMBATEREA  
DISCRIMINĂRII


# JURISPRUDENCE

## FREE MOVEMENT OF WORKERS

RESOURCE CASES  
AND MATERIALS



COUR DE JUSTICE  
DE L'UNION  
EUROPÉENNE



## **Jurisprudence. Free movement of workers: resource cases and materials**

This material represents a compilation of resources and information provided primarily through the official web site of the European Union, in particular the EUR-Lex, the European Commission and the Court of Justice of the European Union.

This document is aimed to provide an easy access to information relating to the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union on free movement of workers and reports published by the European Commission on this issue.

The information and texts available on this material may be reproduced provided the source is acknowledged, such as the Eur-lex, the European Commission and the CJEU. Readers should be aware that certain parts of such information and texts might be protected under intellectual property law, in particular by copyright.

The National Council for Combating Discrimination does not hold any related copyrights over the information provided in this document.

National Council for Combating Discrimination

Office for Promoting Monitoring and Supporting Equality of Treatment for EU Workers

# CONTENT

---

- 1.EU Law and selected Reports..... 4
- 2.Selected case law of the European Court of Justice ..... 6
- DEFINION OF WORKERS      6
- FAMILY MEMBERS    9
- EQUAL TREATMENT      12
- SPORTSPERSONS    20
- OBSTACLES TO FREE MOVEMENT    22
- 3. ....Detailed list of selected case law on freedom of movement workers.....27

# 1. EU LAW AND SELECTED REPORTS

---

Primary source of information EUR-Lex Access to European Union Law, an official website of the European Union at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html>

- [Article 45 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.](#)
- [Directive 2014/54/UE](#) on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers.
- [Directive 2014/50/UE](#) minimum requirements for enhancing worker mobility between Member States by improving the acquisition and preservation of supplementary pension rights.
- [Regulation \(UE\) 492/2011](#) of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union, codifying [Regulation \(CEE\) 1612/68](#) and its successive amendments (Regulations 312/76 and 2434/92 and Article 38 para (1) of Directive 2004/38/EC).
- [Directive 2004/38 / CE](#) of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.
- [Directive 98/49 / CE](#) of 29 June 1998 on safeguarding the supplementary pension rights of employed and self-employed persons moving within the Community.
- [Report from the European Commission to the Parliament, The Council and the European Economic and Social Committee of 16 April 2014 on the implementation of Directive 2014/54/EU](#) on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers
- [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee Free movement of EU citizens and their families](#), COM/2013/0837 final
- [Communication from the Commission to the Council, the Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Reaffirming the free movement of workers: rights and major developments](#), COM/2010/0373 final
- [Communication from the Commission to the Council, the Parliament, The Economic and Social Committee on free movement of workers: achieving the full benefits and potential](#), COM/2002/0694 final

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp?langId=en>

- Report on posting of workers, Reference year 2019, published on 2.08.2021, [available in English language](#)
- Annual report on intra-EU labour mobility 2020, published on 8.01.2021, [available in English language](#)
- Annual report on intra-EU labour mobility 2019, published on 30.01.2020, [available in English language](#)
- Annual report on intra-EU labour mobility 2018, published on 08.02.2019, [available in English Language](#)
- The application of free movement of workers and social security coordination rules by national courts, published on 06.07.2020, [available in English language](#)
- Practical guide on posting, published on 27.11.2019, [available in English language](#)
- Recruiting in Europe – a Guide for Employers, published on 24.07.2013, [available in English language](#)
- Finding a job in Europe – a Guide for jobseekers, published on 24.07.2013, [available in English language](#)

Other relevant reports on free movement in European Union

- European Parliament, Fact Sheets on the European Union, Free movement of workers, 2021, [available in English language](#)
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU FRA), Making EU citizens' rights a reality: national courts enforcing freedom of movement and related rights, 2018, report available in [available in English language](#)
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU FRA), Living in another Member State: barriers to EU citizens' full enjoyment of their rights Romania 2017, report [available in English language](#)

Romanian law relating to free movement of workers

- [Law no. 106 of 18 May 2017 \(in Romanian language\)](#) on measures for the improvement of the exercise of rights conferred in the context of free movement of workers in the European Union, on the territory of Romania



## 2. SELECTED CASE LAW OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

---

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, Case law, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=953&langId=en>

### DEFINION OF WORKERS

#### **D.M. Levin v Staatssecretaris van Justitie, C-53/81, 23 March 1982**

In this case the Court explained the concepts of ‘worker’ and ‘activities as an employed person’. These concepts define fundamental freedoms and may not be interpreted restrictively. The rules on the freedom of movement for workers also concern persons who pursue or wish to pursue an activity as an employed person on a part-time basis and who, based on that fact obtain or would obtain only remuneration lower than the minimum guaranteed in this sector. No distinction may be made between those who are satisfied with that income and those who supplement that income. The rules on the free movement of workers cover only the pursuit of effective and genuine activities. Activities which are regarded as purely marginal and ancillary are excluded. The motives of a worker of a Member State seeking employment in another Member State are of no account to his/her right to enter and reside, if he/she pursues or wishes to pursue an effective and genuine activity. [Full text](#)

#### **Elestina Esselina Christina Morson v State of the Netherlands and Head of the Plaatselijke Politie within the meaning of the Vreemdelingenwet; Sweradje Jhanjan v State of the Netherlands, C-35 and 36/82, 27 October 1982**

Nationals of a Member State may only invoke rights of entry and residence if they have already exercised their freedom of movement in order to carry out an economic activity in another Member State. The Court confirmed that the provisions on the freedom of movement for workers can be invoked only if the case comes within the area to which Union law applies. [Full text](#)

### **Deborah Lawrie-Blum v Land Baden-Württemberg, C-66/85, 3 July 1986**

Free movement of workers is a fundamental freedom of all EU nationals. This case is very important because it confirms that principle and provides a definition of who is a worker. While some Member States argued that the definition of a worker is in accordance with their national law, the Court held that the meaning of the term is a common Union one across the Member States. Any EU national who fills the conditions: -for a period of time; -provides services to another person or company; -is under the direction of another person; -receives remuneration for those services is a worker and thus entitled to full range of EU freedoms and rights. [Full text](#)

### **Steven Malcolm Brown v The Secretary of State for Scotland, C-197/86, 21 June 1988**

A worker is a person who pursues an activity which is effective and genuine, with the exclusion of activities on such a small scale as to be regarded as purely marginal and ancillary. The essential characteristic of the employment relationship is that for a certain period of time a person performs services for and under the direction of another person in return for which he/she receives remuneration. Union law does not impose any additional conditions for a person to be a worker. Member States cannot unilaterally make the grant of social advantages, as mentioned in Union law, conditional upon the completion of a given period of occupational activity. A grant awarded for maintenance and for training with a view to the pursuit of university studies, leading to a professional qualification constitutes a social advantage within the meaning of Union law. A national of another Member State who has undertaken university studies in the host State leading to a professional qualification, after having engaged in occupational activity in that State, must be regarded as having kept his/her status as a worker, provided that there is a link between the previous occupational activity and the studies. If it is established that the worker has acquired his/her status exclusively as a result of being accepted for admission to university to undertake the studies, this national will not be entitled to a grant for studies in another Member State. [Full text](#)

### **The Queen v Immigration Appeal Tribunal, ex parte Gustaff Desiderius Antonissen, C-292/89, 26 February 1991**

This case is important, as the Court discussed the freedom of movement of workers and the right of residence of persons who seek employment. The free movement of workers includes the right for nationals of Member States to seek employment in another Member State. However, this can be subject to temporal limitation. After six months, the person may be required to leave the Member State, unless he/she provides

evidence that he/she is continuing to seek employment and that he/she has genuine a chance of finding employment. [Full text](#)

**V.J.M. Raulin v Minister van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, C-357/89, 26 February 1992**

Retention of the status of worker, by a national who leaves his/her employment to pursue full-time studies, is conditional on there being a link between the occupational activities previously pursued in the host Member State and the studies undertaken. There is an exception for migrant workers who have involuntarily become unemployed and are obliged by conditions within the labour market to undergo vocational retraining in another field of activity. Students from another Member State have the right to the same treatment as is accorded to students who are nationals of the host Member State with regard to any assistance intended to cover enrolment fees or other costs, relating to access to education. They cannot claim assistance for maintenance costs. [Full text](#)

**M.J.E. Bernini v Minister van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, C-3/90, 26 February 1992**

A person engaged in preparatory training in the course of occupational training must be regarded as a worker if the training period is completed under the same conditions of genuine and effective activity as an employed person. This cannot be invalidated by the fact that the productivity of the trainee is low, that he/she works only a small number of hours per week and receives limited remuneration. Assistance granted for maintenance and education in order to pursue university studies evidenced by a professional qualification constitutes for the student who benefits a social advantage within the meaning of Union law. In order to retain the status of worker, there has to be a relationship between the previous occupational activity and the studies undertaken. [Full text](#)

**Andrea Raccanelli v Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften eV., C-94/07, 17 July 2008**

The Court ruled that a researcher preparing a doctoral thesis on the basis of a grant contract, must be regarded as a worker according to Union law, if his/her activities are performed for a certain period of time under the direction of an institute forming part of an organisation operating in the public interest and he/she receives remuneration, in return for those activities. The Court confirmed that a private-law association must observe the non-discrimination principle in relation to workers within the meaning of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. [Full text](#)



### ***L.N. v Styrelsen for Videregående Uddannelser og Uddannelsesstøtte, C-46/12, 21 February 2013***

Articles 7(1)(c) and 24(2) of Directive 2004/38/EC must be interpreted as meaning that a EU citizen who pursues a course of studies in a host Member State whilst at the same time pursuing effective and genuine employment activities such as to confer on him the status of ‘worker’ within the meaning of Article 45 TFEU may not be refused maintenance aid for studies which is granted to the nationals of that Member State. The fact that the person entered the territory of the host Member State with the principal intention of pursuing a course of study is not relevant for determining whether he is a ‘worker’ within the meaning of Article 45 TFEU and, accordingly, whether he is entitled to that aid under the same terms as a national of the host Member State under Article 7(2) of Regulation 1612/68. [Full text](#)

## **FAMILY MEMBERS**

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, Case law, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=953&langId=en>

### ***Aissatou Diatta v Land Berlin, C-267/83, 13 February 1985***

This case concerned persons who are married, but no longer living together. The Court ruled that a marital relationship cannot be regarded as dissolved, as long as it has not been terminated by the competent authority. If persons live separately the marriage is not dissolved, even if they have the intention to divorce at a later date. Consequently, to qualify for a right of residence as a family member under Regulation No 1612/68 (Article 10), it was not necessary to live permanently with the worker. [Full text](#)

### ***State of the Netherlands v Ann Florence Reed, C-59/85, 17 April 1986***

This case concerned the residence rights of unmarried partners. The concept of ‘spouse’ in Article 10 of Regulation No 1612/68 referred to a marital relationship. As a consequence an unmarried partner had no right of residence based on this Regulation. The social developments of the Member State were invoked in this case. However, the Court ruled that an interpretation of a legal term on the basis of these developments must take into consideration the situation within the whole Union, not just in one State. Furthermore the Court stated that the right to be accompanied by

an unmarried companion is a social advantage and governed by the principle of non-discrimination. It follows that a Member State cannot grant an advantage to its own nationals and refuse it to other EU workers based on their nationality. [Full text](#)

**G.B.C. Echternach and A. Moritz v Minister van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, 389/87 and 390/87, 15 March 1989**

In this case, the parent of a child returned to the Member State of origin. The child could not continue his/her studies in the host Member State because there was no coordination of school diplomas and he/she had no choice but to return to the country where he attended school in order to continue studying. The Court held that in this situation a child of a Union worker retains the status of member of a worker's family within the meaning of Regulation No 1612/68. [Full text](#)

**The Queen v Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Surinder Singh, ex parte Secretary of State for Home Department, C-370/90, 7 July 1992**

This case confirmed an EU residence right for the spouse of a national who returns to his/her Member State of origin. This right of residence arises from Union law and prevents a situation of reverse discrimination. This is important since a national could be deterred from leaving his/her country to pursue an activity in another Member State if his/her spouse and children would not be permitted to enter and reside in his/her Member State of origin afterwards. [Full text](#)

**Land Nordrhein-Westfalen v Kari Uecker and Vera Jacquet v Land Nordrhein-Westfalen, C-64/96 and C-65/96, 5 June 1997**

The rules on free movement cannot be applied in respect of an EU citizen, national of the host Member State, who has never exercised the right to free movement within the Union, since this is an internal situation. As a consequence, in this situation a member of the family of the worker cannot rely on Union law since the worker has not exercised his/her free movement right. [Full text](#)

**Belgian State v Fatna Mesbah, C-179/98 11 November 1999**

This case confirmed that Member States must have regard to EU law, when exercising their powers in the sphere of nationality. In this case, the family members were dual Moroccan and EU nationals. Since they had been naturalised, they could not rely on their Moroccan nationality to fall under the equal treatment provision on social security in Article 41 EC-Morocco Cooperation Agreement. The term 'members of the family' in Article 41 EC-Morocco Cooperation Agreement includes persons having a close family relationship with the worker. This concerns relatives in the ascending line,

including those related to the worker by marriage. However, these persons have to live actually with the worker. [Full text](#)

***Blaise Baheten Metock and Others v Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform, C-127/08, 25 July 2008***

The extra condition of previous lawful residence in the EU restricting the free movement of third-country national family members of EU migrants is incompatible with the text and the aim of Directive 2004/38/EC and with the objective of the internal market. It is irrelevant whether the marriage was concluded before or after the Union citizen migrated to the host Member State, where the marriage was concluded and whether the third-country national entered the host Member State before or after the marriage. [Full text](#)

***London Borough of Harrow v Nimco Hassan Ibrahim and Secretary of State for the Home Department, C-310/08, 23 February 2010***

In circumstances such as those of the main proceedings in this case, the children of a national of a Member State who works or has worked in the host Member State and the parent who is their primary carer can claim a right of residence in the latter State on the sole basis of Article 12 of Regulation No 1612/68, without such a right being conditional on their having sufficient resources and comprehensive sickness insurance cover in that State. [Full text](#)

***Maria Teixeira v London Borough of Lambeth and Secretary of State for the Home Department, C-480/08, 23 February 2010***

The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer of a child exercising the right to pursue his/her education in accordance with Article 12 of Regulation No 1612/68 is not conditional on that parent having sufficient resources so as not to become a burden on the social assistance system of that Member State during the period of residence and having comprehensive sickness insurance cover there. The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer for a child of a migrant worker, where that child is in education in that State, is not conditional on one of the child's parents having worked as a migrant worker in that Member State on the date on which the child started in education. The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer for a child of a migrant worker, where that child is in education in that State, ends when the child reaches the age of majority, unless the child continues to need the presence and care of that parent in order to be able to pursue and complete his/her education. [Full text](#)

## EQUAL TREATMENT

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, Case law, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=953&langId=en>

### **Württembergische Milchverwertung-Südmilch AG v Salvatore Ugliola, C-15/69, 15 October 1969**

The Court confirmed that the free movement of workers requires the abolition of any discrimination based on nationality between workers of the Member States. This concerns employment, remuneration and other conditions of work and employment. A rule of national law protecting workers from unfavourable consequences arising out of absence through obligations for military service must also be applied to the nationals of other Member States employed in the territory of the host State, who are subject to military service in their country of origin. [Full text](#)

### **Pieter Marsman v M. Roskamp, C-44/72, 13 December 1972**

This case concerned the special protection against dismissal in the case of a worker who is more than 50% incapacitated to work as a result of an industrial accident. To obtain this protection, it was required that the worker in question has his/her residence on the territory of the Member State in question. This condition was only required for migrant workers and not for national workers. The Court concluded that this requirement infringed the non-discrimination principle. [Full text](#)

### **Giovanni Maria Sotgiu v Deutsche Bundespost, C-152/73, 12 February 1974**

In this case the Court considered that the rules regarding equality of treatment within Union law prohibit overt discrimination because of nationality. Furthermore all covert forms of discrimination which, by application of other criteria of differentiation, lead in fact to the same result are forbidden. [Full text](#)

### **Jean Reyners v Belgian State, C-2/74, 21 June 1974**

This case concerned equal treatment as a fundamental legal provision of the Union. The Court ruled on the public service derogation based on the exercise of official authority. The Court held that for the application of this derogation there has to be a direct and specific connection with the exercise of official authority. The tasks that advocates carry out cannot be considered as being connected with the exercise of

official authority since the exercise of those activities leaves intact the discretion of judicial authority and the free exercise of judicial power. [Full text](#)

### **Johannes Henricus Maria van Binsbergen v Bestuur van de Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Metaalnijverheid, C-33/74, 3 December 1974**

This case concerns the right of EU nationals to provide services across EU borders without being discriminated against in comparison with nationals of that State. The Court's judgment is important because it confirms the rule that service providers from any Member State must be able to compete with national service providers on a level playing field. Furthermore, even obstacles to service provisions which do not discriminate on the basis of nationality will need to be justified by the authorities of the Member State. [Full text](#)

### **Josette Pecastaing v Belgian State, C-98/79, 5 March 1980**

A legal remedy may not be conditional on particular requirements as to form or procedure, which are less favourable than those applicable in proceedings brought against the administration of the Member State by its own nationals. [Full text](#)

### **Françoise Gravier v City of Liège, C-293/83, 13 February 1985**

This case concerned the access of EU nationals to education and vocational training. Access to and participation in courses of instruction and apprenticeship are not unconnected with Union law. In this case, the Member State concerned obliged students, who are nationals of other Member States, to pay a charge or a registration fee as a condition of access to vocational training. This fee was not imposed on students who are nationals of the host Member State. This unequal treatment based on nationality must be regarded as prohibited discrimination. [Full text](#)

### **Vera Hoeckx v Centre public d'aide social de Kalmthout, C-249/83, 27 March 1985**

In this case the Court ruled that EU citizens working and residing in another Member State have the right to claim the same social advantages as nationals of that Member State. A temporal residence requirement is incompatible with Regulation 1612/68. Such a requirement implies an additional condition imposed on workers who are nationals of a Member State. This constitutes direct discrimination on the basis of nationality. [Full text](#)

### **Ian William Cowan v Trésor public, C-186/87, 2 February 1989**

This case confirmed that discrimination on grounds of nationality is also forbidden for tourists as they are recipients of services. This prohibition means that persons may not be subject to conditions, such as residing on the territory of that State, if these

conditions are not obligatory for own nationals. Furthermore the right to equal treatment may not be subject to the issue of a certificate. In this case the right to compensation for a victim of an assault had to be granted. [Full text](#)

### **Mario Vicente Micheletti and others v Delegación del Gobierno en Cantabria, C-369/90, 7 July 1992**

This case confirmed that the freedom of establishment applies to nationals of a Member State irrespective of whether or not the individual also holds a non-EU nationality as well. The Court underlined that matters of nationality are within the exclusive competence of the Member States. However, as long as an individual holds the nationality of another Member State, the host Member State must accord the right. [Full text](#)

### **Ingetraut Scholz v Opera Universitaria di Cagliari and Cinzia Porcedda, C-419/92, 23 February 1994**

This case confirmed that the principle of (direct and indirect) non-discrimination also concerns the public service. It is applicable to any Union national who has exercised the right to freedom of movement for workers and who has been employed in another Member State. The place of residence and the nationality of this national are irrelevant. [Full text](#)

### **Raymond Vander Elst v Office des Migrations Internationales, C-43/93, 9 August 1994**

The Court confirmed that all discrimination on the ground of nationality has to be eliminated with regard to the free movement of services. Any restriction, when liable to prohibit or otherwise impede the activities of a service provider established in another Member State (where he/she lawfully provides similar services) should be abolished. This means that an EU employer is also entitled to send non-EU nationals to provide services, as temporary posted workers in another Member State, provided that: -the third country national is lawfully resident in the same Member State as his/her employer; -the employee is lawfully and habitually employed by an employer who is providing a cross-border service; -the cross-border service must be of a temporary nature. [Full text](#)

### **Ingrid Boukhalfa v Bundesrepublik Deutschland, C-214/94, 30 April 1996**

This case concerns the applicable rules regarding the international posting of an EU national. Provisions of Union law may apply to professional activities outside the Union. A Union law element can be found to exist even where the contract is concluded within the territory of the EU, but performed outside the EU territory, once the



employment relationship is governed by the law of a Member State. As a result the prohibition of discrimination based on nationality is applicable to any employment relationship which is governed by the law of a Member State. [Full text](#)

### **John O’Flynn v Adjudication Officer, C-237/94, 23 May 1996**

This case confirmed that the principle of freedom of workers also applies to social allowances. Migrant workers must enjoy those advantages under the same conditions as national workers. The Court held that the rule of equal treatment prohibits all forms of discrimination. If conditions affect basically migrant workers without making a direct distinction on the basis of nationality they are indirectly discriminatory. Conditions are also considered as indirectly discriminatory if they can more easily be satisfied by national workers than by migrant workers. Such provisions can be justified if they are objective and proportionate. [Full text](#)

### **Maria Martínez Sala v Freistaat Bayern, C-85/96, 12 May 1998**

This is the first case on the meaning of EU Citizenship, the fundamental status of nationals of Member States. The Court ruled that nationals of a Member State can rely on their European citizenship for protection against discrimination on grounds of nationality by another Member State. A residence permit can only have a declaratory and probative force with regard to the recognition of the right of residence. The possession of a permit may not be a requirement for the right to a benefit, if it is not required that own nationals produce any document of that kind. This would be unequal treatment. [Full text](#)

### **C.P.M. Meeusen v Hoofddirectie van de Informatie Beheer Groep, C-337/97, 8 June 1999**

In this case, national legislation did not impose any residence requirement on the children of national workers for the financing of studies. However this requirement was applied to the children of workers who are nationals of other Member States. This was held to be discriminatory. The principle of equal treatment prevents discrimination to the detriment of descendants who are dependent on a self-employed worker. [Full text](#)

### **Roman Angonese v Cassa di Risparmio di Bolzano SpA, C-281/98, 6 June 2000**

A private (banking) undertaking may not make employment conditional upon possession of a certificate of bilingualism issued only in one province of a Member State. The principle of freedom of movement for workers which prohibits discrimination on grounds of nationality applies not only to Member States, but also to private

undertakings. It may be legitimate to require an applicant for a post to have a certain level of linguistic knowledge. The possession of a diploma may constitute a criterion for assessing that knowledge. However, the requirement to provide evidence of his/her linguistic knowledge exclusively by means of one particular diploma, issued in one particular province of a Member State, constitutes discrimination on grounds of nationality. [Full text](#)

### **Rudy Grzelczyk and Centre public d'aide sociale d'Ottignies-Louvain-la-Neuve, C-184/99, 20 September 2001**

This judgment ruled on the right of a student residing in another Member State. It confirms that discrimination on the ground of nationality is not permitted against EU citizens who have exercised their rights of free movement. This case states that Union citizenship is destined to be the fundamental status of nationals of Member States. This enables these nationals, who find themselves in the same situation, to enjoy the same treatment in law irrespective of their nationality, subject to such exceptions as are expressly provided for. Consequently a student can enjoy the benefit of a social advantage, as long as he/she does not become an unreasonable burden on the public finances. Union students do not lose their Union rights if they move to another Member State to study there. It may be required from these students that they guarantee the relevant national authority that they have sufficient resources for their period of residence, that they are enrolled in a recognised educational establishment and that they are covered by sickness insurance. [Full text](#)

### **Marie-Nathalie D'Hoop and Office national de l'emploi, C-224/98, 11 July 2002**

This case is important since the Court broadened its reasoning regarding migrating nationals of the Member States to include own nationals returning to their Member State of nationality. It follows from this judgment that it is prohibited for a Member State to discriminate against its own students who have exercised their right of free movement as students. The national legislature may require that there is a real link between the applicant for an allowance and the geographic employment market concerned. The Court held that it would be contrary to the right of freedom of movement if a citizen, in the Member State of which he/she is a national, receives treatment less favourable than he/she would enjoy if he/she had not made use of his/her freedom of movement. It is inequality of treatment if a Member State links the access to allowances to the condition of having obtained the required diploma in its territory. As a result, nationals educated in another Member State would be placed at a disadvantage. [Full text](#)

### **Isabel Burbaud v Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité, C-285/01, 9 September 2003**

A host Member State may not refuse entry to a regulated profession to a national of a Member State who holds the qualifications necessary for exercise of that profession in another Member State, although he/she had not passed the national entrance examination. This would place nationals of other Member States at a disadvantage and would restrain them from exercising their rights, as workers, to the freedom of movement. This obstacle is incompatible with Union law. The diploma obtained in one Member State has to be equivalent to the required diploma in another Member State, for employment in the hospital public service. [Full text](#)

### **Carlos Garcia Avello and État belge, C-148/02, 2 October 2003**

The Court held that rules governing a person's surname have to comply with Union law. This case is important since it has extended the right to non-discrimination based on nationality to rules of private international law. The principle of non-discrimination requires that comparable situations must not be treated differently and that different situations must not be treated in the same way. However, deviation from this principle of non-discrimination is possible through objective considerations independent of the nationality of the persons concerned. Moreover, it has to be proportionate to the legitimately followed objective. [Full text](#)

### **Christine Morgenbesser v Consiglio dell'Ordine degli avvocati di Genova, C-313/01, 13 November 2003**

The Court examined when a profession must be regarded as regulated within the meaning of Union law. This is the case if access to, or pursuit of, a professional activity is governed by laws, regulations or administrative provisions that create a system under which that professional activity is expressly reserved for those who fulfil certain conditions and access to it is prohibited to those who do not fulfil these conditions. The host Member State must compare diplomas and take into account the differences between national legal systems. In appropriate cases, the Member State may require the national to show that he/she has acquired the learning and skill that he/she is lacking. [Full text](#)

### **Michel Trojani v Centre public d'aide sociale de Bruxelles (CPAS), C-456/02, 7 September 2004**

A worker is any person who pursues activities which are real and genuine, with the exclusion of activities on such a small scale as to be regarded as purely marginal and ancillary. If activities constitute merely rehabilitation or integration for the person concerned, this cannot be regarded as a real and genuine economic activity. The

national court has to examine whether the services performed are regarded as forming part of the normal labour market. [Full text](#)

A Union citizen, who is not economically active, may rely on the non-discrimination principle where he/she has been lawfully resident in the host Member State for a certain time or possesses a residence permit. In such circumstances, Member States may make the residence of a Union citizen who is not economically active, conditional on his/her having sufficient resources.

#### **The Queen (on the application of Dany Bidar) v London Borough of Ealing, Secretary of State for Education and Skills, C-209/03, 15 March 2005**

In this case the Court confirmed that a student can rely on the right to equal treatment during his/her residence in a host Member State. Member States may require students to guarantee that they have sufficient financial funds, so they will not become an unreasonable burden. However they may not require that those funds cover the entire period of stay. Member States are allowed to grant assistance only to students who have demonstrated a certain degree of integration into the society of that State, for example by finding that the student has resided in the host Member State for a certain length of time. In this case the requirement of three years' residence was allowed. [Full text](#)

#### **Office national de l'emploi v Ioannis Ioannidis, C-258/04, 15 September 2005**

In this case the Court confirms that nationals of a Member State who are seeking employment in another Member State fall within the scope of Union law. The Court considers that a condition, which links the grant of an allowance to the requirement that the applicant has obtained the required diploma in that Member State, can be met more easily by the nationals of that Member State. However, this difference in treatment can be justified if it is based on objective considerations which are independent of the nationality of the persons concerned and proportionate to the aim legitimately pursued by the national law. The Court confirmed that the national legislature can require that there is a real link between the applicant for the allowance and the geographic employment market concerned. Nonetheless, it is too general and exclusive if this single condition concerns the place where the diploma of completion of secondary education was obtained. This goes beyond what is necessary for the objective followed. [Full text](#)

#### **Gertraud Hartmann v Freistaat Bayern, C-212/05, 18 July 2007**

In this case, the Court ruled that a national of a Member State who worked within one Member State, but had transferred his/her residence to another Member State is to be considered a frontier worker within the meaning of Regulation No 1612/68. Therefore,

he/she cannot be excluded from access to the social advantages to which nationals of the Member State of origin are entitled. The Court considers that a residence condition is indirectly discriminatory when it affects migrant workers or their spouses more than it affects national workers, and if there is a consequent risk that it will place the migrant workers or their spouses at a particular disadvantage. [Full text](#)

### **R.H.H. Renneberg v Staatssecretaris van Financiën, C-527/06, 16 October 2008 Full text**

In this case direct tax law is discussed. In the absence of unifying or harmonising measures at Union level, the Member States retain their competence. This does not mean that Member States are entitled to impose measures that contravene the freedoms of movement guaranteed by the Treaty. A difference in treatment in respect of a tax advantage between residents and non-residents may constitute discrimination where there is no objective difference between the situations, which would justify that difference.

### **European Commission v. The Netherlands, C-542/09, 14 June 2012**

By requiring that migrant workers and dependent family members have to comply with a requirement of lawful residence in the Netherlands during at least three out of the six years preceding enrolment at a higher education establishment abroad, the Netherlands has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 45 TFEU and Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1612/68 (now Regulation (EC) No 492/2011). This requirement establishes inequality of treatment between Dutch workers and migrant workers residing in the Netherlands or employed in that Member State as frontier workers. [Full text](#)

### **Elodie Giersch and Others v État du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, C-20/12, 20 June 2013**

Refusal to grant the aid to students, who are European Union citizens not residing in the Member State concerned, whose father or mother as a frontier worker works in that Member State. Such a residence condition constitutes indirect discrimination on grounds of nationality. It can be an appropriate tool for attaining the objective of increasing the number of (in casu) Luxembourg residents with a higher education degree but according to the Court of Justice the system was too exclusive in nature as it imposes a condition of prior residence. The court suggests alternative solutions such as a system of loans where the grant or reimbursement of the loan are conditional upon future work in Luxembourg or a condition according to which the recipient's parents must have worked in the member State for a certain period of time. [Full text](#)

## SPORTSPERSONS

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, Case law, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=953&langId=en>

**B.N.O. Walrave, L.J.N. Koch v. international cycle Union Association, Koninklijke Nederlandsche Wielren Unie and Federación Española Ciclismo, C-36/74, 12 December 1974**

This case concerned a rule according to which a cyclist and his pace maker had to be of the same nationality. The Court held that sport was only subject to Community law when it constitutes an economic activity, whether exercised by professional athletes or amateur athletes. If the sport involves gainful employment, it will fall within the scope of Article 45 TFEU. There is an exception to the general rule of non-discrimination for the matches, which are purely of sporting, rather than of economic interest. [Full text](#)

**Gaetano Donà v. Maria Mantero, C-13/76, 14 July 1976**

This case confirmed the judgment in the Walrave case. It stressed that nationals of another Member States may not be excluded from (semi-)professional sports activities only on the basis of their nationality. [Full text](#)

**Union royale belge des sociétés de football association ASBL v Jean-Marc Bosman, Royal club liégeois Sa v Jean-Marc Bosman and others and Union des associations européennes de football (UEFA) v Jean-Marc Bosman, C-415/93, 15 December 1995**

In this case the Court discussed that sports is subject to Union law if it constitutes an economic activity. The transfer rules laid down by sporting associations have to be in conformity with the principle of freedom of movement for workers. The Court considered that the players' opportunities for finding employment are affected by the discussed transfer rules. As a result the freedom of movement of players who wish to practise their activity in another Member State is restricted and such an obstacle is prohibited by Article 45 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. This case allowed professional players to move freely to another club in the EU at the end of the term of their contract. [Full text](#)



**Deutscher Handbalbund eV v. Maros Kolpak, C-438/00, 8 May 2003**

This case is about the discrimination of a Slovak professional handball player whose exclusion by the German Handball Federation on the basis of nationality violated the non-discrimination clause in Article 38(1) of the EC-Slovakia Association Agreement, although this provision did not set out a principle of free movement of Slovak workers. [Full text](#)

**Igor Simutenkov v. Ministerio of Educación Cultura and Real Federación Española de Fútbol, C-265/03, 12 April 2005**

This case concerned a Russian football player who is lawfully employed by a club established in a Member State, whose exclusion on the basis of his nationality from playing in the Spanish football league was held to be a violation of the non-discrimination clause in Article 23(1) of the EC-Russia Partnership Agreement. [Full text](#)

**David Meca-Medina and Igor Majcen v Commission of the European Communities, C-519/04, 18 July 2006**

The Court ruled that International Olympic Committee's rules on doping control fall within the scope of Union competition law. These rules may not go beyond what is necessary to ensure the proper conduct of competitive sport. Sport is subject to Union law if it constitutes an economic activity. The penal nature of the rules at issue and the magnitude of the penalties applicable if they are breached, are capable of producing adverse effects on competition. [Full text](#)

**Olympique Lyonnais SASP v Olivier Bernard and Newcastle UFC, C-325/08, 16 March 2010**

This case concerned a scheme providing for the payment of compensation for training where a young player, at the end of his training, signs a professional contract with a club other than the one that had trained him. The Court confirms that sport is subject to European Union law in so far as it constitutes an economic activity. The Court ruled that such a scheme can, in principle, be justified by the objective of encouraging the recruitment and training of young players. However, this scheme must be suitable to ensure the attainment of this objective and may not go beyond what is necessary to attain it. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by taking into account of the costs borne by the clubs in training both future professional players and those who will never play professionally. [Full text](#)

### **TopFit eV and Daniele Biffi v Deutscher Leichtathletikverband eV C-22/18, 13 June 2019**

This case concerned the participation of a national from another Member State in German amateur sports champions of athletics for the senior category. The person concerned resides and is economically active in Germany. The Court interpreted articles 18, 21 and 165 TFEU. The court remembered that the rules of national sports associations which govern the access of EU citizens to sports competitions are subjected to the respect of the fundamental freedoms and prohibition of discrimination as stipulated in the EU Treaties (art 18 and 21 TFEU.) However, the Court concluded that some restrictions on the participation of foreign athletes to national championships could be justified if based on objective considerations and proportionality. [Full text](#)

## OBSTACLES TO FREE MOVEMENT

Primary source of information European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Moving & working in Europe, Case law, an official website of the European Union available at <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=953&langId=en>

### **Graziana Luisi and Giuseppe Carbone v Ministero del Tesoro, C-286/82 and 26/83, 31 January 1984**

This case concerned the freedom of services. Services fall within the Treaty if they are normally provided for remuneration, in so far as they are not governed by the provisions relating to freedom of movement for goods, capital and persons. The provider and the recipient of a service have a right of residence during the period in which the service is provided. The freedom to provide services includes the freedom for the recipients of services to go to another Member State in order to receive medical treatment. [Full text](#)

### **Ministere Public v Robert Heinrich Maria Mutsch, C-137/84, 11 July 1985**

This case concerned the right of a migrant worker to have his/her court trial conducted in his/her own language. This right plays an important role in the integration of a migrant worker and his/her family into the host State and consequently in achieving the objective of free movement for workers. This right must be considered as a social advantage within the meaning of Union law. [Full text](#)

### **Udo Steymann v Staatssecretaris van Justitie, C-196/87, 5 October 1988**

The Court accepted that remuneration can be in other forms than money, for example, services provided by the employer to the employee. In this case activities were performed by members of a religious community, as part of commercial activities of that community. Those activities constitute economic activities within the meaning of the Treaty in so far as the services may be considered as the indirect compensation for genuine and effective work. [Full text](#)

### **Anita Groener v Minister for Education and the City of Dublin Vocational Educational Committee, C-379/87, 28 November 1989**

Union law does not prohibit the adoption of a policy for the protection and promotion of a language of a Member State, which is both the national language and the first official language. The restriction may not be disproportionate to the aim pursued or unnecessarily discriminatory towards other Member State nationals. The principle of non-discrimination precludes the imposition of any requirement that the linguistic knowledge must have been obtained in the national territory. [Full text](#)

### **Rush Portuguesa Ld v Office national d'immigration, C-113/89, 27 March 1990**

In this case the free movement principles regarding a recently acceded Member State are discussed. In this situation the freedom of movement of workers was limited by the Act of Accession since the transitional period had not ended. The freedom of services is not subject to transitional provisions. The rules on services are applicable if workers move temporarily to provide services for their employer. These workers return to their country of origin at the end of their employment. They do not gain access to the labour market of the host Member State. Thus, it is the employer's right to service provision that is exercised, not a worker's right to free movement. [Full text](#)

### **Stichting Collectieve Antennevoorziening Gouda and others v Commissariaat voor de Media, C-288/89, 25 July 1991**

Indistinctly applicable national rules which restrict the freedom guaranteed by the Treaty in the field of services come within the scope of the Treaty. However, the application of such rules to foreign persons providing services is not justified by overriding reasons relating to the public interest or if the requirements embodied in those rules are already satisfied by the rules imposed on those persons in the Member States in which they are established. [Full text](#)

### **Dieter Kraus v Land Baden-Württemberg, C-19/92, 31 March 1993**

This case explained the conditions under which limitations to the fundamental freedoms can be justified. The Court confirmed that Member States remain competent to regulate a subject which is not yet harmonised, as in this case the use of a postgraduate academic title obtained in another Member State. However, national law may not be an obstacle to the effective exercise of the fundamental freedoms of movement for persons and the rights of establishment. As a result, these rules have to pursue a legitimate objective and have to be justified by pressing reasons of public interest. [Full text](#)

### **Brian Francis Collins v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, C-138/02, 23 March 2004**

This case concerns job-seekers. The Court confirmed that a benefit of a financial nature to facilitate access to employment in the labour market of a Member State falls within the meaning of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The Court pointed out that a Member State may grant a job-seeker's allowance dependent upon a requirement, if this requirement is based on objective considerations that are independent of nationality and is proportionate to a legitimate aim. In this case the requirement of a genuine link between the person seeking work and the employment market of that State was acceptable. [Full text](#)

### **Gérald De Cuyper v Office national de l'emploi, C-406/04, 18 July 2006**

This case concerned the compatibility of national unemployment legislation with the freedom of movement and residence. The Court confirmed that the right of residence is not unconditional; it can be subject to limitations and conditions. The condition of a residence clause for an unemployment allowance is not prohibited. A condition can be justified by objective considerations of public interest and it has to be proportionate. This residence clause reflects the need to monitor the circumstances of unemployed persons. [Full text](#)

### **D.P.W. Hendrix v Raad van Bestuur van Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen, C-287/05, 11 September 2007**

This case concerned access to non-contributory disability benefits. The Court considered these benefits to be social advantages within the meaning of Union law (Regulation No 1612/68). The Court held that it is permissible to reserve such a special non-contributory disability benefit, listed in annex IIa of Regulation 1408/71 to persons who reside in the territory of the Member State which provides the benefit. However a condition of residence can be put forward only if it is objectively justified and proportionate to the objective pursued by national legislation. [Full text](#)

**Athanasios Vatsouras and Josif Koupatantze v Arbeitsgemeinschaft (ARGE) Nürnberg 900, C-22/08 and C-23/08, 4 June 2009**

In this case the Court confirmed that the concept of worker is independent from the limited amount of remuneration and the short duration of the professional activity. Further, it ruled that a job-seeker is entitled to receive any benefit of a financial nature intended to facilitate access to employment. Such a benefit is not social assistance, which Member States may refuse to job-seekers. To receive a benefit the job-seeker can be required to have established genuine links with the labour market of the Member State, for example by showing that he/she has actually sought work in that Member State for a reasonable period. [Full text](#)

**Nicolas Bressol and Others, Céline Chaverot and Others v. Gouvernement de la Communauté française, C-73/08, 13 April 2010**

According to the Court, national legislation, such as that at issue in C-73/08, which limits the number of students not residing in Belgium who may enrol for the first time in medical and paramedical courses in higher education establishments is contrary to Articles 18 and 21 TFEU, unless the referring court finds that such legislation is justified in the light of the objective of protection of public health. [Full text](#)

**Maurits Casteels v British Airways plc, C-379/09, 10 March 2011**

According to the Court, Article 45 TFEU obliges national supplementary pension schemes to take into account the years of service completed by a worker for the same employer in establishments of that employer situated in different Member States and pursuant to the same coordinating contract of employment when determining periods for the acquisition of a supplementary pension in that Member State. A worker who has been transferred from an establishment of his employer in one Member State to an establishment of the same employer in another Member State is not regarded as having left the employer of his own free will. [Full text](#)

**A. Salemink v. Raad van bestuur van het Uitvoeringsinstituut werknemersverzekeringen, C-347/10, 17 January 2012**

National legislation, which lays down that it is the residence criterion which determines whether an employee working on a gas-drilling platform on the continental shelf adjacent to a Member State may benefit from compulsory insurance in that Member State, is contrary to Regulation 1408/71 (now Regulation (EC) No 883/2004). This regulation, together with Article 45 TFEU, must be interpreted as precluding an employee in this situation from being in a position in which he is not compulsorily insured under national statutory employee insurance in that Member State (in casu The

Netherlands) solely on the grounds that he is not resident there but in another Member State (in casu Spain). [Full text](#)

### **Zentralbetriebsrat der gemeinnützigen Salzburger Landeskliniken Betriebs GmbH v Land Salzburg C-514/12, 5 December 2013**

In this case, the Court ruled that article 45 TFEU and Article 7(1) of Regulation No 492/2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union must be interpreted as precluding national legislation under which, in determining the reference date for the purposes of the advancement of an employee of a local or regional authority to the next pay step in his grade, all uninterrupted periods of service completed with that authority has to be taken into account, but of only a proportion of any other periods of service. Such legislation is liable to restrict freedom of movement for workers, an effect which is in principle prohibited by Article 45 TFEU and Article 7(1) of Regulation No 492/2011. Legislation of that kind cannot be accepted unless it pursues one of the legitimate aims listed in the Treaty or is justified by overriding reasons in the public interest. Even so, application of that measure still has to be such as to ensure achievement of the objective in question and must not go beyond what is necessary for that purpose. [Full text](#)













### **Adelheid Krahn v Universität Wien, C-703/17, 10 October 2019**







This case concerned the rules of a university of a Member State which, for the purposes of grading the salaries of its lecturers, limit the account to be taken of previous periods of professionally equivalent service completed in another Member State. The Court concluded that the limitation on the recognition of previous periods of professionally relevant experience completed in another Member State for determining the entry salary for the migrant worker is possible only if the limitation applies equally to national and migrant workers and the work-related experience from another Member State is not fully comparable with the new employment position. In the case, the previous professional experience is comparable or even identical with the new position, the working experience completed in another Member State shall be fully taken into account for determining the initial salary in the host Member State. [Full text](#)





































































### 3. DETAILED LIST OF SELECTED CASE LAW ON FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT WORKERS

Primary source of information Court of Justice of the European Union, Case law, Search form relating to "free movement of workers" available at <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/recherche.jsf?language=en>







Case	Judgment	Date	Name of parties	Subject matter	Curia	EUR-Lex
C-499/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2022:93	10/02/2022	DIMCO Dimovasili M.I.K.E.	Approximation of legislation		
C-788/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2022:55	27/01/2022	Commission/Spain	Free movement workers		
C-274/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:1022	16/12/2021	Prefettura di Massa Carrara	Discrimination		
C-372/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:962	25/11/2021	Finanzamt Österreich	Free movement workers		
C-168/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:907	11/11/2021	MH and ILA	Freedom to establishment		
C-598/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:810	06/10/2021	Conacee	Freedom to establishment		
C-930/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:657	02/09/2021	Belgium state	EU citizenship		
C-718/18	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:662	02/09/2021	Commission/Germany	Freedom to establishment		
C-709/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:602	15/07/2021	The Department for Communities in Northern Ireland	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
C-535/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:595	15/07/2021	A	EU citizenship		
C-719/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:506	22/06/2021	Staatssecretaris van Justitie en Veiligheid	Right to entry and residence		
C-718/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:505	22/06/2021	Ordre des barreaux francophones and germanophone and others	Right to entry and residence		
C-194/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:436	03/06/2021	Stadt Duisburg	Free movement workers		
C-784/19	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:427	03/06/2021	TEAM POWER EUROPE	Free movement workers		
C-27/20	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:383	12/05/2021	CAF	Free movement workers		

<b>C-407/19</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2021:107	11/02/2021	Katoen Natie Bulk Terminals General Services Antwerp	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-218/19</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:1034	17/12/2020	Onofrei	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-626/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:1000	08/12/2020	Poland/Parliament and Council	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-620/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:1001	08/12/2020	Hungary/Parliament and Council	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-815/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:976	01/12/2020	Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-181/19</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:794	06/10/2020	Jobcenter Krefeld	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-724/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:743	22/09/2020	Cali Apartments	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-168/19</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:338	30/04/2020	Istituto nazionale della previdenza sociale	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 
<b>C-710/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:299	23/04/2020	Land Niedersachsen	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-830/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:275	02/04/2020	Landkreis Südliche Weinstraße	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-802/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2020:269	02/04/2020	Caisse pour l'avenir des enfants	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-465/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:1125	19/12/2019	Comune di Bernareggio	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-16/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:1110	19/12/2019	Dobersberger	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-402/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:1023	27/11/2019	Tedeschi and Consorzio Stabile Istant Service	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-35/19</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:894	24/10/2019	Belgian state	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-703/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:850	10/10/2019	Krah	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-93/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:809	02/10/2019	Bajratari	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-544/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:761	19/09/2019	Daknevičiute	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-95/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:767	19/09/2019	van den Berg and Giesen	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-32/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:752	18/09/2019	Moser	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-94/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:693	10/09/2019	Chenchooliah	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-473/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:662	04/09/2019	Bundesagentur für Arbeit - Familienkasse Baden- Württemberg West	Free movement workers		 

<b>C-716/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:598	11/07/2019	A	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-410/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:582	10/07/2019	Aubriet	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-591/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:504	18/06/2019	Austria/Germany	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 
<b>C-309/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:350	02/05/2019	Lavorgna	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-483/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:309	11/04/2019	Tarola	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-699/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:290	04/04/2019	Allianz Vorsorgekasse	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-174/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:205	14/03/2019	Jacob and Lennertz	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-134/18</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:212	14/03/2019	Vester	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-437/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:193	13/03/2019	Gemeinsamer Betriebsrat EurothermenResort Bad Schallerbach	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-116/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:135	26/02/2019	T Danmark	Approximation of legislation		 
<b>C-272/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2019:49	23/01/2019	Zyla	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-18/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:904	14/11/2018	Danieli & C. Officine Meccaniche and others	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-33/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:896	13/11/2018	Čepelnik	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-451/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:861	25/10/2018	Walltopia	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-602/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:856	24/10/2018	Sauvage and Lejeune	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-137/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:771	26/09/2018	Van Gennip and others	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-527/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:669	06/09/2018	Alpenrind and others	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-123/17</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:632	07/08/2018	Yön	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-673/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:385	05/06/2018	Coman	EU citizenship		 
<b>C-355/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:184	15/03/2018	Picart	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-651/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2018:162	07/03/2018	DW	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-419/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:997	20/12/2017	Simma Federspiel	Freedom to establishment		 

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers




<b>C-514/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:908	28/11/2017	Rodrigues de Andrade	Approximation of legislation		
<b>C-20/16</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:488	22/06/2017	Bechtel	Free movement workers		
<b>C-420/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:408	31/05/2017	U	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-690/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:355	10/05/2017	de Lobkowicz	Free movement workers		
<b>C-133/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:354	10/05/2017	Chavez-Vilchez and others	EU citizenship		
<b>C-535/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:315	27/04/2017	Pinckernelle	Approximation of legislation		
<b>C-496/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:152	02/03/2017	Eschenbrenner	Free movement workers		
<b>C-283/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2017:102	09/02/2017	X	Free movement workers		
<b>C-508/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:986	21/12/2016	Ucar	Free movement workers		
<b>C-201/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:972	21/12/2016	AGET Iraklis	Approximation of legislation		
<b>C-76/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:975	21/12/2016	Vervloet and others	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-503/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:979	21/12/2016	Commission/Portugal	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-401/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:955	15/12/2016	Depesme and Kerrou	Free movement workers		
<b>C-238/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:949	14/12/2016	Bragança Linares Verruga and others	Free movement workers		
<b>C-165/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:675	13/09/2016	Rendón Marín	EU citizenship		
<b>C-115/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:487	30/06/2016	NA	EU citizenship		
<b>C-15/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:464	21/06/2016	New Valmar	Free movement workers		
<b>C-300/15</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:361	26/05/2016	Kohll and Kohll-Schlesser	Free movement workers		
<b>C-515/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2016:30	21/01/2016	Commission/Cyprus	Free movement workers		
<b>C-583/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:737	29/10/2015	Nagy	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-298/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:652	06/10/2015	Brouillard	Free movement workers		
<b>C-340/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:641	01/10/2015	Trijber	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-67/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:597	15/09/2015	Alimanovic	Discrimination citizenship nationality		

<b>C-218/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:476	16/07/2015	Singh and others	EU citizenship		 
<b>C-359/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:118	26/02/2015	Martens	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-512/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:108	24/02/2015	Sopora	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-317/14</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2015:63	05/02/2015	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-202/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2450	18/12/2014	McCarthy and others	EU citizenship		 
<b>C-113/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2440	11/12/2014	Azienda sanitaria locale n. 5 «Spezzino»	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-333/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2358	11/11/2014	Dano	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 
<b>C-270/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2185	10/09/2014	Haralambidis	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-244/13</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2068	10/07/2014	Ogieriakhi	EU citizenship		 
<b>C-507/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:2007	19/06/2014	Saint Prix	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-457/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:136	12/03/2014	S. and G.	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-456/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:135	12/03/2014	O.	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-378/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2014:13	16/01/2014	Onuekwere	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-303/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:822	12/12/2013	Imfeld and Garcet	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-514/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:799	05/12/2013	Zentralbetriebsrat der gemeinnützigen Salzburger Landeskliniken	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-522/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:711	07/11/2013	Isbir	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-86/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:645	10/10/2013	Alokpa and Moudoulou	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-221/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:583	24/09/2013	Demirkan	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-140/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:565	19/09/2013	Brey	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-233/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:449	04/07/2013	Gardella	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-20/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:411	20/06/2013	Giersch and others	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-529/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:290	08/05/2013	Alarape and Tijani	Right to entry and residence		 

<b>C-202/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:239	16/04/2013	Las	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-46/12</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2013:97	21/02/2013	N.	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 
<b>C-40/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2012:691	08/11/2012	Iida	EU citizenship		 
<b>C-147/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2012:538	06/09/2012	Czop	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-172/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2012:399	28/06/2012	Erny	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-39/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2012:282	10/05/2012	Commission/Estonia	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-7/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2012:180	29/03/2012	Kahveci	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-424/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:866	21/12/2011	Ziolkowski	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-371/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:809	08/12/2011	Ziebell	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-253/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:795	01/12/2011	Commission/Ungaria	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-256/11</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:734	15/11/2011	Dereci and others	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-187/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:623	29/09/2011	Unal	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-244/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:607	22/09/2011	Mesopotamia Broadcast	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-240/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:591	15/09/2011	Schulz-Delzers and Schulz	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 
<b>C-325/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:498	21/07/2011	Dias	Right to entry and residence		 
<b>C-484/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:395	16/06/2011	Pehlivan	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-61/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:340	24/05/2011	Commission/Greece	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-54/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:339	24/05/2011	Commission/Germany	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-53/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:338	24/05/2011	Commission/Austria	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-51/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:336	24/05/2011	Commission/Luxembourg	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-50/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:335	24/05/2011	Commission/France	Freedom to establishment		 
<b>C-47/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:334	24/05/2011	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers		 
<b>C-391/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:291	12/05/2011	Runevič-Vardyn and Wardyn	Discrimination citizenship nationality		 

## CJUE Jurisprudence




### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-434/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:277	05/05/2011	McCarthy	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-379/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:131	10/03/2011	Casteels	Free movement workers		
<b>C-34/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:124	08/03/2011	Ruiz Zambrano	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-25/10</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:65	10/02/2011	Missionswerk Werner Heukelbach	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-309/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:609	10/02/2011	Olbek Industrial Services	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-308/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:609	10/02/2011	B.A.M. Vermeer Contracting	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-307/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:64	10/02/2011	Vicoplus	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-155/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2011:22	20/01/2011	Commission/Greece	Free movement workers		
<b>C-338/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:814	22/12/2010	Yellow Cab Verkehrsbetrieb	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-301/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:608	09/12/2010	Oguz	Free movement workers		
<b>C-300/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:756	09/12/2010	Toprak	Free movement workers		
<b>C-145/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:708	23/11/2010	Tsakouridis	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-162/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:592	07/10/2010	Lassal	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-74/09</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:431	15/07/2010	Bâtiments and Ponts Construction and WISAG Produktionservice	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-91/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:182	13/04/2010	Wall	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-325/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:143	16/03/2010	Olympique Lyonnais	Free movement workers		
<b>C-480/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:83	23/02/2010	Teixeira	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-310/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2010:80	23/02/2010	Ibrahim and Secretary of State for the Home Department	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-562/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:614	06/10/2009	Commission/Spain	Free movement workers		
<b>C-242/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:554	17/09/2009	Sahin	Free movement workers		
<b>C-269/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:527	10/09/2009	Commission/Germany	Free movement workers		
<b>C-544/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:258	23/04/2009	Rüffler	EU citizenship		



## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-222/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:124	05/03/2009	UTECA	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-228/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2009:101	19/02/2009	Soysal and Savatli	Free movement workers		
<b>C-524/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:724	16/12/2008	Huber	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-527/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:566	16/10/2008	Renneberg	Free movement workers		
<b>C-127/08</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:449	25/07/2008	Metock and others	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-94/07</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:425	17/07/2008	Raccanelli	Free movement workers		
<b>C-294/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:36	24/01/2008	Payir and others	Free movement workers		
<b>C-152/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2008:17	17/01/2008	Commission/Germany	Free movement workers		
<b>C-357/06</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:818	18/12/2007	Frigerio Luigi & C.	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-341/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:809	18/12/2007	Laval un Partneri	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-465/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:781	13/12/2007	Commission/Italy	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-438/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:772	11/12/2007	International Transport Workers' Federation and Finnish Seamen's Union	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-291/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:771	11/12/2007	Eind	Free movement workers		
<b>C-464/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:631	25/10/2007	Geurts and Vogten	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-112/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:623	23/10/2007	Commission/Germany	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-318/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:495	11/09/2007	Commission/Germany	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-287/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:494	11/09/2007	Hendrix	Free movement workers		
<b>C-76/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:492	11/09/2007	Schwarz and Gootjes-Schwarz	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-213/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:438	18/07/2007	Geven	Free movement workers		
<b>C-212/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:437	18/07/2007	Hartmann	Free movement workers		
<b>C-522/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:405	05/07/2007	Commission/Belgium	EU citizenship		
<b>C-150/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:69	30/01/2007	Commission/Danmark	Free movement workers		
<b>C-329/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:57	25/01/2007	Meindl	Freedom to establishment		










## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-1/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2007:1	09/01/2007	Jia	Free movement workers		
<b>C-97/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:780	14/12/2006	Gattoussi	Free movement workers		
<b>C-346/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:711	09/11/2006	Chateignier	Free movement workers		
<b>C-345/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:685	26/10/2006	Commission/Portugal	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-50/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:493	18/07/2006	Nikula	Free movement workers		
<b>C-255/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:401	15/06/2006	Commission/France	Free movement workers		
<b>C-10/05</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:220	30/03/2006	Mattern and Cikotic	Free movement workers		
<b>C-408/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:192	23/03/2006	Commission/Belgium	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-493/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:167	09/03/2006	Piatkowski	Free movement workers		
<b>C-152/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:123	21/02/2006	Ritter-Coulais	Free movement workers		
<b>C-502/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:112	16/02/2006	Torun	Free movement workers		
<b>C-185/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:107	16/02/2006	Öberg	Free movement workers		
<b>C-137/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:106	16/02/2006	Rockler	Free movement workers		
<b>C-230/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2006:5	10/01/2006	Sedef	Free movement workers		
<b>C-152/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:775	15/12/2005	Durré	Free movement workers		
<b>C-151/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:775	15/12/2005	Nadin and Nadin-Lux	Free movement workers		
<b>C-464/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:546	15/09/2005	Commission/Denmark	Free movement workers		
<b>C-383/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:436	07/07/2005	Dogan	Free movement workers		
<b>C-374/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:435	07/07/2005	Gürol	Free movement workers		
<b>C-373/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:434	07/07/2005	Aydinli	Free movement workers		
<b>C-136/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:340	02/06/2005	Dörr and Ünal	Free movement workers		
<b>C-249/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:329	26/05/2005	Allard	Free movement workers		
<b>C-109/04</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2005:187	17/03/2005	Kranemann	Free movement workers		

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-467/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:708	11/11/2004	Cetinkaya	Free movement workers		
<b>C-200/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:639	19/10/2004	Zhu and Chen	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-275/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:570	30/09/2004	Ayaz	Free movement workers		
<b>C-386/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:535	16/09/2004	Baldinger	Free movement workers		
<b>C-465/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:530	16/09/2004	Commission/Austria	Free movement workers		
<b>C-169/03</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:403	01/07/2004	Wallentin	Free movement workers		
<b>C-493/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:262	29/04/2004	Oliveri	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-482/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2004:262	29/04/2004	Orfanopoulos	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-209/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:610	13/11/2003	Schilling and Fleck-Schilling	Free movement workers		
<b>C-369/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:572	21/10/2003	Sahin	Free movement workers		
<b>C-317/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:572	21/10/2003	Abatay and others	Free movement workers		
<b>C-47/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:516	30/09/2003	Anker and others	Free movement workers		
<b>C-405/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:515	30/09/2003	Colegio de Oficiales de la Marina Mercante Española	Free movement workers		
<b>C-224/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:513	30/09/2003	Köbler	Free movement workers		
<b>C-25/02</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:435	09/09/2003	Rinke	Free movement workers		
<b>C-285/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:432	09/09/2003	Burbaud	Free movement workers		
<b>C-171/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:260	08/05/2003	Wählergruppe Gemeinsam	Free movement workers		
<b>C-466/00</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2003:127	06/03/2003	Kaba	Free movement workers		
<b>C-385/00</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:750	12/12/2002	de Groot	Free movement workers		
<b>C-100/01</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:712	26/11/2002	Oteiza Olazabal	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-188/00</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:694	19/11/2002	Kurz	Free movement workers		
<b>C-413/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:493	17/09/2002	Baumbast and R	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-367/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:326	04/06/2002	Commission/Portugal	Freedom to establishment		

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-394/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:182	19/03/2002	Lorthiois and Comtexbel	Free movement workers		
<b>C-393/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:182	19/03/2002	Hervein and Hervillier	Free movement workers		
<b>C-277/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2002:74	05/02/2002	Kaske	Free movement workers		
<b>C-184/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:458	20/09/2001	Grzelczyk	Right to entry and residence		
<b>C-212/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:357	26/06/2001	Commission/Italy	Free movement workers		
<b>C-283/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:307	31/05/2001	Commission/Italy	Free movement workers		
<b>C-33/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:176	20/03/2001	Fahmi and Esmoris Cerdeiro-Pinedo Amado	Free movement workers		
<b>C-85/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:166	15/03/2001	Offermanns	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-68/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2001:137	08/03/2001	Commission/Germany	Freedom to establishment		
<b>C-195/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:655	30/11/2000	Österreichischer Gewerkschaftsbund	Free movement workers		
<b>C-135/99</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:647	23/11/2000	Elsen	Free movement workers		
<b>C-262/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:492	26/09/2000	Engelbrecht	Free movement workers		
<b>C-65/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:336	22/06/2000	Eyüp	Free movement workers		
<b>C-281/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:296	06/06/2000	Angonese	Discrimination citizenship nationality		
<b>C-37/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:224	11/05/2000	Savas	Free movement workers		
<b>C-356/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:200	11/04/2000	Kaba	Free movement workers		
<b>C-329/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:133	16/03/2000	Ergat	Free movement workers		
<b>C-211/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:119	14/03/2000	Örs	Free movement workers		
<b>C-102/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:119	14/03/2000	Kocak	Free movement workers		
<b>C-355/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:113	09/03/2000	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers		
<b>C-169/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:85	15/02/2000	Commission/France	Free movement workers		
<b>C-34/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:84	15/02/2000	Commission/France	Free movement workers		
<b>C-340/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:77	10/02/2000	Nazli	Free movement workers		

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-190/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:2000:49	27/01/2000	Graf	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-108/98</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1999:400	09/09/1999	RI.SAN.	Freedom to establishment	 
<b>C-337/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1999:284	08/06/1999	Meeusen	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-212/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1999:126	09/03/1999	Centros	Freedom to establishment	 
<b>C-1/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:568	26/11/1998	Birden	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-210/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:555	19/11/1998	Akman	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-114/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:519	29/10/1998	Commission/Spain	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-35/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:431	24/09/1998	Commission/France	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-171/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:368	16/07/1998	Pereira Roque	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-367/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:222	12/05/1998	Kefalas and others	Freedom to establishment	 
<b>C-85/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:217	12/05/1998	Martínez Sala	Right to entry and residence	 
<b>C-350/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:205	07/05/1998	Clean Car Autoservice	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-24/97</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:184	30/04/1998	Commission/Germany	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-15/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1998:3	15/01/1998	Schöning-Kougebetopoulou	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-62/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:565	27/11/1997	Commission/Greece	Discrimination citizenship nationality	 
<b>C-98/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:446	30/09/1997	Ertanir	Free movement workers	
<b>C-36/96</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:445	30/09/1997	Günaydin	Free movement workers	
<b>C-285/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:280	05/06/1997	Kol	Free movement workers	
<b>C-386/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:257	29/05/1997	Eker	Free movement workers	
<b>C-351/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:205	17/04/1997	Kadiman	Free movement workers	
<b>C-344/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:81	20/02/1997	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-171/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:31	23/01/1997	Tetik	Free movement workers	
<b>C-134/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1997:16	16/01/1997	USSL n° 47 di Biella	Free movement workers	


















## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-278/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:321	12/09/1996	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-290/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:265	02/07/1996	Commission/Greece	Free movement workers	
<b>C-173/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:264	02/07/1996	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-473/93</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:263	02/07/1996	Commission/Luxembourg	Free movement workers	
<b>C-334/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:90	07/03/1996	Commission/France	Discrimination citizenship nationality	
<b>C-193/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:70	29/02/1996	Skanavi and Chryssanthakopoulos	Freedom to establishment	
<b>C-53/95</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1996:58	15/02/1996	Kemmler	Freedom to establishment	
<b>C-415/93</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1995:463	15/12/1995	Bosman	Free movement workers	 
<b>C-151/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1995:357	26/10/1995	Commission/Luxembourg	Free movement workers	
<b>C-434/93</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1995:168	06/06/1995	Bozkurt	Free movement workers	
<b>C-7/94</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1995:118	04/05/1995	Gaal	Free movement workers	
<b>C-279/93</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1995:31	14/02/1995	Schumacker	Free movement workers	
<b>C-355/93</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1994:369	05/10/1994	Eroglu	Free movement workers	
<b>C-118/92</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1994:198	18/05/1994	Commission/Luxembourg	Free movement workers	
<b>C-419/92</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1994:62	23/02/1994	Scholz	Free movement workers	
<b>C-19/92</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1993:125	31/03/1993	Kraus	Free movement workers	
<b>C-237/91</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:527	16/12/1992	Kus	Free movement workers	
<b>C-279/89</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:439	17/11/1992	Commission/United Kingdom	Free movement workers	
<b>C-326/90</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:419	10/11/1992	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-370/90</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:296	07/07/1992	Singh	Free movement workers	
<b>C-106/91</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:230	20/05/1992	Ramrath	Freedom to establishment	
<b>C-332/90</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1992:40	28/01/1992	Steen	Free movement workers	
<b>C-355/89</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1991:287	03/07/1991	Barr & Montrose Holdings	Free movement workers	

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-41/90</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1991:161	23/04/1991	Höfner and Elser	Freedom to establishment	
<b>C-292/89</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1991:80	26/02/1991	Antonissen	Free movement workers	
<b>C-297/88</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1990:360	18/10/1990	Dzodzi	Free movement workers	
<b>C-192/89</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1990:322	20/09/1990	Sevince	Free movement workers	
<b>C-265/88</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1989:632	12/12/1989	Messner	Freedom to establishment	
<b>C-379/87</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1989:599	28/11/1989	Groener	Free movement workers	
<b>C-33/88</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1989:222	30/05/1989	Alluè	Free movement workers	
<b>C-249/86</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1989:204	18/05/1989	Commission/Germany	Free movement workers	
<b>C-321/87</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1989:176	27/04/1989	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-42/87</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1988:454	27/09/1988	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers	
<b>C-39/86</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1988:322	21/06/1988	Lair	Free movement workers	
<b>C-222/86</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1987:442	15/10/1987	Heylens	Free movement workers	
<b>C-256/86</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1987:359	09/07/1987	Frascoigna	Free movement workers	
<b>C-316/85</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1987:302	18/06/1987	Lebon	Free movement workers	
<b>C-66/85</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1986:284	03/07/1986	Lawrie-Blum	Free movement workers	
<b>C-298/84</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1986:33	23/01/1986	Iorio	Free movement workers	
<b>C-137/84</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1985:335	11/07/1985	Heinrich	Free movement workers	
<b>C-157/84</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1985:243	06/06/1985	Frascoigna	Free movement workers	
<b>C-293/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1985:69	13/02/1985	Gravier	Free movement workers	
<b>C-267/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1985:67	13/02/1985	Aissatou	Free movement workers	
<b>C-251/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1984:397	13/12/1984	Haug-Adrion	Free movement workers	
<b>C-261/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1984:280	12/07/1984	Castelli	Free movement workers	
<b>C-237/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1984:277	12/07/1984	Prodest	Free movement workers	









## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-238/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1984:250	05/07/1984	Meade	Free movement workers		
<b>C-180/83</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1984:233	28/06/1984	Moser	Free movement workers		
<b>C-152/82</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1983:205	13/07/1983	Forcheri	Free movement workers		
<b>C-35/82</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1982:368	27/10/1982	Morson	Free movement workers		
<b>C-149/79</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1982:195	26/05/1982	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers		
<b>C-115/81</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1982:183	18/05/1982	Adoui	Free movement workers		
<b>C-53/81</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1982:105	23/03/1982	Levin	Free movement workers		
<b>C-65/81</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1982:6	14/01/1982	Reina	Free movement workers		
<b>C-149/79</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1980:297	17/12/1980	Commission/Belgium	Free movement workers		
<b>C-157/79</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1980:179	03/07/1980	Pieck	Free movement workers		
<b>C-131/79</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1980:131	22/05/1980	Santillo	Free movement workers		
<b>C-175/78</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1979:88	28/03/1979	Saunders	Free movement workers		
<b>C-16/78</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1978:210	28/11/1978	Choquet	Free movement workers		
<b>C-30/77</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1977:172	27/10/1977	Bouchereau	Free movement workers		
<b>C-63/76</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1976:192	16/12/1976	Inzirillo	Free movement workers		
<b>C-13/76</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1976:115	14/07/1976	Dona	Free movement workers		
<b>C-118/75</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1976:106	07/07/1976	Watson	Free movement workers		
<b>C-48/75</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1976:57	08/04/1976	Royer	Free movement workers		
<b>C-36/75</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1975:137	28/10/1975	Rutili	Free movement workers		
<b>C-32/75</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1975:120	30/09/1975	Cristini	Free movement workers		
<b>C-67/74</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1975:34	26/02/1975	Bonsignore	Free movement workers		
<b>C-36/74</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1974:140	12/12/1974	Walrave	Free movement workers		
<b>C-41/74</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1974:133	04/12/1974	Van Duyn	Free movement workers		

## CJUE Jurisprudence

### Free movement of EU workers

<b>C-2/74</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1974:68	21/06/1974	Reyners	Freedom to establishment	 
<b>C-152/73</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1974:13	12/02/1974	Sotgiu	Free movement workers	
<b>C-76/72</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1973:46	11/04/1973	Scutari	Free movement workers	
<b>C-44/72</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1972:120	13/12/1972	Marsman	Free movement workers	
<b>C-1/72</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1972:56	22/06/1972	Frilli	Free movement workers	
<b>C-15/69</b>	Judgment ECLI:EU:C:1969:46	15/10/1969	Ugliola	Free movement workers	