

Other party to the proceedings: European Commission (represented by: T. Maxian Rusche and B. Stromsky, acting as Agents)

### **Operative part of the judgment**

The Court:

- 1) Sets aside the Order of the General Court of the European Union in Mory and Others v Commission (T-545/12, EU:T:2013:607);
- 2) Dismisses as inadmissible the action for annulment brought by Mory SA, Mory Team and Superga Invest against Decision C(2012) 2401 final of the Commission of 4 April 2012 concerning the takeover of assets of the Sernam group as part of its composition with creditors;
- 3) Orders Mory SA, Mory Team, Superga Invest and the European Commission to bear their own costs relating both to the proceedings at first instance and to the appeal.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 102, 7.4.2014.

---

### **Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 15 September 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the Bundessozialgericht — Germany) — Jobcenter Berlin Neukölln v Nazifa Alimanovic and Others**

(Case C-67/14) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Freedom of movement for persons — Citizenship of the Union — Equal treatment — Directive 2004/38/EC — Article 24(2) — Social assistance — Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 — Articles 4 and 70 — Special non-contributory cash benefits — Member State nationals who are job-seekers and resident in a different Member State — Excluded — Retention of the status of ‘worker’)*

(2015/C 371/10)

Language of the case: German

### **Referring court**

Bundessozialgericht

### **Parties to the main proceedings**

Applicant: Jobcenter Berlin Neukölln

Defendants: Nazifa Alimanovic, Sonita Alimanovic, Valentina Alimanovic, Valentino Alimanovic

## Operative part of the judgment

Article 24 of Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council 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, amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC and Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, as amended by Commission Regulation (EU) No 1244/2010 of 9 December 2010, must be interpreted as not precluding legislation of a Member State under which nationals of other Member States who are in a situation such as that referred to in Article 14(4)(b) of that directive are excluded from entitlement to certain 'special non-contributory cash benefits' within the meaning of Article 70(2) of Regulation No 883/2004, which also constitute 'social assistance' within the meaning of Article 24(2) of Directive 2004/38, although those benefits are granted to nationals of the Member State concerned who are in the same situation.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 142, 12.5.2014.

---

## Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 17 September 2015 (request for a preliminary ruling from the College van Beroep voor het bedrijfsleven — Netherlands) — KPN BV v Autoriteit Consument en Markt (ACM)

(Case C-85/14) <sup>(1)</sup>

*(Reference for a preliminary ruling — Electronic communications networks and services — Universal service and users' rights — Directive 2002/22/EC — Article 28 — Access to numbers and to services — Non-geographic numbers — Directive 2002/19/EC — Articles 5, 8 and 13 — Powers of the national regulatory authorities — Price control — Call transit services — National legislation requiring providers of telephone call transit services not to charge higher tariffs for calls to non-geographic numbers than for calls to geographic numbers — Undertaking without significant market power — Relevant national authority)*

(2015/C 371/11)

Language of the case: Dutch

### Referring court

College van Beroep voor het bedrijfsleven

### Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: KPN BV

Defendant: Autoriteit Consument en Markt (ACM)

Intervening parties: UPC Nederland BV, UPC Nederland Business BV, Tele2 Nederland BV, BT Nederland NV

## Operative part of the judgment

- 1) EU law must be interpreted as allowing a relevant national authority to impose a tariff obligation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, under Article 28 of Directive 2002/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 March 2002 on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services (Universal Service Directive), as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009, to remove an obstacle to calling non-geographic numbers within the European Union which is not technical in nature, but which results from the tariffs applied, without a market analysis having been carried out showing that the undertaking concerned has significant market power, if such an obligation constitutes a necessary and proportionate step to ensure that end-users are able to access services using non-geographic numbers within the European Union.