

**Synopsis of the work
of the Court of Justice
of the European Communities
in 1976**

Luxembourg 1977

Foreword

This synopsis of the work of the Court of Justice of the European Communities is intended for judges, lawyers and practitioners generally, as well as teachers and students of Community law.

It is issued for information only, and obviously must not be cited as an official publication of the Court, whose judgments are published officially only in the *European Court Reports*.

The synopsis is published in the working languages of the Communities (Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Italian). It is obtainable free of charge on request (specifying the language required) from the Information Bureaux of the European Communities at the following addresses:

I — *Countries of the Community*

1049 BRUSSELS
Rue Archimède 73
Belgium

1004 COPENHAGEN
Gammel Torv 4
Postbox 144
Denmark

5300 BONN
Zitelmannstrasse 22
Federal Republic of Germany

1000 BERLIN 19
Kaiserdamm 118
Federal Republic of Germany

75782 PARIS CEDEX 16
Rue des Belles Feuilles 61
France

DUBLIN 2
29 Merrion Square
Ireland

00187 ROME
Via Poli 29
Italy

LUXEMBOURG-KIRCHBERG
Centre européen
Bâtiment Jean Monnet
Luxembourg

THE HAGUE
Lange Voorhout 29
Netherlands

LONDON W8 4QQ
20 Kensington Palace Gardens
United Kingdom

CARDIFF
4 Cathedral Road
P.O. Box 15
United Kingdom

EDINBURGH EH 2 4PH
7 Alva Street
United Kingdom

II — *Non-member countries*

SANTIAGO 9
Avenida Ricardo Lyon 1177
Casilla 10093
Chile

OTTAWA ONT. K1R 7S8
Association House (Suite 1110)
350 Sparks Street
Canada

WASHINGTON DC 20037
2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
USA

NEW YORK NY 10017
1 Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza
245 East 47th Street
USA

ATHENS 134
2 Vassilissis Sofias
T.K. 1602
Greece

TOKYO 102
Kowa 25 Building
8-7 Sanbancho
Chiyoda-Ku
Japan

1211 GENEVA 20
Case Postale 195
37-39 Rue de Vermont
Switzerland

ANKARA
13 Bogaz Sokak
Kavaklidere
Turkey

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I — Changes in the composition of the Court (in 1976).....	7
II — Proceedings of the Court.....	9
1. Cases decided by the Court of Justice.....	9
A — Statistical information	9
B — Subject matter of the cases decided by the Court.....	15
I. General questions concerning the application of Community law	15
II. External relations.....	16
III. Fulfilment by the Member States of their obligations	17
IV. Rules on competition and trade-marks.....	18
V. Freedom of movement for workers.....	19
VI. Freedom to provide services.....	20
VII. Social security	21
VIII. Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters	22
2. Meetings and visits.....	25
III — Decisions of national courts on Community law.....	27
Annex I: Composition of the Court of Justice for the judicial year 1976-1977	33
Annex II: Former presidents, former Members of the Court of Justice....	34
Annex III: Organization of public hearings of the Court.....	36
Annex IV: Summary of the types of procedure before the Court of Justice..	37
Annex V: Visitors to the Court of Justice in 1976.....	39
Annex VI: Information and documentation on the Court of Justice and its work	40
Annex VII: Information on Community law	42

I — Changes in the composition of the Court (in 1976)

At a number of formal hearings certain Members of the Court took their leave and new Members were received:

On 3 February: departure of Judge R. Monaco and arrival of Judge F. Capotorti;

On 7 October: departure of President R. Lecourt and of Advocate-General A. Trabucchi, arrival of Judge G. Bosco; appointment of F. Capotorti to the duties of Advocate-General.

The same day, pursuant to the fifth paragraph of Article 167 of the EEC Treaty, the Court elected Judge H. Kutscher President of the Court of Justice for three years.

On 26 October the Court of Justice welcomed Judge A. Touffait.

II — Proceedings of the Court

1. Cases decided by the Court of Justice

A — Statistical information

Judgments delivered

During 1976 the Court of Justice of the European Communities delivered 88 judgments:

- 11 in direct actions;
- 53 in cases referred to the Court for preliminary rulings by the national courts of the Member States;
- 24 actions brought by officials of the Communities.

In addition the Court made 6 orders for interim measures.

Documentation

The written procedure in these cases runs to some 100 000 pages, of which 40 000 have been translated by the Language Directorate.

Hearings

In 1976 the Court met for 163 public hearings.

Lawyers

During these hearings, apart from the representatives or agents of the Council, the Commission and the Member States, the Court heard:

- 23 Belgian lawyers,
- 13 British lawyers,
- 4 Danish lawyers,
- 15 French lawyers,
- 27 lawyers from the Federal Republic of Germany,
- 14 Italian lawyers,
- 11 Luxembourg lawyers,
- 14 Netherlands lawyers.

Duration of proceedings

Proceedings lasted for the following periods of time:

In cases brought directly before the Court the average duration for most of them has been rather more than 9 months, the shortest being 7 months. In cases arising

from questions referred by national courts for preliminary rulings, the average duration has been some 6 months (including judicial vacations).

Cases brought in 1976

In 1976, 132 cases were brought before the Court of Justice. They concern:

1. Actions brought by the Commission for failure to fulfil an obligation against:		
— Belgium	2	
— France	1	
— Italy	2	
— Netherlands	1	
	—	6
2. Actions brought by the Member States against the Commission:		
— France	2	
— Netherlands	1	
— FR of Germany	1	
	—	4
3. Actions brought by natural or legal persons against:		
— Commission	8	
— Council	3	
— Council and Commission	11	
	—	22
4. Actions brought by officials of the Communities:		19
5. References made to the Court of Justice by national courts for preliminary rulings on the interpretation or validity of provisions of Community law. Such references originated as follows:		
<i>Belgium</i>		11
— 3 from the Cour de Cassation		
— 8 from courts of first instance or of appeal		
<i>Federal Republic of Germany</i>		28
— 2 from the Bundesgerichtshof		
— 1 from the Bundesverwaltungsgericht		
— 4 from the Bundesfinanzhof		
— 1 from the Bundessozialgericht		
— 20 from courts of first instance or of appeal		
	—	—
	<i>To be carried forward:</i>	39 51

	<i>Carried forward:</i>	39	51
<i>France</i>		8	
— 2 from the Cour de Cassation			
— 6 from courts of first instance or of appeal			
<i>Ireland</i>		1	
from a court of appeal			
<i>Italy</i>		12	
— 2 from the Corte Suprema di Cassazione			
— 10 from courts of first instance or of appeal			
<i>Netherlands</i>		14	
— 3 from the Hoge Raad			
— 11 from courts of first instance or of appeal			
<i>United Kingdom</i>		1	
from a court of first instance			
		—	75
6. Interlocutory judgments			6
			—
	Total:		132

TABLE 1
Cases analysed by subject matter¹
 Situation at 31 December 1976
 (the Court of Justice for which provision was made in the ECSC Treaty took up its duties in 1953)

Type of case	ECSC				EEC								Other ³	Eurotom	Privileges and immunities	Proceedings by staff of institutions	Total
	Scrap compensation	Transport	Competition	Other ²	Free movement of goods and customs union	Right of establishment, freedom to supply services	Tax cases	Competition	Social security and free movement of workers	Agricultural policy	Transport	Convention Article 220					
New cases	169	36	62	20 (1)	101 (16)	12 (3)	34 (3)	93 (6)	104 (17)	302 (47)	5 (1)	7 (7)	10 (4)	4 (1)	8	477 (19)	1 445 ⁴ (126)
Cases not resulting in a judgment	22	6	19	9	13 (1)	1	5	5 (1)	3	16 (5)				1	1	90 (5)	192 ⁴ (13)
Cases decided	147	30	41	10	76 (11)	10 (4)	26 (3)	82 (6)	90 (10)	239 (48)	4	7 (7)	8 (2)	3 (1)	7	367 (20)	1 147 (112)
Cases pending			2	1	12	1	3	6	11	47	1		2			20	106

The figures in brackets represent the cases dealt with by the Court in 1976.

¹ Cases concerning several subjects are classified under the most important heading.

² Levies, investment declarations, tax charges, miners' bonuses.

³ Contentious proceedings, Staff Regulations, Community terminology.

⁴ In one of which no service was effected and the case was removed forthwith from the register.

TABLE 2
Cases analysed by type (EEC Treaty)¹
 Situation at 31 December 1976
 (the Court of Justice for which provision was made in the EEC Treaty took up its duties in 1958)

Type of case	Proceedings brought under										Proto- cols Art. 220 Conven- tions	Grand total ²	
	Art. 169 and 93	Art. 170	Art. 173				Art. 175	Art. 177					Art. 215
			By Govern- ments	By Indivi- duals	By Com- munity Insti- tutions	Total		Validity	Inter- pre- ta- tion	Total			
New cases	44		22	95	3	120	9	49	396	417	84	7	674 ⁶
Cases not resulting in a judgment	11		4	9		13		1	16	16	4		45 ⁶
Cases decided	28		14	80	3	97	9 ⁵	40	337	354	59	7	546
In favour of applicant ³	24		4	20	1	25					57		
Dismissed on the merits ⁴	4		9	36	2	47					2		
Rejected as inadmissible			1	24		25	8				2		
Cases pending	5		4	6		10		8	43	47	21		83

¹ Excluding proceedings by staff and cases concerning the interpretation of the Protocol on Privileges and Immunities and of the Staff Regulations (see Table 1).

² Totals may be smaller than the sum of individual items because some cases are based on more than one Treaty Article.

³ In respect of at least one of the applicant's main claims.

⁴ This also covers proceedings rejected partly as inadmissible and partly on the merits.

⁵ Including one non-suit.

⁶ In one of which no service was effected and the case was removed forthwith from the register.

TABLE 3

Cases analysed by type (ECSC and Euratom Treaties)¹

Situation at 31 December 1976

(the Court of Justice for which provision was made in the Euratom Treaty took up its duties in 1958)

Type of case	Number of proceedings instituted						Total	
	By Governments		By Community institutions		By Individuals (undertakings)			
	ECSC	Euratom	ECSC	Euratom	ECSC	Euratom	ECSC	Euratom
New cases	22		1	2	265	2	288	4
Cases not resulting in a judgment	9			1	47		56	1
Cases decided	13		1	1	215	2 ²	229	3
In favour of applicant ³	5			1	48	1 ²		
Dismissed on the merits ⁴	7				118	1		
Rejected as inadmissible	1		1		49			
Cases pending					3		3	

¹ Excluding proceedings by staff and cases concerning the interpretation of the Protocol on Privileges and Immunities and of the Staff Regulations (see Table 1).

² Terminated by order of the Court.

³ In respect of at least one of the applicant's main claims.

⁴ This also covers proceedings rejected partly as inadmissible and partly on the merits.

B — *Subject-matter of the cases decided by the Court*

It is not possible within the confines of this Synopsis to present a full report on the case-law of the Court. For this reason, and in spite of the risk of a certain degree of subjectivity which is involved in any choice, the decision has been taken to set out here only a selection of judgments. For a fuller analysis the reader is invited to refer to Chapter V (Community law) of the Tenth General Report by the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels-Luxembourg, February 1977.

I. **General questions concerning the application of Community law**

Judgment of 8 April 1976, Case 43/75 (Defrenne v Sabena), Reports of Cases Before the Court, 1976, p. 455

Apart from the importance of this judgment in the context of the principle of equal pay laid down by Article 119 of the EEC Treaty, two aspects of the case concerning the application of Community law in general should be noted:

1. First, the Court held that neither the Member States (by a Resolution of 31 December 1961), nor the Council (by a Directive of 10 February 1975) had power to change the date on which the principle laid down in Article 119 was to be fully effective, either under the EEC Treaty itself or under the Treaty of Accession of the new Member States.
2. Secondly, this was the first time that the Court of Justice, giving a ruling under Article 177 of the EEC Treaty, has decided to distinguish between the date upon which a legal rule took effect (that is, in this case, 1 January 1962 for the original Member States and 1 January 1973 for the new Member States) and the date of its own judgment. The Court justified this distinction in terms of the serious consequences for the economies of several Member States which would flow from a large number of actions brought in the wake of its own judgment:

‘Important considerations of legal certainty affecting all the interests involved, both public and private, make it impossible in principle to re-open the question of pay as regards the past. The direct effect of Article 119 cannot be relied on in order to support claims concerning pay periods prior to the date of the judgment, except as regards those workers who have already brought legal proceedings or made an equivalent claim.’ ([1976] ECR 456)

Judgments of 16 December 1976, Case 33/76 (REWE v Landwirtschaftskammer für das Saarland) and Case 45/76 (Comet BV v Produktschap voor Siergewassen), [1976] ECR 1989 and 2043

In these two judgments the Court of Justice ruled on *the precise extent of direct effect of Community law in relation to the procedural rules of national law.*

Certain Member States had levied charges in intra-Community trade contrary to the prohibition on charges having equivalent effect to customs duties. The Court held that in the existing state of Community law the periods of limitation provided for by national law could still be relied on against a litigant who alleged before a national court that a decision by a national authority was incompatible with Community law. However, it added that the procedural rules governing an action in which a litigant invokes the right which he claimed to derive from a Community provision must be no less favourable than those governing similar actions concerning purely internal matters.

Judgment of 15 June 1976, Case 113/75 (Frecassetti v Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato), [1976] ECR 983

This judgment is worthy of note because, in the exercise of its power to give *preliminary rulings*, the Court for the first time interpreted a *recommendation*.

Under Article 177 of the EEC Treaty it has jurisdiction to give rulings on the interpretation of 'acts of the institutions of the Community'.

Judgment of 22 January 1976, Case 60/75 (Russo v AIMA), [1976] ECR 45

In this judgment in a case concerning an agricultural matter, the Court of Justice makes a *distinction* between infringement of a regulation by a Member State (involving its *liability vis-à-vis* the institutions and the other Member States) and the *liability* of that State *vis-à-vis* individuals.

After confirming that a Member State was contravening the regulation when it took certain measures specified in the judgment, the Court went on to hold that the individual could seek damages from the Member State only if those measures actually prevented the applicant from enjoying the advantages which the regulation sought to confer.

II. External relations

Judgment of 14 July 1976, Joined Cases 3, 4 and 6/76 (Officier van Justitie v Cornelis Kramer), [1976] ECR 1279

The cases in which the above judgment was given concerned criminal proceedings brought by the Netherlands authorities against Netherlands fishermen accused of having exceeded the catch quotas set by the Netherlands under commitments assumed in connexion with the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Convention (NEAFC). The Netherlands courts asked the Court of Justice in Luxembourg

whether the Community had the exclusive power to enter into such commitments. A similar question concerning the 'external' authority of the Community was raised for the first time in Case 22/70, *AETR*, judgment of 31 March 1971, [1971] ECR 263.

In its judgment of 14 July 1976 the Court began by restating the principle that in the absence of express conferment by the Treaty, Community external authority 'may equally flow implicitly from other provisions of the Treaty, from the Act of Accession and from measures adopted, within the framework of those provisions, by the Community institutions'.

Having considered closely the provisions of the Treaty, the Court concluded that such Community authority also extends - in so far as the Member States have similar authority under public international law - to *fishing on the high seas*.

However, the Community has not yet 'fully exercised its functions in the matter', whether within the framework of the NEAFC or internally. The Court therefore deduced that at the time when the disputes arose within the Netherlands, the Member States still had the power to assume commitments, within the framework of the NEAFC, in respect of the conservation of the biological resources of the sea, and therefore the right to ensure the application of those commitments within the area of their jurisdiction.

III. Fulfilment by the Member States of their obligations

During 1976 the Court of Justice gave judgment on *two* cases of failure to fulfil obligations under the Treaties:

Judgment of 26 February 1976, Case 52/75 (Commission v Italian Republic), [1976] ECR 277

Disparities in the rules in force in the various Member States concerning the use of vegetable seeds were forming a barrier to trade between Member States. Being aware of this, the Council of the Community, by Directive of 29 September 1970, laid down common rules involving common requirements regarding the sale of such seed on the national markets. That directive set a time limit of 1 July 1972 for the implementation of the national measures. In June 1975 the Commission brought before the Court of Justice an action for a declaration that Italy had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Treaty, in that it had not yet adopted the measures necessary to conform to the provisions of the directive.

Italy explained this delay by maintaining that the period prescribed by the directive was too short for the implementation at the national level of the specific and precise provisions of the directive.

The Court of Justice held that the correct application of a directive is particularly important since the implementing measures are left to the discretion of the Member States and that the time limits laid down are a guarantee of the effectiveness of the measure. The Court further held that if the period allowed for the implementation of a directive proves to be too short the only means of action compatible with

Community law available to the Member State concerned consists in requesting the competent Community institution to grant an extension of the period.

The Court ruled that by not adhering to the time limits laid down for the implementation of a directive the Italian Republic had failed in one of its obligations under the Treaty.

Judgment of 22 September 1976, Case 10/76 (Commission v Italian Republic), [1976] ECR 1359

On 26 July 1971 the Council adopted two directives concerning the abolition of restrictions on freedom to provide services in respect of public works contracts and the coordination of national procedures for the award of such contracts. The Member States were given 12 months from the date of notification to implement the necessary measures, which period expired on 29 July 1972.

On 2 February 1973 the Italian Republic enacted a law relating to the procedures for the award of public contracts by restricted invitation to tender, the text of which was notified to the Commission on 16 August 1973.

By a letter of 10 June 1974 the Commission informed the Italian Republic that that law did not fulfil the obligations under the directive. Italy did not contest the alleged infringement and in July 1974 conveyed to the Commission a draft bill 'implementing fully the Community rules'.

By 1976 that law had still not been adopted by the Italian Parliament and accordingly the measures intended to ensure the execution of the directives were still not in force.

The Commission was therefore compelled in February 1976 to bring an action before the Court pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty. Those proceedings led to a finding that the Italian Republic had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Council Directive of 26 July 1971 and it was ordered to bear the costs. The Court of Justice stated that the mandatory nature of directives entails the obligation for all Member States to comply with the time limits contained therein in order that their implementation shall be achieved uniformly within the whole Community.

IV. Rules on competition and trade-mark rights

Judgment of 15 June 1976, Case 51/75 (EMI Records Ltd v CBS United Kingdom Ltd), [1976] ECR 913

A reference concerning the same problem from three different national courts - the *High Court of Justice*, London, the *Landgericht Köln* and the *So- og Handelsretten* (Maritime and Commercial Court), Copenhagen - prompted the Court of Justice of the Communities to rule that:

'Neither the rules of the Treaty on the free movement of goods nor those on putting into free circulation of products coming from third countries nor, finally, the principles governing the common commercial policy, prohibit the

proprietor of a mark in all the Member States of the Community from exercising his right in order to prevent the importation of similar products bearing the same mark and coming from a third country.

Although the trade-mark right confers upon its proprietor a special position within the protected territory this, however, does not imply the existence of a dominant position within the meaning of Article 86, in particular where, as in the present case, several undertakings whose economic strength is comparable to that of the proprietor of the mark operate in the market for the products in question and are in a position to compete with the said proprietor. Furthermore, in so far as the exercise of a trade-mark right is intended to prevent the importation into the protected territory of products bearing an identical mark it does not constitute an abuse of a dominant position within the meaning of Article 86 of the Treaty.

In so far as the proprietor of a mark in the Member States of the Community may prevent the sale by a third party within the Community of products bearing the same mark held in a third country, the requirement that such third party must, for the purposes of his exports to the Community, obliterate the mark on the products concerned and perhaps apply a different mark forms part of the permissible consequences of the protection which the national laws of each Member State afford to the proprietor of the mark against the importation of products from third countries bearing a similar or identical mark.'

The dispute behind these three references for preliminary rulings arose from the fact that the proprietor of the Columbia mark in the United States transferred its rights in various European countries to EMI Records Limited, the intention of the latter being to exercise that mark in Europe, prohibiting its use by CBS.

V. Freedom of movement for workers

During 1976 the Court of Justice of the European Communities has twice given rulings regarding the right of nationals of Member States to enter and reside in the territory of another Member State.

Judgment of 8 April 1976, Case 48/75 (Tribunal de Première Instance de Liège v J. N. Royer), [1976] ECR 497

The Court stated that the right of nationals of one Member State to enter the territory of another Member State and reside there is a right conferred *directly* on any person falling within the ambit of Community law by the Treaty - in particular Articles 48, 52 and 59 - or, in appropriate cases, provisions adopted for its implementation, independently of the issue of any residence permit by the Member State concerned. The exception laid down in Articles 48(3) and 56(1) of the Treaty concerning the safeguarding of public policy, public security or public health are to be understood not as a condition precedent to the acquisition of the right of entry and residence, but as offering the possibility, in *individual*

cases and in the event of sufficient *justification*, of placing *restrictions on the exercise of a right derived directly from the Treaty*.

Judgment of 7 July 1976, Case 118/75 (Lynn Watson and Alessandro Belmann), [1976] ECR 1185

On a reference from a national court the Court of Justice gave a ruling in a case where an au pair omitted to report to the police authorities following her entry into the country of residence. As a result of this she and the person with whom she was staying were open to prosecution pursuant to the national rules.

On this question the Court of Justice stated that such national rules which require nationals of other Member States who benefit from the provisions of Articles 48 to 66 of the Treaty to report to the authorities of that State and prescribe that residents who provide accommodation for such foreign nationals must inform the said authorities of the identity of such foreign nationals are in principle compatible with the provisions in question, provided, first, that the period fixed for the discharge of the said obligations is reasonable and, secondly, that the penalties attaching to a failure to discharge them are not disproportionate to the gravity of the offence and do not include deportation. In so far as such rules do not entail restrictions on freedom of movement for persons, they do not constitute discrimination prohibited under Article 7 of the Treaty.

[On the problem of freedom of movement for workers, see also, for 1974 and 1975, the following judgments:

- judgment of 21 June 1974, Case 2/74 (*Reyners v Belgian State*), [1974] ECR 631;
- judgment of 4 December 1974, Case 41/74 (*C. Van Duyn v Home Office*), [1974] ECR 1299;
- judgment of 26 February 1975, Case 67/74 (*Bonsignore v Oberstadtdirektor Köln*), [1975] ECR 297;
- judgment of 28 October 1975, Case 36/75 (*Rutili v Minister for the Interior*), [1975] ECR 1219].

VI. Freedom to provide services

Judgment of 14 July 1976, Case 13/76 (G. Donà and Mantero), [1976] ECR 1333

Freedom to provide services within the Member States of the Community, which is governed by Articles 59 to 62 of the EEC Treaty, applies, *inter alia*, to sporting activities in so far as the latter constitute an *economic* activity. Thus, in 1974, the Court of Justice ruled that:

‘The prohibition on discrimination based on nationality in the sphere of economic activities which have the character of gainful employment or remunerated service covers all work or services without regard to the exact nature of the legal relationship under which such activities are performed’

(judgment of 12 December 1974, Case 36/74 [*Walrave and Koch v Association Union Cycliste Internationale, Koninklijke Nederlandse Wielren Unie, Federación Español Ciclismo*]), [1974] ECR 1405). That case concerned cycling.

In 1976, in relation to obstacles placed by private organizations on the transfer of professional footballers between different Member States, the Court of Justice once more ruled that:

‘Rules or a national practice, even adopted by a sporting organization, which limit the right to take part in football matches as professional or semi-professional players solely to the nationals of the State in question, are incompatible with Article 7 and, as the case may be, with Articles 48 to 51 or 59 to 66 of the Treaty, unless such rules or practice exclude foreign players from participation in certain matches for reasons which are not of an economic nature, which relate to the particular nature and context of such matches and are thus of sporting interest only’ ([1976] ECR 1333).

VII. Social security

It may well be a sign of the times that, for the first time, the Court of Justice has been called upon to rule on preliminary questions concerning the right to *unemployment benefits*.

Judgment of 23 November 1976, Case 40/76 (Mrs S. Kermaschek v Bundesanstalt für Arbeit), [1976] ECR 1669

May the wife of a worker who is a national of a Member State but is not herself a national of a Member State of the Community claim unemployment benefit where it is she and not her husband who is without work?

In the context of a reference from a national court the Court of Justice was called upon to interpret this question of Community law, and more precisely Articles 67 to 70 of Regulation No 1408/71 (social security). It ruled that:

‘Articles 67 to 70 of Regulation No 1408/71 have only one main purpose, namely the coordination of the rights to unemployment benefits provided by virtue of the national legislation of the Member States for employed persons who are nationals of a Member State. The members of the family of such workers are entitled only to the benefits provided by such legislation for the members of the family of unemployed workers and it is to be understood that the nationality of those members of the family does not matter for this purpose.’

Judgment of 15 December 1976, Case 39/76 (Bestuur der Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Metaalnijverheid v Mouthaan), [1976] ECR 1901

What is the position with regard to the unemployment benefit where the worker is made unemployed in a Member State other than the State of residence, where the employer who renders him unemployed is resident in the Member State of

residence? Which institution must, in such a case, pay the unemployment benefits?

In reply to a reference from a national court, the Court, interpreting Articles, 1, 71(1)(b)(ii) and 4(1) of Regulation No 1408/71, ruled that:

‘It must be accepted that the status of worker within the meaning of Regulation No 1408/71 is acquired when the worker complies with the substantive conditions laid down objectively by the social security scheme applicable to him even if the steps necessary for affiliation to that scheme have not been completed.

A wholly unemployed worker who, in the course of his last employment, was employed in a Member State other than that of his residence by an undertaking established in the latter State and who, in respect of that activity, was subject to the legislation of the State of employment may, by virtue of Article 71(1)(b)(ii) of Regulation No 1408/71, claim unemployment benefits under the provisions of the national legislation of the State where he resides and to whose employment services he makes himself available for work.’

‘The unemployment benefits referred to in Article 4(1)(g) of Regulation No 1408/71 are essentially intended to guarantee to an unemployed worker the payment of sums which do not correspond to contributions made by that worker in the course of his employment. Benefits such as those under Title III A of the Netherlands law on unemployment the aim of which is to enable a worker who is owed wages following the insolvency of his employer to recover the amounts due to him within the limits laid down by that law do not constitute “unemployment benefits” within the meaning of Article 4(1)(g) of Regulation No 1408/71.’

VIII. Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters

On 27 September 1968 the six original Member States who signed the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community signed a Convention in Brussels pursuant to the provisions of Article 220 of the EEC Treaty by virtue of which they undertook to secure the simplification of formalities governing the reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgments of courts or tribunals.

According to the preamble to the Convention the High Contracting Parties were anxious to strengthen in the Community the legal protection of persons therein established and considered that it was necessary for this purpose to determine the international jurisdiction of their courts, to facilitate recognition and to introduce an expeditious procedure for securing the enforcement of judgments, authentic instruments and court settlements.

The Protocol concerning interpretation by the Court of Justice of the said Convention was signed in Luxembourg on 3 June 1971 by the six original Member States

of the Community and came into force with regard to those States on 1 September 1975 (Official Journal of the European Communities No L 204, of 2 August 1975).

During the judicial year 1976 to 1977, the Court of Justice gave a number of judgments concerning the interpretation of the Brussels Convention.

Thus between 6 October and 14 December 1976 the Court of Justice gave the following seven judgments within the context of the 'Brussels Convention':

Judgment of 6 October 1976, Case 12/76 (Industrie Tessili Italiana Como v Dunlop AG), [1976] ECR 1473

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Special jurisdiction – Dispute having an international character – Matter relating to a contract – Court having jurisdiction (Convention, Article 5(1)).

Judgment of 6 October 1976, Case 14/76 (Ets. A. De Bloos v Bouyer), [1976] ECR 1497

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Special powers – Grantee of an exclusive sales concession – Branch, agency or other establishment of the grantor – Control – Criteria (Convention, Article 5(5)).

Judgment of 14 October 1976, Case 29/76 (LTU Lufttransportunternehmen GmbH and Co KG v Eurocontrol), [1976] ECR 1541

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Area of application – Action between a public authority and a person governed by private law – Exercise of the powers of the public authority – Judgment – Exclusion (Convention, Article 1).

Judgment of 30 November 1976, Case 42/76 (Jozef De Wolf v Harry Cox BV), [1976] ECR 1759

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Judgment obtained in a Member State – Enforcement in another Contracting State possible by virtue of Article 31 of the Convention – Application concerning the same subject-matter and between the same parties brought before a court of that State – Prohibition – Costs of procedure (Convention, Article 31).

Judgment of 30 November 1976, Case 21/76 (Handelskwekerij G. J. Bier BV v Mines de Potasse d'Alsace), [1976] ECR 1735

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Pollution of the atmosphere or of water – Dispute of an international character – Matters relating to tort, delict or quasi delict – Courts having jurisdiction – Special jurisdiction – Place where the harmful event occurred – Place of the event giving rise to the damage and place where the damage occurred – Connecting factors of significance as regards jurisdiction – Right of plaintiff to elect (Convention, Article 5(3)).

Judgment of 14 December 1976, Case 24/76 (Estasis Salotti di Colzani v Rüüva), [1976] ECR 1831

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Courts having jurisdiction – Jurisdiction by consent – Written form – Contract signed by the parties – General conditions of

sale printed on the back – Clause conferring jurisdiction – Necessity for an express reference to those conditions in the contract (Convention, Article 17).

Judgment of 14 December 1976, Case 25/76 (Galeries Segoura v Bonakdarian), [1976] ECR 1851

Convention of 27 September 1968 – Jurisdiction – Jurisdiction by consent – Form – Orally concluded contract – Vendors confirmation in writing – Notification of general conditions of sale – Clause conferring jurisdiction – Need for acceptance in writing by the purchaser – Oral agreement within the framework of a continuing trading relationship – Implied acceptance of the clause conferring jurisdiction (Convention, Article 17).

2. Meetings and visits

During 1976 the Court of Justice continued the practice which it has pursued for more than 10 years of establishing and maintaining friendly and fruitful contacts with the judicial and legal orders, both national and international.

In accordance with this tradition various seminars, study days and meetings were organized. In April 1976 two study days for lawyers of the nine Member States; in May, the Court received a delegation of French judges from the Centre de Formation Permanente de l'École Nationale de la Magistrature (Vaucresson). In June there were two study days for German teachers of law; from 18 to 22 October there was a seminar organized for 80 judges from the Member States.

The Court also made its presence known in official visits abroad or by the participation of certain of its Members at professional reunions held in various Member States.

The following may be noted, *inter alia*:

- 15 and 16 March: visit to the Bundeskartellamt in Berlin;
- 10 to 12 May: official visit by the Court to Paris (Conseil d'État, Cour de Cassation, Conseil Constitutionnel, Assemblée Nationale, Sénat, Président du Conseil, Garde des Sceaux). Following this visit the Members of the Court were received by the President of the Republic;
- 10 and 11 June: visit to the Swiss Tribunal Fédéral at Lausanne, followed by a study day at the Centre d'Études Juridiques Européennes in Geneva;
- 9 and 10 September: participation by Members of the Court in the International Congress of Private Law in Rome;
- 17 to 18 September: the Court was received in Bonn by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany and by the Federal Minister for Justice;
- 20 to 22 October: Conference of Constitutional Courts in Rome;
- 27 to 31 October: Colloquium of Conseils d'État and Supreme Administrative Courts of the Member States of the European Communities in The Hague;
- 28 to 30 October: Colloquium at the Max-Planck Institute, Heidelberg, on the protection of fundamental rights within the context of Community law and the European Convention on Human Rights;
- 18 November: the Court of Justice was represented at the 25th anniversary of the Bundesverfassungsgericht, Karlsruhe.

In connexion with the exchange of views on problems of Community law, mention should be made of the meeting of lawyers and academics held at the Court of Justice on 27 and 28 September 1976.

During those two days the views and ideas of senior national judges, university professors and the Members of the Court gave rise to a wide-ranging discussion.

The case-law of the Court and its contribution to European integration were outlined to the Ministers of Justice and Secretaries of State for Justice or their equivalent of the nine Member States by President Robert Lecourt.

The Court also received a delegation from the Council of Europe and a delegation from the Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities.

On 9 November 1976 there occurred an event of great importance for the Court: Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness Prince Philip consented to unveil a sculpture by Henry Moore, which is on permanent loan to the Court of Justice.

III — Decisions of national courts on Community law

Mention should also be made of some of the more important decisions given by national courts of the Member States applying Community law. It is true that it is not always possible to obtain full information regarding this case-law. However, a promising start has been made in this field thanks to the cooperation between the Directorate of Library and Documentation of the Court of Justice and a very large number of national courts.¹

The comparative table below indicates the number of Community cases decided directly by national courts, supreme or otherwise, in 1976, which have come to the notice of the above Directorate, whether or not they involve the use of the procedure for preliminary rulings:

Member States	Supreme Courts	Courts of appeal or of first instance	Total
Belgium	5	17	22
Denmark	—	—	—
France	3	13	16
FR of Germany	33	61	94
Ireland	—	1	1
Italy	22	25	47
Luxembourg	1	8	9
Netherlands	4	32	36
United Kingdom	5	4	9
	73	161	234

¹ The Court of Justice is very interested in receiving a copy of any decision given by national courts on points of Community law, at the following address:
Directorate of Library and Documentation, Court of Justice of the European Communities,
Boîte Postale 1406, Luxembourg.

Member State	Number	Courts giving judgment			
Belgium	22	Judgments given by supreme courts	5	Cour de Cassation	5
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	17	Cour d'Appel de Bruxelles	1
				Hof van Beroep Gent	1
				Cour du Travail de Mons	3
				Arbeidsrechtbank Hasselt	2
				Tribunal du Travail de Charleroi	3
				Tribunal du Travail de Bruxelles	1
				Tribunal de Commerce de Bruxelles	1
				Rechtbank van Koophandel Brugge	1
				Rechtbank van Koophandel Antwerpen	1
Tribunal de Commerce de Verviers	1				
Correctionele Rechtbank Oudenaarde	1				
Vrederecht 1 ^e Kanton Turnhout	1				
				17	
France	16	Judgments given by supreme courts	3	Cour de Cassation	3
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	13	Cour d'Appel de Paris	2
				Cour d'Appel de Douai	1
				Cour d'Appel de Metz	1
				Cour d'Appel de Lyon	1
				Cour d'Appel d'Orléans	1
				Cour d'Appel de Nancy	1
				Tribunal Administratif de Rennes	2
				Tribunal Administratif de Nancy	1
				Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris	1
Tribunal de Grande Instance de Besançon	1				
Tribunal de Grande Instance de Strasbourg	1				
				13	

Member State	Number	Courts giving judgment		
FR of Germany	94	Judgments given by supreme courts	33	Bundesgerichtshof 5 Bundesfinanzhof 21 Bundessozialgericht 1 Bundesverwaltungsgericht 6 <hr/> 33
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	61	Oberlandesgericht Frankfurt 4 Oberlandesgericht Stuttgart 2 Oberlandesgericht Düsseldorf 1 Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg 1 Oberlandesgericht Karlsruhe 1 Finanzgericht Hamburg 11 Finanzgericht Berlin 3 Finanzgericht Düsseldorf 4 Finanzgericht Rheinland-Pfalz 1 Finanzgericht Bremen 1 Finanzgericht Baden-Württemberg 1 Finanzgericht Münster 1 Hessisches Finanzgericht 14 Oberverwaltungsgericht Rheinland-Pfalz 1 Hessischer Verwaltungsgerichtshof 1 Landgericht Aachen 1 Landgericht Freiburg 1 Landgericht Stuttgart 1 Landgericht Bayreuth 1 Landgericht Heidelberg 1 Landgericht Siegen 1 Landgericht Oldenburg 1 Verwaltungsgericht Frankfurt 4 Verwaltungsgericht Hamburg 1 Landessozialgericht Nordrhein-Westfalen 1 Sozialgericht Gelsenkirchen 1 <hr/> 61

Member State	Number	Courts giving judgment		
Ireland	1	Judgment given by a court of first instance	1	High Court Dublin 1 <hr/> 1
Italy	47	Judgments given by supreme courts	22	Corte Costituzionale 8 Corte Suprema di Cassazione 13 Consiglio di Stato 1 <hr/> 22
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	25	Corte d'Appello di Genova 3 Corte d'Appello di Trieste 2 Corte d'Appello di Milano 1 Tribunale Civile e Penale di Milano 1 Tribunale di Pavia 2 Tribunale di Bassano del Grappa 2 Tribunale di Firenze 1 Pretura di Roma 2 Pretura di Susa 3 Pretura di Milano 2 Pretura di Abbiategrosso 1 Pretura di Recco 1 Pretura di Cento 1 Pretura di Cittadella 1 Ufficio di Conciliazione di Roma 1 Giudice Conciliatore di Rovigo 1 <hr/> 25
Luxembourg	9	Judgment given by a supreme court	1	Cour Supérieure de Justice (ruling on a point of law) 1
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	8	Cour Supérieure de Justice (appeal) 7 Tribunal d'Arrondissement de Luxembourg 1 <hr/> 8

Member State	Number	Courts giving judgment			
Netherlands	36	Judgments given by supreme courts	4	Hoge Raad	4
		Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	32	Centrale Raad van Beroep	3
				College van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven	7
				Tariefcommissie	3
				Raad van Beroep Amsterdam	2
				Gerechtshof Amsterdam	2
				Gerechtshof Arnhem	2
				Gerechtshof 's-Gravenhage	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Amsterdam	3
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Rotterdam	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Almelo	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Zwolle	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Breda	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Roermond	1
				Arrondissementsrechtbank Alkmaar	1
Arrondissementsrechtbank 's-Gravenhage	1				
Arrondissementsrechtbank Dordrecht	1				
Kantongerecht Rotterdam	1				
				32	
United Kingdom	9	Judgments given by courts of appeal or of first instance	9	National Insurance Commissioner	5
				High Court of Justice	4

Certain of these judgments, which are particularly representative, merit special attention:

Bundesverwaltungsgericht (Federal Administrative Court), Order of 2 July 1975

In its judgment of 26 February 1975 (*Bonsignore*, Case 67/74 [1975] ECR 297), the Court of Justice had ruled that certain provisions of Community law prevent 'the deportation of a national of a Member State if such deportation is ordered for the purpose of deterring other aliens'.

At the time when that judgment was given the Bundesverwaltungsgericht was seised of a case comparable to that of *Bonsignore*: an Italian national resident in Germany was subject to a deportation order for the unauthorized importation of a pistol and for tax evasion; the only ground put forward was the alleged necessity of dissuading other aliens from committing similar offences. Prior to the judgment in *Bonsignore*, the Bundesverwaltungsgericht had interpreted the German legislation as permitting deportation orders based on such grounds.

In an order of 2 July 1975 (Reports of the Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Volume 49, pp. 60 and 61), the Bundesverwaltungsgericht stated that the interpretation given by the Court of Justice takes priority over the former case-law of the Bundesverwaltungsgericht; accordingly, it abandoned that case-law.

Corte Costituzionale of the Italian Republic, judgment of 28 July 1976

In two cases the joint civil chambers of the Corte di Cassazione had referred to the Corte Costituzionale disputes concerning the constitutionality of Italian legislative provisions incorporating into the internal law *directly applicable* Community rules.

The Corte Costituzionale held that the Community Regulations Nos 136/66 and 754/67 are fully valid and directly applicable within the internal legal order of the Member States and stated that in consequence they were wrongly incorporated into Italian internal law. The corresponding Italian legislative provisions were declared unconstitutional.

(Reference: Judgment No 205 of 1976 – 28 July 1976).

Composition of the Court of Justice of the European Communities for the judicial year 1976-1977 (order of seniority)

H. KUTSCHER (President)
A. DONNER (President of the First Chamber)
P. PESCATORE (President of the Second Chamber)
J.-P. WARNER (First Advocate-General)
J. MERTENS DE WILMARS (Judge)
H. MAYRAS (Advocate-General)
M. SØRENSEN (Judge)
LORD MACKENZIE STUART (Judge)
G. REISCHL (Advocate-General)
A. O'CAOIMH (O'KEEFFE) (Judge)
F. CAPOTORTI (Advocate-General)
G. BOSCO (Judge)
A. TOUFFAIT (Judge)
A. VAN HOUTTE (Registrar)

Composition of the Chambers

First Chamber

President: A. M. DONNER

Judges: J. MERTENS DE WILMARS
A. O'KEEFFE
G. BOSCO

Advocates-

General: J.-P. WARNER
H. MAYRAS

Second Chamber

President: P. PESCATORE

Judges: M. SØRENSEN
LORD MACKENZIE STUART
A. TOUFFAIT

Advocates-

General: G. REISCHL
F. CAPOTORTI

ANNEX II

Former Presidents of the Court of Justice

PILOTTI (Massimo)†	President of the Court of Justice of the European Coal and Steel Community from 4 December 1952 to 6 October 1958
DONNER (André)	President of the Court of Justice of the European Communities from 7 October 1958 to 7 October 1964
HAMMES (Charles-Léon)†	President of the Court of Justice of the European Communities from 8 October 1964 to 8 October 1967
LECOURT (Robert)	President of the Court of Justice of the European Communities from 8 October 1967 to 7 October 1976

Former Members of the Court of Justice

PILOTTI (Massimo)†	President and Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 6 October 1958
SERRARENS (P. J. S.)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 6 October 1958
VAN KLEFFENS (A.)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 6 October 1958
CATALANO (Nicola)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 7 October 1958 to 8 March 1962
RUEFF (Jacques)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 18 May 1962
RIESE (Otto)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 31 January 1963
ROSSI (Rino)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 7 October 1958 to 7 October 1964
DELVAUX (Louis)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 8 October 1967
HAMMES (Charles-Léon)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 8 October 1967, President of the Court from 8 October 1964 to 8 October 1967
LAGRANGE (Maurice)	Advocate-General at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 7 October 1964

STRAUSS (Walter)†	Judge at the Court of Justice from 1 February 1963 to 6 October 1970
GAND (Joseph)†	Advocate-General at the Court of Justice from 7 October 1964 to 6 October 1970
DUTHELLET DE LAMOTHE (Alain)†	Advocate-General at the Court of Justice from 7 October 1970 to 2 January 1972
ROEMER (Karl)	Advocate-General at the Court of Justice from 4 December 1952 to 9 October 1973
Ó DÁLAIGH (Cearbhall)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 9 January 1973 to 12 December 1974
LECOURT (Robert)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 18 May 1962 to 7 October 1976. President of the Court of Justice from 8 October 1967 to 7 October 1976
MONACO (Riccardo)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 7 October 1964 to 3 February 1976
TRABUCCHI (Alberto)	Judge at the Court of Justice from 8 March 1962 to 31 December 1972. Advocate-General at the Court of Justice from 1 January 1973 to 7 October 1976

ANNEX III

Organization of public hearings of the Court

As a general rule, sessions of the Court are held on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays every week, except during the Court's vacations (from 20 December to 6 January, the week preceding and two weeks following Easter, 15 July to 15 September. Please consult the full list of public holidays in Luxembourg set out below).

Visitors may attend public hearings of the Court or of the Chambers to the extent permitted by the seating capacity. No visitor may be present at cases heard *in camera* or during interlocutory proceedings.

Half an hour before the beginning of public hearings a briefing is given to visitors who have indicated their intention of attending the hearing.

Public holidays in Luxembourg

In addition to the Court's vacations mentioned above the Court of Justice is closed on the following days:

New Year's Day	1 January
Carnival Monday	variable
Easter Monday	variable
Ascension Day	variable
Whit Monday	variable
Labour Day	1 May
Luxembourg national holiday	23 June
Assumption	15 August
'Schobermesse' Monday	Last Monday of August or first Monday of September
All Saints' Day	1 November
All Souls' Day	2 November
Christmas Eve	24 December
Christmas Day	25 December
Boxing Day	26 December
New Year's Eve	31 December

Summary of types of procedure before the Court of Justice

It will be remembered that under the Treaties a case may be brought before the Court of Justice either by a national court with a view to determining the validity or interpretation of a provision of Community law, or directly by the Community institutions, Member States or private parties under the conditions laid down by the Treaties.

A – References for preliminary rulings

The national court submits to the Court of Justice questions relating to the validity or interpretation of a provision of Community law by means of a formal judicial document (decision, judgment or order) containing the wording of the question(s) which it wishes to refer to the Court of Justice. This document is sent by the registry of the national court to the Registry of the Court of Justice,¹ accompanied in appropriate cases by a file intended to inform the Court of Justice of the background and scope of the questions referred.

During a period of two months the Council, the Commission, the Member States and the parties to the national proceedings may submit observations or statements of case to the Court of Justice, after which they will be summoned to a hearing at which they may submit oral observations, through their agents in the case of the Council, the Commission and the Member States, through lawyers who are members of a Bar of a Member State or through university teachers who have a right of audience before the Court pursuant to Article 36 of the Rules of Procedure.

After the Advocate-General has presented his opinion the judgment given by the Court of Justice is transmitted to the national court through the registries.

B – Direct actions

Actions are brought before the Court by an application addressed by a lawyer to the Registrar (B.P. 1406, Luxembourg) by registered post.

Any lawyer who is a member of the Bar of one of the Member States or a professor holding a chair of law in a university of a Member State, where the law of such State authorizes him to plead before its own courts, is qualified to appear before the Court of Justice.

The application must contain:

- the name and permanent residence of the applicant;
- the name of the party against whom the application is made;
- the subject-matter of the dispute and the grounds on which the application is based;
- the form of order sought by the applicant;
- the nature of any evidence offered;
- an address for service in the place where the Court has its seat, with an indication of the name of a person who is authorized and has expressed willingness to accept service.

¹ Court of Justice of the European Communities, Kirchberg, B.P. 1406, Luxembourg; Tel. 4 76 21; Telegrams; CURIALUX; Telex; 2510 CURIA LU.

The application should also be accompanied by the following documents:

- the decision the annulment of which is sought, or, in the case of proceedings against an implied decision, documentary evidence of the date on which the request to the institution in question was lodged;
- a certificate that the lawyer is entitled to practise before a court of a Member State;
- where an applicant is a legal person governed by private law, the instrument or instruments constituting and regulating it, and proof that the authority granted to the applicant's lawyer has been properly conferred on him by someone authorized for the purpose.

The parties must choose an address for service in Luxembourg. In the case of the Governments of Member States, the address for service is normally that of their diplomatic representative accredited to the Government of the Grand Duchy. In the case of private parties (natural or legal persons) the address for service – which in fact is merely a 'letter box' – may be that of a Luxembourg lawyer or any person enjoying their confidence.

The application is notified to defendants by the Registry of the Court of Justice. It calls for a statement of defence to be put in by them; these documents may be supplemented by a reply on the part of the applicant and finally a rejoinder on the part of the defence.

The written procedure thus completed is followed by an oral hearing, at which the parties are represented by lawyers or agents (in the case of Community institutions or Member States).

After the opinion of the Advocate-General has been heard, the judgment is given. It is served on the parties by the Registry.

Visitors to the Court of Justice in 1976¹

Description	Belgium	Denmark	France	FR Germany	Ireland	Italy	Luxem- bourg	Nether- lands	UK	Third countries	Mixed	Total
Visits and individual seminars	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	1	7	8	2	21
Lawyers	—	10	85	65	50	—	20	—	2	1	81	314
Students	378	114	276	678	16	71	107	425	346	204	25	2640
Journalists/Photographers	5	26	—	13	—	—	20	3	—	1	67	135
Officials and trainees from the Commission and European Parliament	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	—	203	235
Teachers of law	—	—	—	20	—	40	—	—	—	—	—	60
Trade Unionists	—	—	—	30	—	—	—	—	33	—	20	83
Mixed	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parliamentarians	20	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	10	—	32
Other	28	47	35	122	—	15	60	45	25	—	170	547
Total	431	198	396	928	67	129	207	474	445	224	568	4 067
Carried:												4 067
Belgian judges												12
Judges Seminar												78
German judge												1
French judges												4
Centre de formation permanente de l'École nationale de la Magistrature (Vaucresson)												42
Meeting of judges and academics												150
Total												4 354

ANNEX V

¹ Total 180 visits.

ANNEX VI

Information and documentation on the Court of Justice and its work

COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Post Box 1406, Luxembourg. Telephone 4 76 21 from (28 August 1977: 4 30 31).
Telex (Registry): 2510 CURIA LU.
Telex (Court Information Service): 2771 CJ INFO LU.
Telegrams: CURIA Luxembourg.

Complete list of publications giving information on the Court:

I – Information on current cases (for general use)

1. *Hearings of the Court*

The calendar of public hearings is drawn up each week. It is sometimes necessary to alter it subsequently; it is therefore for information only. This calendar may be obtained free of charge on request from the Court Registry. In French.

2. *Proceedings of the Court of Justice of the European Communities*

Weekly summary of the proceedings of the Court published in the six official languages of the Community. Free of charge. Available from the information office; please indicate language required. (Orders for the United States may be addressed to the Communities' information office in Washington or in New York.)

3. *Judgments or orders of the Court, reports for hearing, opinions of Advocates-General*

Photocopies of these documents are sent to the parties and may be obtained on request by other interested persons, after they have been read and distributed at the public hearing. Free of charge. Requests for judgments, orders and reports for hearings should be made to the Registry. Opinions of the Advocates-General may be obtained from the information office. As from May 1972 the London *Times* carries articles under the heading 'European Law Reports' covering the more important cases in which the Court has given judgment.

However, this service is provided only on express request in each case as it arises; readers wishing to obtain the full collection of the case-law are advised to subscribe to the Reports of Cases before the Court (cf. III, Official publications).

II – Technical information and documentation

1. *Information on the Court of Justice of the European Communities*

Quarterly bulletin published by the information office of the Court of Justice. It contains the title and a short summary of the more important cases brought before the Court of Justice and before national courts. Free of charge. May be obtained from the Communities' information offices (cf. addresses set out in the Foreword).

2. *Annual synopsis of the activities of the Court*

In the six official languages. Free of charge. May be ordered from the Communities' information offices.

3. *Collection of texts on the organization, powers and procedures of the Court*

A new edition appeared in December 1975. Orders should be addressed, indicating the language required, to the Publications Office of the European Communities, or to the booksellers whose addresses are listed below.

4. *Legal publications on European integration (Bibliography)*

On sale at the address set out below.

5. *Bibliography of European case-law (1965)*

On sale at the following addresses:

BELGIUM:	Éts Emile Bruylant, Rue de la Régence 67, 1000 Bruxelles.
DENMARK:	J. H. Schultz – Boghandel – Montergade 19, 1116 København K.
FRANCE:	Éditions A. Pedone, 13 rue Soufflot, 75005 Paris
GERMANY:	Carl Heymann's Verlag, Gereonstrabe 18–32, 5 Köln 1.
IRELAND:	Messrs Greene & Co. Booksellers, 16 Clare Street, Dublin 2.
ITALY:	CEDAM-Casa Editrice Dott. A. Milani, Via Jappelli 5, 35100 Padova (M-64194)
LUXEMBOURG:	Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes, Boîte postale 1003, Luxembourg.
NETHERLANDS:	NV Martinus Nijhoff, Lange Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage
UNITED KINGDOM:	Sweet & Maxwell, Spon (Booksellers) Limited, North Way, Andover, Hants SP10 5BE.
OTHER COUNTRIES:	Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes, Boîte postale 1003, Luxembourg.

6. *Compendium of case-law relating to the European Communities (Europäische Rechtsprechung – Répertoire de la jurisprudence)*

Extracts from cases relating to the Treaties establishing the European Communities published in German and French. Extracts from national judgments are also published in the original language.

The German and French versions are available from:

Carl Heymann's Verlag,
Gereonstrabe 18–32,
D 5000 Köln 1 (Federal Republic of Germany).

In addition to the complete collection in French and German an English version is available as from 1973. The first volume of the English series is on sale at:

Elsevier – North Holland – Excerpta Medica,
P.O. Box 211,
Amsterdam (Netherlands).

III – Official publications

The *Recueil de la Jurisprudence de la Cour* is the only authentic source for citations of judgments of the Court of Justice. The volumes for 1954 to 1972 are published in Dutch, French, German and Italian. As from 1973 they have also been published in Danish and English.

These reports, covering 23 years of case-law (1953 to 1976) are on sale at the same addresses as the publications mentioned under II, above. An English edition of the volumes for 1954 to 1972 will be completed by the end of 1977; the volumes for 1962 to 1971 are already available.

As from 1973, the reports are also published in English under the title 'Reports of Cases Before the Court'.

ANNEX VII

Information on Community law

The decisions of the Court were published during 1976 in the following journals in particular:

- Belgium:* Agence Europe
Cahiers de Droit Européen
Journal des Tribunaux
Rechtskundig Weekblad
Jurisprudence Commerciale de Belgique
Revue belge de Droit International
Revue de Droit Fiscal
Tijdschrift voor Privaatrecht
Info-Jura
Europolitique
- Denmark:* Ugeskrift for Retsvæsen
Juristen
Nordisk Tidsskrift for internasjonal Rett
- France:* Annuaire français de droit international
Droit rural
Le Droit et les Affaires
Droit social
Gazette du Palais¹
Jurisclasseur périodique (La semaine juridique)
Recueil Dalloz
Revue critique de droit international privé
Revue internationale de la concurrence
Revue trimestrielle de droit européen
Sommaire de sécurité sociale
La vie judiciaire
- Germany:* Recht der Internationalen Wirtschaft
(Aussenwirtschaftsdienst des Betriebsberaters)²
Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt
Europarecht
Neue Juristische Wochenschrift
Die öffentliche Verwaltung
Vereinigte Wirtschaftsdienste (VWD)
Wirtschaft und Wettbewerb
Zeitschrift für das gesamte Handels- und Wirtschaftsrecht
Europäische Grundrechte-Zeitschrift (EuGRZ)

¹ In collaboration with the Außenwirtschaftsdienst des Betriebsberaters.

² In collaboration with the Gazette du Palais.

- Italy:* Diritto dell'economia
Foro italiano
Foro padano
Rivista di diritto europeo
Rivista di diritto internazionale
Rivista di diritto privato e processuale
Il Diritto negli scambi internazionali
- Luxembourg:* Pasicrisie luxembourgeoise
- Netherlands:* Administratieve en Rechterlijke Beslissingen
Ars Aequi
Common Market Law Review
Nederlandse Jurisprudentie
Rechtspraak van de Week
Sociaal-economische Wetgeving
- United Kingdom:* Common Market Law Reports
The Times (European Law Reports)
'Europe' International Press Agency
European Report (Agra, Brussels)
F.T. European Law Newsletter
European Law Review

