Request for a preliminary ruling from the Hoge Raad der Nederlanden (Netherlands) lodged on 27 February 2015 — Sprengen/Pakweg Douane BV, other party: Staatssecretaris van Financiën

(Case C-97/15)

(2015/C 171/19)

Language of the case: Dutch

Referring court

Hoge Raad der Nederlanden

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Sprengen/Pakweg Douane BV

Other party: Staatssecretaris van Financiën

Questions referred

1. Must the last paragraph of Note 5(C) to Chapter 84 of the CN — whether or not having regard to Attachments A and B to the Information Technology Agreement — be interpreted as meaning that apparatus such as the screenplays described in this judgment are to be classified as 'hard disk drives' in subheading 8471 70 50 of the CN, even though the apparatus has features and characteristics such that it is capable of reproducing on a television set or video monitor multimedia files stored on the hard disks, after converting those files into analogue signals?

2. If question 1 must be answered in the negative, must heading 8521 of the CN then be interpreted as meaning that apparatus such as the screenplays can be classified under it, even though their video reproducing function is not their specific function, but is their principal function?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Juzgado de lo Social No 33 de Barcelona (Spain) lodged on 27 February 2015 — María Begoña Espadas Recio v Servicio Público de Empleo Estatal (SPEE)

(Case C-98/15)

(2015/C 171/20)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Juzgado de lo Social No 33 de Barcelona

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: María Begoña Espadas Recio

Defendant: Servicio Público de Empleo Estatal (SPEE)

Questions referred

1. In accordance with the line of authority laid down in the judgment of 10 June 2010 of the Court of Justice in *Bruno and Others* (C-395/08 and C–396/08], must Clause 4 of the Framework Agreement on part-time work, annexed to Directive 97/81/EC ([1]) concerning the Framework Agreement on part-time work, be interpreted as applying to a contributory unemployment benefit like that provided for in Article 210 of the Spanish Ley General de Seguridad Social, funded exclusively by the contributions paid by the employee and the undertakings having employed her, and based on the periods of employment in respect of which contributions were paid in the six years preceding the legal situation of unemployment?

2. If the previous question is answered in the affirmative, in accordance with the case-law laid down in *Bruno and Others*, must Clause 4 of the Framework Agreement be interpreted as precluding a national provision which, as is the case of Article 3(4) of Real Decreto 625/1985 of 2 April (Rules on unemployment benefits), to which rule 4 of paragraph 1 of the seventh additional provision of the Ley General de Seguridad Social refers — in the case of 'vertical' part-time work (work carried out only three days a week) — disregards, for the purposes of calculation of the duration of unemployment benefit, days not worked even though contributions were paid in respect of those days, with the resulting reduction in the duration of the benefit granted?

3. Must the prohibition of direct and indirect discrimination on grounds of sex laid down in Article 4 of Directive 79/7 ([2]) be interpreted as prohibiting or precluding a national provision which, as is the case of Article 3(4) of [Real Decreto 625/1985], in the case of 'vertical' part-time work (work carried out only three days a week), excludes days not worked from the calculation of days in respect of which contributions have been paid, with the resulting reduction in the duration of unemployment benefit?

([1]) OJ 1998 L 14, p. 9.

([2]) Council Directive 79/7/EEC of 19 December 1978 on the progressive implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security (OJ 1979 L 6, p. 24).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal Supremo (Sala de lo Civil) (Spain) lodged on 27 February 2015 — Christian Liffers v Producciones Mandarina, S.L. and Gestevisión Telecinco, S.A.

(Case C-99/15)

(2015/C 171/21)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Tribunal Supremo (Sala de lo Civil)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Christian Liffers

Defendants: Producciones Mandarina, S.L. and Gestevisión Telecinco, S.A.

Question referred

1. May Article 13(1) of Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council ([1]) of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights be interpreted as meaning that the party injured by an intellectual property infringement who claims damages for pecuniary loss based on the amount of royalties or fees that would be due if the infringer had requested authorisation to use the intellectual property right in question cannot also claim damages for the moral prejudice suffered?

([1]) OJ 2004 L 157, p. 45.