Form of order sought

— declare that, by failing to adopt a national strategy for the implementation of the reduction of biodegradable waste going to landfills in accordance with Article 5(1) of Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste, the Slovak Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 5(1) of that directive;

— order Slovak Republic to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

According to Article 5(1) of Council Directive 1999/31/EC, 'Member States shall set up a national strategy for the implementation of the reduction of biodegradable waste going to landfills, not later than two years after the date laid down in Article 18(1) and notify the Commission of this strategy', Article 18(1) providing that 'Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive not later than two years after its entry into force'. Pursuant to Article 19, the directive entered into force 16 July 1999. That directive thus had to be complied with by 16 July 2001 and the obligation to set up a national strategy, as laid down in Article 5(1), had to be fulfilled by 16 July 2003.

Since for new Member States no different time-limit was laid down in Article 54 of the Act concerning the conditions of accession, the Slovak Republic was to set up a national strategy for the implementation of the reduction of biodegradable waste going to landfills pursuant to Article 5(1) by the date of accession, that is, by 1 May 2004.

The European Commission thus claims that the Slovak Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 5(1) of Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste.

Reference for a preliminary ruling from the Regeringsrätten (Sweden) lodged on 25 May 2010 — Försäkringskassan v Elisabeth Bergström

(Case C-257/10)

(2010/C 195/22)

Language of the case: Swedish

Referring court

Regeringsrätten

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Försäkringskassan

Defendant: Elisabeth Bergström

Questions referred

1. Under Union law, in particular the Agreement with Switzerland on the free movement of persons and Article 72 of Regulation No 1408/71, [1] can a qualification period for family benefit in the form of income-related benefit for childcare be completed in its entirety through employment and insurance in Switzerland?

2. Under Union law, in particular the Agreement with Switzerland on the free movement of persons and Articles 3(1) and 72 of Regulation No 1408/71, is income earned in Switzerland to be equated with domestic income in the determination of entitlement to family benefit in the form of income-related benefit for childcare?

[1] OJ 1971 L 149, p. 2.

Order of the President of the Fourth Chamber of the Court of 22 April 2010 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Bundesgerichtshof (Germany)) — Prof. Dr. Claus Scholl v Stadtwerke Aachen AG

(Case C-146/09) [1]

(2010/C 195/23)

Language of the case: German

The President of the Fourth Chamber has ordered that the case be removed from the register.

[1] OJ C 153, 4.7.2009.