



Plenary sitting

A8-0167/2016

2.5.2016

*****I**

REPORT

on the draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the transfer to the General Court of the European Union of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants
(N8-0110/2015 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD))

Committee on Legal Affairs

Rapporteur: Mady Delvaux

Symbols for procedures

*	Consultation procedure
***	Consent procedure
***I	Ordinary legislative procedure (first reading)
***II	Ordinary legislative procedure (second reading)
***III	Ordinary legislative procedure (third reading)

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the draft act.)

Amendments to a draft act

Amendments by Parliament set out in two columns

Deletions are indicated in ***bold italics*** in the left-hand column. Replacements are indicated in ***bold italics*** in both columns. New text is indicated in ***bold italics*** in the right-hand column.

The first and second lines of the header of each amendment identify the relevant part of the draft act under consideration. If an amendment pertains to an existing act that the draft act is seeking to amend, the amendment heading includes a third line identifying the existing act and a fourth line identifying the provision in that act that Parliament wishes to amend.

Amendments by Parliament in the form of a consolidated text

New text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Deletions are indicated using either the ■ symbol or strikeout. Replacements are indicated by highlighting the new text in ***bold italics*** and by deleting or striking out the text that has been replaced.

By way of exception, purely technical changes made by the drafting departments in preparing the final text are not highlighted.

CONTENTS

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	8
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AFFAIRS ON THE LEGAL BASIS	10
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS	16
PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE	19

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the transfer to the General Court of the European Union of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants
(N8-0110/2015 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD))**

(Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the request from the Court of Justice submitted to Parliament and the Council (N8-0110/2015),
 - having regard to the second subparagraph of Article 19(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Article 256(1), the first and second paragraphs of Article 257 and the second paragraph of Article 281 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and Article 106a(1) of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community, pursuant to which the draft act was submitted to Parliament (C8-0367/2015),
 - having regard to Article 294(3) and (15) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,
 - having regard to Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2015/2422 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2015 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union¹, and in particular recital 9 thereof,
 - having regard to the opinion of the Commission (COM(2016)0081)²,
 - having regard to Rule 59 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Legal Affairs and the opinion of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (A8-0167/2016),
1. Adopts its position at first reading hereinafter set out;
 2. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council, the Court of Justice, the Commission and the national parliaments.

Amendment 1

Draft regulation

Citation 1

¹ OJ L 341, 24.12.2015, p. 14.

² Not yet published in the Official Journal.

Draft by the Court of Justice

Amendment

Having regard to the Treaty on European Union, and in particular the second subparagraph of Article 19(2) thereof, ***deleted***

Justification

Article 19(2) TEU is not an appropriate legal basis for this regulation, as no change is made to the number of judges at the General Court. The proper legal basis is to be found in Articles 256(1), 257 and 281 TFEU together with Article 106a of the Euratom Treaty.

Amendment 2

Draft regulation
Article 1 – point 1

Draft by the Court of Justice

Amendment

1. Council Decision 2004/752/EC,
Euratom ***of 2 November 2004 establishing the European Union Civil Service Tribunal and, in consequence, Article 62c of Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union, together with Annex I thereto, without prejudice to Article 4;***

1. Council Decision 2004/752/EC,
Euratom^{1a};

^{1a} ***Council Decision 2004/752/EC, Euratom of 2 November 2004 establishing the European Union Civil Service Tribunal (OJ L 333, 9.11.2004, p. 7).***

Justification

It is preferable to deal with the modifications to the Protocol in Article 2, by also explicitly repealing the articles introduced at the time by Council Decision 2004/752/EC.

Amendment 3

Draft regulation
Article 2 – point 2

Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union
Article 62c

Draft by the Court of Justice

Amendment

2. The following article is inserted:

2. Title IVa is deleted.

‘Article 62c

The provisions relating to the jurisdiction, composition, organisation and procedure of any specialised court established under Article 257 TFEU shall be contained in an Annex to this Statute.’

Justification

There is no need to replace Article 62c with a generic reference to specialised courts and to a non-existent annex. The entire title on specialised courts, which contains only this article, can be repealed. It could, of course, be recreated in the future if and when a specialised court is established, as was the case in 2004.

Amendment 4

Draft regulation

Article 2 – point 2 a (new)

Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union

Annex I

Draft by the Court of Justice

Amendment

2a. Annex I is deleted, without prejudice to Article 4 of this Regulation.

Justification

It is preferable to repeal Annex I explicitly in the article concerning modifications to the Protocol.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

This regulation is the fourth relating to the reform of the Court of Justice. The first regulation made various changes to the formations and procedure of the Court of Justice and General Court, and the second made provision for temporary judges at the Civil Service Tribunal.

The third part of the reform was the most controversial, as it concerned an increase in the number of judges at the General Court. The initial increase envisaged was from 28 to 40 judges. At the end of the road, the co-legislators agreed, under the impulse of the Council, to increase the number of judges at the General Court to 56, so as to allow each Member State to nominate two judges each. This increase was subject to the condition that the Civil Service Tribunal was to be abolished, and civil service disputes transferred back to the General Court.

The present regulation is therefore a follow-up to the third regulation reforming the Court of Justice. In parallel with the second step in the increase in judges at the General Court, from 40 to 47, the Civil Service Tribunal, which has seven judges, must be abolished.

The Court of Justice's proposal is therefore logical and corresponds to a request by the co-legislators. It merely proposes the repeal of the provisions relating to the Civil Service Tribunal, along with a small number of consequential amendments and transitional provisions. Those consequential amendments include, of course, the repeal of the second regulation on the reform of the Court of Justice. Your rapporteur therefore proposes that the European Parliament should approve the proposal.

This report contains some technical amendments, which your rapporteur considers make for better legislation. The amending provisions are made clearer, and the section on specialised courts is completely repealed, as it is not needed until such a time as a specialised court is again established. These amendments do not, however, affect the substance of the proposal.

Your rapporteur would like to stress that the modalities of the transfer to the General Court of the cases pending before the Civil Service Tribunal are covered by the proposal. The cases pending before the Civil Service Tribunal on 31 August 2016 will be transferred as they stand on that date. In the interest of legal certainty, those cases will be subject to the application of the Rules of Procedure of the General Court. Your rapporteur points out that changes should be made to the Rules of Procedure of the General Court in order to take into account, regarding civil service disputes, the specific rules currently set out in the Rules of Procedure of the Civil Service Tribunal, in particular Articles 108 and 109.

Not only will the Rules of Procedure of the General Court have to be modified, but also its internal organisation. Your rapporteur agrees with the proposal the Commission has made in its opinion¹, and considers that a higher number of cases should be assigned to larger benches where justified by their importance in order to ensure the coherence and quality of case law. There should also be some reflection on the possibility of adapting the rules and practices

¹ Commission opinion on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the transfer to the General Court of the European Union of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants, COM(2016)0081, 22.2.2016, point 10.

governing the allocation of cases so as to create thematic synergies.

Finally, your rapporteur wishes to comment on one legal controversy which surrounds this change. It has been claimed by some that, as Article 257 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union gives the co-legislators the competence to establish specialised courts, but does not explicitly refer to modifications to specialised courts or indeed their abolition, the European Parliament and the Council cannot disestablish specialised courts they have created. Your rapporteur considers that, when an article permits the creation of an institutional organ, it seems logical to deduce that this article also implicitly permits its abolition when required by changing circumstances.

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AFFAIRS ON THE LEGAL BASIS

Mr Pavel Svoboda
Chair
Committee on Legal Affairs
BRUSSELS

Subject: Opinion on the legal basis of the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the transfer to the General Court of the European Union of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants (COM(2016)0081 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD))

Dear Mr Chair,

In March 2015, the Committee on Legal Affairs decided of its own motion, pursuant to Rule 39(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to provide an opinion on the appropriateness of the change of the legal basis proposed in the draft report on the above proposal.

The legal bases proposed by the Court of Justice are, on the one hand, Article 19(2) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), which concerns the number of judges at the General Court, and, on the other hand, Article 256(1), Article 257 and the second paragraph of Article 281 TFEU, which concern, respectively, the jurisdiction of the General Court and possible changes thereto, the establishment of specialised courts by secondary legislation, and the modification of the statute of the Court of Justice by secondary legislation. The legal basis also includes Article 106a(1) of the Euratom Treaty, which concerns the Court of Justice to the extent that it is also the Court of Justice of the Euratom Community.

The rapporteur for the regulation considers that Article 19(2) should not be used as a legal basis for the present proposal as it does not modify the number of judges at the General Court, and has proposed an amendment to that effect.

The aim of this opinion is to determine the validity and the appropriateness of the amendment removing Article 19(2) as a legal basis.

I - Background

This regulation is the fourth relating to the reform of the Court of Justice. The first regulation made various changes to the formations and procedure of the Court of Justice and General Court, and the second made provision for temporary judges at the Civil Service Tribunal.

The third part of the reform was the most controversial, as it concerned an increase in the number of judges at the General Court. The initial increase envisaged was from 28 to 40 judges. At the end of the road, the co-legislators agreed, under the impulse of the Council, to

increase the number of judges at the General Court to 56, so as to allow each Member State to nominate two judges each. This increase was subject to the condition that the Civil Service Tribunal was to be abolished, and civil service disputes transferred back to the General Court.

The present regulation is therefore a follow-up to the third regulation reforming the Court of Justice. In parallel with the second step in the increase in judges at the General Court, from 40 to 47, the Civil Service Tribunal, which has seven judges, must be abolished.

The Court of Justice's proposal merely proposes the repeal of the provisions relating to the Civil Service Tribunal, along with a small number of consequential amendments and transitional provisions. Those consequential amendments include, of course, the repeal of the second regulation on the reform of the Court of Justice.

It has been claimed by some that, as Article 257 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union gives the co-legislators the competence to establish specialised courts, but does not explicitly refer to modifications to specialised courts or indeed their abolition, the European Parliament and the Council cannot disestablish specialised courts they have created. Your rapporteur considers that, when an article permits the creation of an institutional organ, it seems logical to deduce that this article also implicitly permits its abolition when required by changing circumstances.

II - Relevant Treaty articles (emphasis added)

Article 19(2) reads as follows:

Article 19 TEU

[...]

2. The Court of Justice shall consist of one judge from each Member State. It shall be assisted by Advocates-General.

The General Court shall include at least one judge per Member State.

The Judges and the Advocates-General of the Court of Justice and the Judges of the General Court shall be chosen from persons whose independence is beyond doubt and who satisfy the conditions set out in Articles 253 and 254 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. They shall be appointed by common accord of the governments of the Member States for six years. Retiring Judges and Advocates-General may be reappointed.

[...]

Article 256(1) TFEU reads as follows:

Article 256 TFEU

1. The General Court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine at first instance actions or proceedings referred to in Articles 263, 265, 268, 270 and 272, with the exception of those assigned to a specialised court set up under Article 257 and those reserved in the Statute for the Court of Justice. The Statute may provide for the General Court to have jurisdiction for

other classes of action or proceeding.

Decisions given by the General Court under this paragraph may be subject to a right of appeal to the Court of Justice on points of law only, under the conditions and within the limits laid down by the Statute.

[...]

Article 257 TFEU reads as follows:

Article 257 TFEU

The European Parliament and the Council, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure, may establish specialised courts attached to the General Court to hear and determine at first instance certain classes of action or proceeding brought in specific areas. The European Parliament and the Council shall act by means of regulations either on a proposal from the Commission after consultation of the Court of Justice or at the request of the Court of Justice after consultation of the Commission.

The regulation establishing a specialised court shall lay down the rules on the organisation of the court and the extent of the jurisdiction conferred upon it.

[...]

Article 281 TFEU reads as follows:

Article 281 TFEU

[...]

The European Parliament and the Council, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure, may amend the provisions of the Statute, with the exception of Title I and Article 64. The European Parliament and the Council shall act either at the request of the Court of Justice and after consultation of the Commission, or on a proposal from the Commission and after consultation of the Court of Justice.

Article 106a(1) Euratom Treaty reads as follows:

Article 106a Euratom Treaty

1. Article 7, Articles 13 to 19, Article 48(2) to (5), and Articles 49 and 50 of the Treaty on European Union, and Article 15, Articles 223 to 236, Articles 237 to 244, Article 245, Articles 246 to 270, Article 272, 273 and 274, Articles 277 to 281, Articles 285 to 304, Articles 310 to 320, Articles 322 to 325 and Articles 336, 342 and 344 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and the Protocol on Transitional Provisions, shall apply to this Treaty.

[...]

III - General principle for the choice of legal basis

It is settled case law of the Court of Justice that "the choice of legal basis for a Community measure must rest on objective factors amenable to judicial review, which include in particular the aim and content of the measure"¹. The choice of an incorrect legal basis may therefore justify the annulment of the act in question.

In this case, it therefore has to be established whether the proposal either:

1. pursues a multiple purpose or has several components, and one of those is identifiable as the main or predominant purpose or component, whereas the others are merely incidental; or
2. simultaneously pursues a number of objectives or has several components that are indissociably linked, without one being secondary and indirect in relation to the others.

According to the case law of the Court of Justice, in the first case the act must be based on a single legal basis, namely that required by the main or predominant purpose or component, and in the second case the act will have to be founded on the various corresponding legal bases.²

In this case, it is clear that Articles 256(1), 257 and 281 TFEU and Article 106a(1) Euratom Treaty must be used as a joint legal basis, as they concern different, but equally important aspects of the same problem, as will be shown below.

IV - Aim and content of the proposal

The proposal repeals, in Article 1:

- Council Decision 2004/752/EC, Euratom of 2 November 2004 establishing the European Union Civil Service Tribunal;
- Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 979/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 relating to temporary Judges of the European Union Civil Service Tribunal.

Article 2 introduces two new Articles into the Statute of the Court:

- A new Article 50a sets out, in paragraph 1, pursuant to the last sentence of Article 256(1) TFEU, the jurisdiction of the General Court with regard to the civil service. Paragraph 2 reintroduces the invitation to the court responsible for civil service disputes, to examine the possibilities of amicable settlement of disputes.
- A new Article 62c provides, in general terms, that the provisions relating to the jurisdiction, composition, organisation and procedure of any specialised court are to be contained in an Annex to the Statute. The draft report proposes not to insert this article as it is redundant in the absence of any specialised court.

Articles 3, 4 and 5 contain transitional provisions necessary for the transfer of jurisdiction.

¹ Case C-45/86, *Commission v. Council* (Generalised Tariff Preferences) [1987] ECR 1439, para. 5; Case C-440/05 *Commission v. Council* [2007] E.C.R. I-9097; Case C-411/06 *Commission v. Parliament and Council* [2009] ECR I-7585.

² See the Case C-411/06, cited above, paras 46-47.

V - Analysis and determination of the appropriate legal basis

The Court of Justice proposal contains five legal bases:

- Article 19(2) TEU is not an appropriate legal basis, as it concerns the number of judges at the General Court, which this proposal does not affect.
- Article 256(1) TFEU is a required legal basis, as it allows the statute to be amended to give the General Court jurisdiction over additional categories of cases. This is relevant as the Treaties do not explicitly give the General Court jurisdiction over staff disputes involving staff not subject to the Staff Regulations (i.e., staff at the European Central Bank and the European Investment Bank).
- Article 257 TFEU is a required legal basis as it allows the establishment of specialised courts such as the Civil Service Tribunal. It stands to reason that the legislator can also modify or abolish specialised courts when the circumstances so require: the entire purpose of Article 257 TFEU is to allow sufficient flexibility in the Union's jurisdictional architecture.
- Article 281 TFEU, second paragraph, is a required legal basis as it allows the co-legislators to amend the statute of the Court of Justice by the ordinary legislative procedure, in particular to make the changes allowed by Articles 256(1) and 257.
- Article 106a(1) Euratom Treaty is also a required legal basis, as it provides that various institutional provisions of the TEU and the TFEU, including all articles mentioned above, also apply to the Euratom Community. Lack of reference to this article would suggest that the jurisdictional rules of the EU and Euratom could differ, which is not the case.

It therefore follows that the appropriate joint legal bases are Article 256(1) TFEU, concerning the extension of the jurisdiction of the General Court, Article 257 TFEU, first and second paragraph, concerning specialised courts and their creation, modification or abolition, Article 281 TFEU, second paragraph, concerning the amendment of the statute of the Court of Justice, and Article 106a(1) Euratom Treaty, concerning the application of all the above changes to the Euratom Community also. Article 19(2) TEU should not be used as a legal basis as the present proposal does not concern the number of judges at the General Court.

The four legal bases must be used in conjunction as they concern different aspects of the change. Leaving any one of the legal bases out of the proposal would leave the resulting regulation without a sufficient foundation in the Treaties.

VI - Conclusion and recommendation

The appropriate legal basis for the above proposal is quadruple: Article 256(1) TFEU, Article 257 TFEU, first and second paragraph, Article 281 TFEU, second paragraph, and Article 106a(1) Euratom Treaty. Article 19(2) TEU is not an appropriate legal basis for this proposal.

At its meeting of 21 April 2016, the Committee on Legal Affairs accordingly decided, by 16 votes to 3, with 1 abstention¹, to recommend that the Committee on Legal Affairs and the

¹ The following were present for the final vote: Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (1. Vice-Chair), Jean-Marie Cavada (2. Vice-Chair), Axel Voss (3. Vice-Chair), Mady Delvaux (4. Vice-Chair), Max Andersson, Joëlle Bergeron, Marie-Christine Boutonnet, Kostas Chrysogonos, Therese Comodini Cachia, Angel Dzhambazki,

Plenary should therefore endorse the amendment changing the legal basis.

Yours sincerely,

Pavel Svoboda

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Enrico Gasbarra, Heidi Hautala, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Dietmar Köster, Gilles Lebreton, Emil Radev, József Szájer, Cecilia Wikström, Josef Weidenholzer (for Evelyn Regner pursuant to Rule 200(2)).

21.4.2016

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

for the Committee on Legal Affairs

on the draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the transfer to the General Court of the European Union of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants

(N8-0110/2015 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD))

Rapporteur: Danuta Maria Hübner

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

On 28 March 2011 the Court of Justice submitted a proposal on the amendment of the Statute of the Court of Justice of the EU on the basis of Articles 254(1) and 281(2) TFEU. Following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, such proposal should, for the first time, be adopted in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure.

The submitted legislative proposal contains separate proposals in respect of each of the three jurisdictions which compose the Court of Justice of the European Union.

Regarding the Court of Justice the proposals mainly concern the establishment of the office of Vice-President of the Court of Justice and the amendment of the rules relating to the composition and the way the Grand Chamber operates.

Another part of the proposal intends to allow the appointment of temporary Judges to the Civil Service Tribunal. It was proposed, in a separate draft regulation, to amend Article 62c of the Statute of the Court by providing, in general terms, for the possibility of attaching temporary Judges to the specialised courts. Two regulations were adopted as a result of the Court proposals¹.

To cope with the increased workload (increase of 65% of cases brought before the General Court between 2000 and 2010; at the end of 2010, 1 300 cases were pending, whereas in the same year 527 cases were resolved), the Court of Justice considers, in order to find a

¹ Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 979/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 relating to temporary Judges of the European Union Civil Service Tribunal, OJ L 303, 31.10.2012, p. 83–84. Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 741/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 August 2012 amending the Protocol on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union and Annex I thereto, OJ L 228, 23.8.2012, p. 1–3

structural solution, that an increase in the number of Judges by at least 12, bringing the number of General Court Judges to 39, was necessary.

The Commission and the Parliament¹, at first reading, have accepted this increase in the number of judges. Member states were however not able to agree on the modalities for the appointment of 12 additional judges. If the large Member States wanted them to be appointed on merit, small Member States required a rotation system which ensures them, in turn, two judges at the Court.

In July 2014, the Italian Presidency asked the Court to formulate a new reform proposal; proposal that the President of the Court of Justice submitted in autumn 2014.

The updated version of the Court's proposal proposes to double the number of judges of the Court and raise it to 56 in three steps. In 2015, twelve new judicial positions would be created. In 2016, the seven judges of the Civil Service Tribunal would join the General Court. Finally, in 2019, nine new posts would be created.

It is on the basis of this new proposal that Parliament and the Council reached an agreement².

Recital 9 of the adopted regulation provides that *"In September 2016, (...) the seven posts of the Judges sitting at the European Union Civil Service Tribunal ('Civil Service Tribunal') should be transferred to the General Court ..."*

The proposal now under consideration is aimed at implementing the decision to transfer the seven judges of the Civil Service Tribunal to the General Court taken in the regulation mentioned above, by also transferring the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Tribunal to the General Court. As such, the proposal does not raise particular questions and the rapporteur suggests accepting it without amendment.

The Committee on Constitutional Affairs calls on the Committee on Legal Affairs, as the committee responsible, to propose that Parliament adopts its position at first reading taking over the request by the Court of Justice without amendments.

¹ Amendments adopted by the European Parliament on 12 December 2013 on the draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending the Protocol on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union by increasing the number of Judges at the General Court (02074/2011 – C7-0126/2012 – 2011/0901B(COD)) (1)

European Parliament legislative resolution of 15 April 2014 on the draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending the Protocol on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union by increasing the number of Judges at the General Court (02074/2011 – C7-0126/2012 – 2011/0901B(COD)) (Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)

² Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2015/2422 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2015 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union, OJ L 341, 24.12.2015, p. 14–17

PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

Title	Transfer to the General Court of the EU of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants
References	N8-0110/2015 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD)
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	JURI 26.11.2015
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	AFCO 26.11.2015
Rapporteur Date appointed	Danuta Maria Hübner 3.12.2015
Discussed in committee	15.3.2016
Date adopted	20.4.2016
Result of final vote	+: 19 –: 3 0: 1
Members present for the final vote	Mercedes Bresso, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Kostas Chrysogonos, Richard Corbett, Esteban González Pons, Danuta Maria Hübner, Ramón Jáuregui Atondo, Constance Le Grip, Jo Leinen, Morten Messerschmidt, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Paulo Rangel, György Schöpflin, Pedro Silva Pereira, Barbara Spinelli, Claudia Tapardel, Josep-Maria Terricabras, Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski
Substitutes present for the final vote	Max Andersson, Gerolf Annemans, David McAllister, Andrej Plenković, Cristian Dan Preda
Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote	Axel Voss

PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE

Title	Transfer to the General Court of the EU of jurisdiction at first instance in disputes between the Union and its servants
References	N8-0110/2015 – C8-0367/2015 – 2015/0906(COD)
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	JURI 26.11.2015
Committees asked for opinions Date announced in plenary	AFCO 26.11.2015
Rapporteurs Date appointed	Mady Delvaux 18.2.2016
Legal basis disputed Date of JURI opinion	JURI 21.4.2016
Discussed in committee	15.3.2016
Date adopted	21.4.2016
Result of final vote	+: 15 –: 4 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Max Andersson, Joëlle Bergeron, Marie-Christine Boutonnet, Jean-Marie Cavada, Kostas Chrysogonos, Therese Comodini Cachia, Mady Delvaux, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Enrico Gasbarra, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Dietmar Köster, Gilles Lebreton, Emil Radev, József Szájer, Axel Voss
Substitutes present for the final vote	Angel Dzhambazki, Heidi Hautala, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Cecilia Wikström
Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote	Josef Weidenholzer
Date tabled	2.5.2016