Court, Germany) for a preliminary ruling in the proceedings pending before that court between Hauptzollamt Heilbronn and Temic Telefunken Microelectronic GmbH in the presence of the Bundesministerium der Finanzen — on the interpretation of Article 18 (2) (d), the first subparagraph of Article 18 (3) and the first indent of Article 21 (1) (a) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1999/85 of 16 July 1985 on inward processing relief arrangements [2] — the Court (Fourth Chamber), composed of: P. J. G. Kapteyn, President of the Chamber, C. N. Kakouris and J. L. Murray (Rapporteur), Judges; G. Tesauro, Advocate-General; L. Hewlett, Administrator, for the Registrar, has given a judgment on 29 June 1995, in which it rules:

Article 18 (2) (d), the first subparagraph of Article 18 (3) and the first indent of Article 21 (1) (a) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1999/85 of 16 July 1985 on inward processing relief arrangements are to be interpreted as meaning that a quantitative limitation may not be attached to an authorization to use the system of processing under customs control as a way of discharging the inward processing relief arrangements.

[1] OJ No C 332, 8. 12. 1993.
[2] OJ No L 188, 20. 7. 1985, p. 1.

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

(Sixth Chamber)

of 29 June 1995

in Case C-454/93 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Arbeidshof, Brussels): Rijksdienst voor Arbeidsvoorziening v. Joop van Gestel [1]

(Social security for migrant workers — Designation of the competent State in accordance with Article 17 of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 — Residence and employment in a Member State other than the competent State — Unemployment benefits provided pursuant to Article 71 (1) (b) (ii))

(95/C 229/09)

(Language of the case: Dutch)

(Provisional translation; the definitive translation will be published in the European Court Reports)

In Case C-454/93: reference to the Court under Article 177 of the EC Treaty by the Arbeidshof (Higher Labour Court), Brussels, for a preliminary ruling in the proceedings pending before that court between Rijksdienst voor Arbeidsvoorziening and Joop van Gestel on the interpretation of Articles 17 and 71 (1) (b) (ii) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to members of their families moving within the Community [2], as amended and updated by Council Regulation (EEC) No 2001/83 of 2 June 1983 [3] — the Court (Sixth Chamber), composed of: F. A. Schockweiler, President of the Chamber, G. F. Mancini, C. N. Kakouris (Rapporteur), J. L. Murray and G. Hirsch, Judges; G. Cosmas, Advocate-General; H. A. Rühl, Principal Administrator, for the Registrar, gave a judgment on 29 June 1995, the operative part of which is as follows:

1. *Article 71 (1) (b) (ii) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to members of their families moving within the Community, as amended and updated by Council Regulation (EEC) No 2001/83 of 2 June 1983 must be interpreted as also applying to unemployed persons who during their last employment resided in the Member State in which they worked, even where, in derogation from Article 13 (2) (a) of that Regulation, and pursuant to Article 17, therein referred to, the competent authorities of two Member States are in agreement that the employed person is to remain subject to the social security legislation of one of those Member States, not being the one in whose territory the unemployed person was employed;*

2. *that article applies even where the agreement pursuant to Article 17 of the Regulation came into being when the employed person was already working and residing in the territory of one and the same Member State.*

[1] OJ No C 1, 4. 1. 1994.
[2] OJ No L 149, 5. 7. 1971, p. 2.
[3] OJ No L 230, 22. 8. 1983, p. 6.

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

(Sixth Chamber)

of 29 June 1995

in Case C-456/93 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Oberlandesgericht Frankfurt am Main): Zentrale zur Bekämpfung unlauteren Wettbewerbs eV v. Privatkellerei Franz Wilhelm Langguth Erben GmbH & Co. KG [1]

(Description of wines — Repetition on the label of the terms 'Kabinett', 'Spätlese', 'Auslese' and 'Weißherbst' as parts of a brand name)

(95/C 229/10)

(Language of the case: German)

(Provisional translation; the definitive translation will be published in the European Court Reports)

In Case C-456/93: reference to the Court under Article 177 of the EC Treaty by the Oberlandesgericht (Higher Regional Court) Frankfurt am Main (Germany) for a preliminary ruling in the proceedings pending before that court between Zentrale zur Bekämpfung unlauteren Wettbewerbs eV and Privatkellerei Franz Wilhelm Langguth Erben GmbH & Co. KG on the interpretation of Article 40 (3) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2392/89 of 24 July 1989 laying down general rules for the description and presentation of wines and grape musts [2] and Article 3 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3201/90 of 16 October 1990 laying down detailed rules for the description and presentation of wines