



EU Enforcement of Free Movement of People Rules

Standard Note: SN/IA/6783

Last updated: 20 December 2013

Author: Vaughne Miller

Section International Affairs and Defence Section

The principle of free movement is fundamental to the EU's single market and EU citizenship. It is enshrined in Articles 21 and 45 of the *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union* and in EU directives and regulations.

The European Commission monitors Member States' implementation of free movement rules and believes the economic crisis has prompted some Member States to take unilateral, discriminatory action in breach of them.

This Note outlines Commission and Court of Justice action in the area of the free movement of people with specific reference to UK cases.

In the context of EU enlargement, see Standard Note 6606, [Ending of transitional restrictions for Bulgarian and Romanian workers](#), 29 November 2013.

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Commission action	3
3	Court of Justice rulings	4
3.1	CJEU Case- law	4
3.2	Free movement cases involving the UK	11
4	Further reading	12

1 Introduction

The principle of free movement is fundamental to the EU's single market and EU citizenship. It is enshrined in Articles 21 and 45 of the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) and in EU directives and regulations. It began with the free movement of labour, but has gradually evolved to cover self-employed people, students, pensioners and EU citizens in general.

The European Court of Justice initially dealt with free movement as a largely economic concept, but increasingly the social implications of free movement have become the subject of Commission infringement proceedings and Court of Justice case law.

[EC Directive 2004/38/EC](#), the so-called Free Movement Directive, extended the principle of equal treatment to social assistance. In November 2009 an expert group on the right to free movement of persons was established to improve the implementation of the 2004 Directive. Its aim was to improve coordination with Member States and promote an exchange of views and best practices. Since the Lisbon Treaty came into force in December 2009, free movement rights have also been supported by Article 1 (human dignity) and Article 34 (social security and social assistance) of the [EU Charter of Fundamental Rights](#).¹

EU [Regulation 492/2011](#) of 27 May 2011 codified the rights associated with the free movement of workers (access to employment in another Member State, pay and working conditions, social and tax advantages, access to training, trade union membership, housing and access to education and training for the children of EU migrant workers). In November 2013 a Commission Communication ([COM\(2013\)837 final](#)) proposed five actions to make a difference in the area of free movement of EU citizens and their families:

1. Helping Member States fight marriages of convenience
2. Helping authorities apply EU social security coordination rules
3. Helping authorities meet social inclusion challenges
4. Addressing the needs of local authorities by promoting the exchange of best practices
5. Helping local authorities to apply EU free movement rules on the ground.²

¹ The effects of the Charter in the UK are discussed in [Standard Note 6765](#), 26 November 2013

² For summary of Communication, see [Commission press release 25 November 2013](#).

2 Commission action

A [Commission press release in August 2011](#) outlined how the Commission had responded to infringements of the free movement directive:

Since summer 2010, a total of 786 issues were identified by the Commission and raised in bilateral meetings with Member States. The Commission made clear that if problems were not resolved, Treaty infringement proceedings would be inevitable. As a result, 711 issues (around 90%) were solved through dialogue and/or presentation by Member States of draft amended laws. Only 75 issues currently remain outstanding and are now the subject of infringement proceedings. In the French case, the government adopted the legislative amendments required by the Commission to ensure compliance with the Free Movement Directive on 16 June, including the safeguards that protect EU citizens against arbitrary expulsions or discriminatory treatment. The Commission continues to work with the remaining countries to tackle outstanding issues, such as entry and residence for family members, residence cards for third-country nationals and safeguards against expulsions.

The Commission added that difficult economic times were no justification for Member States taking unilateral, discriminatory action, and that the free movement directive provided “sufficient safeguards to ensure that citizens’ exercise of their right to free movement does not disproportionately burden a Member State’s budget”.

In its [30th Annual Report on Monitoring the Application of EU Law in 2012](#) the Commission outlined the free movement complaints received in 2012:

The Commission received 309 complaints on employment issues in 2012, more than in 2011 (269). In the area of the free movement of workers, most complaints concerned:

- access to and working conditions in the public sector (especially recognition of professional experience and qualifications acquired in other Member States);
- access to study grants (restrictive criteria for providing study grants, employment obligation for graduates); and
- obstacles to the free movement of professional sports players. [...]

There were 491 complaints concerning justice in 2012 (433 in 2011). Most concerned the free movement of people, citizenship rights, various forms of discrimination, fundamental rights,⁵¹⁹ civil justice and consumer law.

The Commission fully closed 312 out of the 358 justice complaints it handled in 2012 by sending a full response. It transferred 27 complaints to EU pilot to be discussed with the Member States.

⁵¹⁹ [Report on the Application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights](#)

The Commission received 60 complaints concerning the free movement of people “in particular difficulties in obtaining residence cards, requiring a visa from family members of EU citizens, refusing visas for reasons prohibited by EU law”. The Commission also issued a

Reasoned Opinion concerning the UK's failure to properly implement the free movement directive, with the threat of legal action before the Court of Justice and a possible fine.³

3 Court of Justice rulings

Jonathan Tomkin⁴ looked at how the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) has interpreted freedom of movement issues as the principle has evolved:

... the introduction of the citizenship provisions into the Treaty has served to enhance the free movement rights of Member State nationals. As a first step, the Court interpreted the citizenship provisions in combination with the right to equal treatment and prohibition of discrimination, now enshrined in Article 18 TFEU. Once the situation of a Union citizen fell within the material scope of the Treaty, he or she was entitled to rely on provisions prohibiting discrimination on grounds of nationality. A further step in the advancement of citizens' rights was the Court's willingness to interpret secondary legislation, in particular, residence directives concerning economically inactive Member State nationals, in light of the Treaty's citizenship provisions. Thus, for example, although these directives clearly and unambiguously made rights of residence subject to a sufficient resource requirement, the Court emphasised that recourse to social benefits could not automatically entail the loss of residence rights. Access to social benefits was to be extended to Union citizens who could demonstrate a requisite degree of integration with their Member State of residence. The Court recognised that the ties of solidarity between Member States and migrant Union citizens precluded a blanket prohibition on accessing social benefits and that Member States were under an obligation to consider the situation of Union citizens on a case by case basis.⁵

3.1 CJEU Case-law

Below is a selection of free movement cases at the EU Court of Justice from 1975 to 2012.⁶

[Carmelo Angelo Bonsignore v Oberstadtdirektor der Stadt Köln, C-67/74, 26 February 1975](#)

The Court ruled that EU law prohibits expulsion of a national of a Member State on general preventive grounds. Restrictive measures, such as expulsion, must be based on an actual threat and cannot be justified just by a general risk. Expulsion can be ordered in the case of breaches of the peace and public security actually caused by the individual defendant himself/herself. Matters unrelated to the individual may not be taken into account.

[Roland Rutili v Ministre de l'intérieur, C-36/75, 28 October 1975](#)

This case concerned a worker who was involved in trade union activities. The Court ruled that the right of a national of any Member State to enter the territory of another Member State, to stay there and to move within it, may not be restricted unless the presence or conduct of this national constitutes a genuine and sufficiently serious threat to public policy

³ [Commission press release 26 April 2012](#). See also [Commission press release, 25 August 2011](#) on freedom of movement implementation. A list of single market infringements to which the Commission has responded in 2013 is on the [Single Market website](#), but it covers a wide range of single market areas, not just the free movement of persons.

⁴ Barrister-at-law, Director of Irish Centre for European Law, Trinity College, Dublin; Former Référendaire at EU Court of Justice.

⁵ *European Journal of Migration and Law*, [Citizenship in Motion: The Development of the Freedom of Movement for Citizens in the Case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union](#), 2011.

⁶ Information taken mainly from European Commission, [Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion case law website](#), Curia. This list is not comprehensive.

[Jean Noël Royer, C-48/75, 8 April 1976](#)

Exceptions to free movement of workers have to be based on public policy, public security and public health. However, these exceptions are not considered as conditions precedent to the acquisition of the right of entry and residence. They provide for the possibility, in individual cases where there is sufficient justification, of imposing restrictions on the exercise of a right.

The granting of a permit is a measure of a Member State that serves to prove the individual position of a national of another Member State. The failure of a national of a Member State to complete the legal formalities on access, movement and residence does not justify a decision that orders expulsion based on a breach of public policy or public security.

A decision that orders expulsion of a national of a Member State cannot be executed, except for cases of urgency which have been properly justified, against a person protected by Union law until the party concerned has been able to exhaust its remedies.

[Regina v Stanislaus Pieck, C-157/79, 3 July 1980](#)

The Court confirmed that the freedom of movement can be restricted on grounds of public policy, public security and public health; also that a residence document has only a declaratory effect.

The Court held expulsion incompatible with EU law. National authorities are not entitled to impose penalties which are so disproportionate to the gravity of the infringement (non-compliance with administrative formalities) that they become obstacles to the free movement of persons. Imprisonment was not proportionate in this situation.

[Elestina Esselina Christina Morson v State of the Netherlands and Head of the Plaatselijke Politie within the meaning of the Vreemdelingenwet; Sweradjie Jhanjan v State of the Netherlands, C-35 and 36/82, 27 October 1982](#)

Nationals of a Member State may only invoke rights of entry and residence if they have already exercised their freedom of movement in order to carry out an economic activity in another Member State. The Court confirmed that the provisions on the freedom of movement for workers can be invoked only if the case comes within the area to which Union law applies.

[Graziana Luisi and Giuseppe Carbone v Ministero del Tesoro, C-286/82 and 26/83, 31 January 1984](#)

This case concerned the freedom of services. Services fall within the Treaty if they are normally provided for remuneration, in so far as they are not governed by the provisions relating to freedom of movement for goods, capital and persons. The provider and the recipient of a service have a right of residence during the period in which the service is provided. The freedom to provide services includes the freedom for the recipients of services to go to another Member State in order to receive medical treatment.

[Vera Hoeckx v Centre public d'aide social de Kalmthout, C-249/83, 27 March 1985](#)

The Court ruled that EU citizens working and residing in another Member State have the right to claim the same social advantages as nationals of that Member State. A temporal residence requirement is incompatible with [Regulation 1612/68](#). Such a requirement implies an additional condition imposed on workers who are nationals of a Member State. This constitutes direct discrimination on the basis of nationality.

[Ministere Public v Robert Heinrich Maria Mutsch, C-137/84, 11 July 1985](#)

This case concerned the right of a migrant worker to have his/her court trial conducted in his/her own language. This right plays an important role in the integration of a migrant worker and his/her family

into the host State and consequently in achieving the objective of free movement for workers. This right must be considered as a social advantage within the meaning of EU law

[Deborah Lawrie-Blum v Land Baden-Württemberg, C-66/85, 3 July 1986](#)

Free movement of workers is a fundamental freedom of all EU nationals. This case is very important because it confirms that principle and provides a definition of who is a worker. While some Member States argued that the definition of a worker is in accordance with their national law, the Court held that the meaning of the term is a common EU one across the Member States. Any EU national who fills the conditions:

- for a period of time;
- provides services to another person or company;
- is under the direction of another person;
- receives remuneration for those services

is a worker and thus entitled to full range of EU freedoms and rights.

[Anita Groener v Minister for Education and the City of Dublin Vocational Educational Committee, C-379/87, 28 November 1989](#)

EU law does not prohibit the adoption of a policy for the protection and promotion of a language of a Member State, which is both the national language and the first official language. The restriction may not be disproportionate to the aim pursued or unnecessarily discriminatory towards other Member State nationals. The principle of non-discrimination precludes the imposition of any requirement that the linguistic knowledge must have been obtained in the national territory.

[Rush Portuguesa Ld v Office national d'immigration, C-113/89, 27 March 1990](#)

This concerned free movement principles regarding a recently acceded Member State. In this situation the freedom of movement of workers was limited by the Act of Accession since the transitional period had not ended. The freedom of services is not subject to transitional provisions.

The rules on services are applicable if workers move temporarily to provide services for their employer. These workers return to their country of origin at the end of their employment. They do not gain access to the labour market of the host Member State. Thus, it is the employer's right to service provision that is exercised, not a worker's right to free movement.

[The Queen v Immigration Appeal Tribunal, ex parte Gustaff Desiderius Antonissen, C-292/89, 26 February 1991](#)

The Court discussed the freedom of movement of workers and the right of residence of persons who seek employment. The free movement of workers includes the right for nationals of Member States to seek employment in another Member State. However, this can be subject to temporal limitation. After six months, the person may be required to leave the Member State, unless he/she provides evidence that he/she is continuing to seek employment and that he/she has genuine a chance of finding employment.

[Commission v The Netherlands, C-68/89, 30 May 1991](#)

The Court confirmed that nationals of Member States have the right to enter the territory of other Member States in the exercise of the various freedoms recognized by the Treaty and in particular the freedom to provide services, which is enjoyed by both the providers and the recipients of services. The

Court held that the establishment of conditions of entry other than the production of a valid passport or identity card was inconsistent with EU law.

[Mario Vicente Micheletti and others v Delegación del Gobierno en Cantabria, C-369/90, 7 July 1992](#)

This case confirmed that the freedom of establishment applies to nationals of a Member State irrespective of whether or not the individual also holds a non-EU nationality. The Court underlined that matters of nationality are within the exclusive competence of the Member States, but that as long as an individual holds the nationality of another Member State, the host State must accord the right.

[Kraus v Land Baden-Württemberg, Case C-19/92, 31 March 1993](#)

The Court held that the situation of a Community national who holds a postgraduate academic title awarded in another Member State and facilitates access to a profession or the pursuit of an economic activity, is governed by EU law, even as regards the relations between that national and his Member State of origin. Accordingly, if a Member State can make use of that title in its territory subject to an administrative authorisation, the authorisation procedure must be intended solely to verify whether the title was properly awarded.

[Union royale belge des sociétés de football association and others v Bosman and others, Case C-415/93, 15 December 1995](#)

The Court ruled on the compatibility of rules of football federations with freedom of movement of workers. It stated that professional sport is an economic activity whose exercise may not be hindered by rules governing the transfer of players or restricting the number of players who are nationals of other Member States.

[John O'Flynn v Adjudication Officer, C-237/94, 23 May 1996](#)

This case confirmed that the principle of freedom of workers also applies to social allowances. Migrant workers must enjoy those advantages under the same conditions as national workers. The Court held that the rule of equal treatment prohibits all forms of discrimination. If conditions affect migrant workers without making a direct distinction on the basis of nationality, they are indirectly discriminatory. Conditions are also considered as indirectly discriminatory if they can more easily be satisfied by national workers than by migrant workers. Such provisions can be justified if they are objective and proportionate.

[Maria Martínez Sala v Freistaat Bayern, C-85/96, 12 May 1998](#)

This is the first case on the meaning of EU Citizenship, the fundamental status of nationals of Member States. The Court ruled that nationals of a Member State can rely on their European citizenship for protection against discrimination on grounds of nationality by another Member State.

A residence permit can only have a declaratory and probative force with regard to the recognition of the right of residence. The possession of a permit may not be a requirement for the right to a benefit, if own nationals do not have to produce any document of that kind. This would be unequal treatment.

[Rudy Grzelczyk and Centre public d'aide sociale d'Ottignies-Louvain-la-Neuve, C-184/99, 20 September 2001](#)

This judgment ruled on the right of a student residing in another Member State. It confirms that discrimination on the ground of nationality is not permitted against EU citizens who have exercised their rights of free movement. Union citizenship is destined to be the fundamental status of nationals of Member States. This enables these nationals, who find themselves in the same situation, to enjoy the same treatment in law irrespective of their nationality, subject to such exceptions as are expressly

provided for. Consequently a student can enjoy the benefit of a social advantage, as long as he/she does not become an unreasonable burden on the public finances.

EU students do not lose their EU rights if they move to another Member State to study there. These students may be required to guarantee the relevant national authority that they have sufficient resources for their period of residence, that they are enrolled in a recognised educational establishment and that they are covered by sickness insurance.

[Ministre de l'Intérieur and Aitor Oteiza Olazabal, C-100/01, 26 November 2002](#)

The Court ruled that Member States may take administrative police measures against migrant workers if:

- such action is justified by reasons of public order or public security based on his/her individual conduct;
- by reason of their seriousness, those reasons could otherwise give rise only to a measure prohibiting him/her from residing in, or banishing him/her from, the whole of the national territory;
- the conduct which the Member State concerned wishes to prevent gives rise, in the case of its own nationals, to punitive measures or other genuine and effective measures designed to combat it.

If these requirements are met, the measures will not be regarded as discriminatory.

[Isabel Burbaud v Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité, C-285/01, 9 September 2003](#)

A host Member State may not refuse entry to a regulated profession to a national of a Member State who holds the qualifications necessary for exercise of that profession in another Member State, although he/she had not passed the national entrance examination. This would place nationals of other Member States at a disadvantage and would restrain them from exercising their rights, as workers, to the freedom of movement. This obstacle is incompatible with EU law. The diploma obtained in one Member State has to be equivalent to the required diploma in another Member State, for employment in the hospital public service

[Brian Francis Collins v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, C-138/02, 23 March 2004](#)

This case concerns job-seekers. The Court confirmed that a benefit of a financial nature to facilitate access to employment in the labour market of a Member State falls within the meaning of the *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*. The Court pointed out that a Member State may grant a job-seeker's allowance dependent upon a requirement, if this requirement is based on objective considerations that are independent of nationality and is proportionate to a legitimate aim. In this case the requirement of a genuine link between the person seeking work and the employment market of that State was acceptable.

[Georgios Orfanopoulos and Others and Raffaele Olivieri v Land Baden-Württemberg, C-482/01 and C-493/01, 29 April 2004](#)

The expulsion of nationals of other Member States is an obstacle to the freedom of movement for workers. In this case the Court held that such an obstacle may be justified on grounds of public policy, based on the personal conduct of the individual concerned. Previous criminal convictions are not in themselves sufficient to justify an obstacle. The concept of public policy presupposes a genuine and sufficiently serious threat which affects one of the fundamental interests of society. The national authorities have to consider in every case whether the personal conduct constitutes a present threat of public policy at the time of the expulsion. This examination has to be made in compliance with the general principles of EU law. Special attention has to be paid to the fundamental rights, especially the right to family life.

[Michel Trojani v Centre public d'aide sociale de Bruxelles \(CPAS\), C-456/02, 7 September 2004](#)

A worker is any person who pursues activities which are real and genuine, with the exclusion of activities on such a small scale as to be regarded as purely marginal and ancillary. If activities constitute merely rehabilitation or integration for the person concerned, this cannot be regarded as a real and genuine economic activity. The national court has to examine whether the services performed are regarded as forming part of the normal labour market.

An EU citizen who is not economically active may rely on the non-discrimination principle where he/she has been lawfully resident in the host Member State for a certain time or possesses a residence permit. In such circumstances, Member States may make the residence of an EU citizen who is not economically active conditional on his/her having sufficient resources.

[Kunqian Catherine Zhu and Man Lavette Chen v Secretary of State for the Home Department, C-200/02, 19 October 2004](#)

A minor who is a Member State national, is covered by sickness insurance and has available to him/her sufficient resources also has that right to reside. EU law does not require the child itself to have the necessary resources and a refusal to grant at the same time to its mother, who is a third-country national, a right to reside would render redundant the child's right to reside. Even where the purpose of acquiring the nationality of a Member State is to obtain for a third-country national a right of residence pursuant to EU law, it is not permissible for a Member State to restrict the effects of the grant of the nationality of another Member State.

[The Queen \(on the application of Dany Bidar\) v London Borough of Ealing, Secretary of State for Education and Skills, C-209/03, 15 March 2005](#)

The Court confirmed that a student can rely on the right to equal treatment during his/her residence in a host Member State. Member States may require students to guarantee that they have sufficient financial funds, so they will not become an unreasonable burden. However they may not require that those funds cover the entire period of stay. Member States are allowed to grant assistance only to students who have demonstrated a certain degree of integration into the society of that State, for example by finding that the student has resided in the host Member State for a certain length of time. In this case the requirement of three years' residence was allowed.

[Commission v Spain \(Free movement of persons\) C-157/03, 14 April 2005](#)

The requirements for initial entry visa are discussed. The Court prohibited Spain from requiring the formalities of a Residence application as part of the visa process:

[Office national de l'emploi v Ioannis Ioannidis, C-258/04, 15 September 2005](#)

The Court confirms that nationals of a Member State who are seeking employment in another Member State fall within the scope of Union law. The Court considers that a condition linking the grant of an allowance to the requirement that the applicant has obtained the required diploma in that Member State can be met more easily by the nationals of that Member State. However, this difference in treatment can be justified if based on objective considerations which are independent of the nationality of the persons concerned and proportionate to the aim legitimately pursued by the national law.

The Court confirmed that the national legislature can require that there is a real link between the applicant for the allowance and the geographic employment market concerned. But it is too general and exclusive if this single condition concerns the place where the diploma of completion of secondary education was obtained. This goes beyond what is necessary for the objective followed

[Gérald De Cuyper v Office national de l'emploi, C-406/04, 18 July 2006](#)

This case concerned the compatibility of national unemployment legislation with the freedom of movement and residence. The Court confirmed that the right of residence is not unconditional; it can be subject to limitations and conditions. The condition of a residence clause for an unemployment allowance is not prohibited. A condition can be justified by objective considerations of public interest and it has to be proportionate. This residence clause reflects the need to monitor the circumstances of unemployed persons.

[D.P.W. Hendrix v Raad van Bestuur van Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen, C-287/05, 11 September 2007](#)

This case concerned access to non-contributory disability benefits. The Court considered these benefits to be social advantages within the meaning of EU law (Regulation No 1612/68). The Court held that it is permissible to reserve such a special non-contributory disability benefit, listed in annex IIa of Regulation 1408/71 to persons who reside in the territory of the Member State which provides the benefit. However a condition of residence can be put forward only if it is objectively justified and proportionate to the objective pursued by national legislation.

[Blaise Baheten Metock and Others v Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform, C-127/08, 25 July 2008](#)

The extra condition of previous lawful residence in the EU restricting the free movement of third-country national family members of EU migrants is incompatible with the text and the aim of Directive 2004/38/EC and with the objective of the internal market. It is irrelevant whether the marriage was concluded before or after the EU citizen migrated to the host Member State, where the marriage was concluded and whether the third-country national entered the host Member State before or after the marriage.

[Athanasios Vatsouras and Josif Koupatantze v Arbeitsgemeinschaft \(ARGE\) Nürnberg 900, C-22/08 and C-23/08, 4 June 2009](#)

The Court confirmed that the concept of worker is independent from the limited amount of remuneration and the short duration of the professional activity. Further, a job-seeker is entitled to receive any benefit of a financial nature intended to facilitate access to employment. Such a benefit is not social assistance, which Member States may refuse to job-seekers. To receive a benefit the job-seeker can be required to have established genuine links with the labour market of the Member State, for example by showing he/she has sought work in that Member State for a reasonable period.

[Maria Teixeira v London Borough of Lambeth and Secretary of State for the Home Department, C-480/08, 23 February 2010](#)

The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer of a child exercising the right to pursue his/her education in accordance with Article 12 of Regulation No 1612/68 is not conditional on that parent having sufficient resources so as not to become a burden on the social assistance system of that Member State during the period of residence and having comprehensive sickness insurance cover there. The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer of a child of a migrant worker, where that child is in education in that State, is not conditional on one of the child's parents having worked as a migrant worker in that Member State on the date on which the child started in education.

The right of residence in the host Member State of the parent who is the primary carer of a child of a migrant worker, where that child is in education in that State, ends when the child reaches the age of majority, unless the child continues to need the presence and care of that parent in order to be able to pursue and complete his/her education.
































[Ruiz Zambrano v Office National de L'Emploi, C-34/09, 8 March 2011](#)

The Court established the principle that if the removal of the primary carer from the host Member State would necessitate the EU citizen child for whom they were caring leaving the territory of the EU, the third country national primary carer could derive a lawful right to reside in the host Member State under EU law from their relationship to the child.














[European Commission v. The Netherlands, C-542/09, 14 June 2012](#)

By requiring that migrant workers and dependent family members have to comply with a requirement of lawful residence in the Netherlands during at least three out of the six years preceding enrolment at a higher education establishment abroad, the Netherlands has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 45 TFEU and Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1612/68 (now [EU Regulation 492/2011](#)). This requirement establishes inequality of treatment between Dutch workers and migrant workers residing in the Netherlands or employed in that Member State as frontier workers.

3.2 Free movement cases involving the UK⁷

<i>Case</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Name of the parties</i>	<i>Subject-matter</i>	<i>Curia</i>
C-529/11	Judgment	08/05/2013	Alarape and Tijani	Citizenship of the Union - Right of entry and residence	
C-147/11	Judgment	06/09/2012	Czop	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-545/09	Judgment	02/02/2012	Commission v United Kingdom	Provisions governing the institutions	
C-480/08	Judgment	23/02/2010	Teixeira	Citizenship of the Union - Right of entry and residence	
C-310/08	Judgment	23/02/2010	Ibrahim and Secretary of State for the Home Department	Citizenship of the Union - Right of entry and residence	
C-294/06	Judgment	24/01/2008	Payir and Others	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-109/01	Judgment	23/09/2003	Akrich	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-466/00	Judgment	06/03/2003	Kaba	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-257/00	Judgment	09/01/2003	Givane and Others	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-60/00	Judgment	11/07/2002	Carpenter	Freedom to provide services	 
C-413/99	Judgment	17/09/2002	Baumbast and R	Citizenship of the Union - Right of entry and residence	 
C-192/99	Judgment	20/02/2001	Kaur	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-63/99	Judgment	27/09/2001	Gloszczuk	External relations - Association Agreement	 
C-357/98	Judgment	09/11/2000	Yiadom	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-356/98	Judgment	11/04/2000	Kaba	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-37/98	Judgment	11/05/2000	Savas	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-171/96	Judgment	16/07/1998	Pereira Roque	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-65/95	Judgment	17/06/1997	Shingara	Freedom of movement for workers	 
C-237/94	Judgment	23/05/1996	O'Flynn	Freedom of movement for workers	

⁷ Information collated from [Curia website](#).

<i>Case</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Name of the parties</i>	<i>Subject-matter</i>	<i>Curia</i>
C-175/94	Judgment	30/11/1995	Gallagher	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-370/90	Judgment	07/07/1992	Singh	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-15/90	Judgment	04/10/1991	Middleburgh	Social security	
C-355/89	Judgment	03/07/1991	Barr & Montrose Holdings	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-292/89	Judgment	26/02/1991	Antonissen	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-279/89	Judgment	17/11/1992	Commission v United Kingdom	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-197/86	Judgment	21/06/1988	Brown	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-157/79	Judgment	03/07/1980	Pieck	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-131/79	Judgment	22/05/1980	Santillo	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-110/79	Judgment	24/04/1980	Coonan	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-175/78	Judgment	28/03/1979	Saunders	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-30/77	Judgment	27/10/1977	Bouchereau	Freedom of movement for workers	
C-41/74	Judgment	04/12/1974	Van Duyn	Freedom of movement for workers	

4 Further reading

Independent 20 December 2013, [David Cameron presses EU to restrict free movement of people from poorer member states](#)

European Voice, 6 December 2013, [Reding offers help with free movement](#)

European Commission press release, 8 October 2013: [Free movement: Vice-President Reding's intervention at the Justice and Home Affairs Council](#) and Memo, 25 November 2013, [European Commission upholds free movement of people](#)

European Law [blog on free movement of persons](#)

European Commission Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security Right of Union citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the Union: [Guide on how to get the best out of Directive 2004/38/EC](#)

European Commission: [For EU citizens free movement is...](#)

Europa, [Freedom to move and live in Europe: A Guide to your rights as an EU citizen](#) and [Free movement of persons, asylum and immigration](#)

[COM/2009/0313 final](#), Commission Communication on guidance for better transposition and application of Directive 2004/38/EC.

Flash Eurobarometer 365, February 2013, [European Union Citizenship](#)

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), [Social benefits and migration: a contested relationship and policy challenge in the EU](#), 2013.

Government [Legal Annex on free movement](#), 2013