GÖRG

YOUR BUSINESS LAW FIRM

Employment Tracker

SEPTEMBER 2026

GÖRG

YOUR BUSINESS LAW FIRM

Stay up to date with us

With our Employment Tracker, we regularly look into the "future of labour law" for you!

At the beginning of each month, we present the most important decisions expected for the month from the Federal Labour Court (BAG) and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) as well as other courts. We report on the results in the issue of the following month. In addition, we point out upcoming milestones in legislative initiatives by politicians, so that you know today what you can expect tomorrow.

Never Far Away – Our Offices

BERLIN
T: +49 30 884503-0
berlin@goerg.de

HAMBURG
T: +49 40 500360-0
hamburg@goerg.de

FRANKFURT AM MAIN
T: +49 69 170000-17
frankfurt@goerg.de

COLOGNE
T: +49 221 33660-0
koeln@goerg.de

MUNICH
T: +49 89 3090667-0
muenchen@goerg.de

Recent decisions

With the following overview of current decisions of the past month, you are informed which legal issues have been decided recently and what impact this may have on legal practice!

Subject	Date/ AZ	Remark/ note for practice
Federal Labour Court		
Calculation of a collective agreement overload rate	25.08.2026 - 9 AZR 162/25 -	**The interpretation of a collective agreement on partial retirement may indicate that employees outside the scope of the collective agreement must be considered when calculating whether a so-called overload rate is met.** *This was decided by the 9th Senate of the Federal Labour Court.* *– Announced in a press release dated 25.08.2026 –* Facts of the case The claimant had been working as a systems electrician for the defendant, which develops and manufactures nutritional solutions for special dietary requirements, since 1 April 1995. He was a member of the Food, Beverages and Catering Workers‘ Union (NGG). On 15 March 2021, an ‘Company-Level Collective Agreement on Partial Retirement’ (ATZ-HTV) was concluded between the defendant and the NGG. Under Section 2 of this collective agreement, an employee was entitled to partial retirement under certain conditions. However, pursuant to Section 3(1) of the ATZ-HTV, this entitlement was excluded if, and for as long as, at least 2.5 % of the employees at the site to which the applicant belonged had already taken advantage of a partial retirement scheme. Any further agreements regarding partial retirement were at the defendant’s discretion. On 1 March 2023, the claimant submitted a written application to enter into a partial retirement agreement under the block model. He fell within the scope of the ATZ-HTV and met the conditions for entitlement set out in Section 2 of the ATZ-HTV. The defendant,

		however, rejected the application, citing the overload rate defined in the collective agreement. The claimant requested that the defendant be ordered to enter into a partial retirement agreement for the period from 1 September 2023 to 31 August 2029. He argued that the collective agreement's overload rate had not in fact been reached. In calculating this rate, only partial retirement agreements under the ATZ-HTV with trade union members should have been taken into account. He also claimed that the defendant had unlawfully manipulated the ranking of applicants through the misuse of the contract terms. The defendant, on the other hand, took the view that the overload rate had been met. In its opinion, partial retirement agreements with non-union members should also be included, as it was free to apply the collective agreement to all employees of the undertaking who met the conditions set out in Section 3 of the ATZ-HTV. <u>The decision of the Federal Labour Court</u> The claimant's appeal was unsuccessful before the Ninth Senate of the Federal Labour Court. The claimant had no entitlement to the conclusion of the requested partial retirement agreement pursuant to Section 2 of the ATZ-HTV. This was countered by the fact that the overload rate has been met. When calculating the rate, employees outside the personal scope of the collective agreement who have taken advantage of partial retirement must also be included. The same applies to employees with partial retirement agreements that were not concluded in accordance with the ATZ-HTV. This follows from an interpretation of Section 3(1) and (2) of the ATZ-HTV.
Renumeration for default of acceptance – No right to information regarding applications for job offers	26.08.2026 - 5 AZR 37/25 -	**The employer has a right to information from the employee claiming renumeration for default of acceptance about which job offers he has received from the Employment Agency or the Jobcentre. However, the employer does not have a further – independently enforceable – right to information about whether, how and with what result the employee applied for these jobs.** *This was decided by the 5th Senate of the Federal Labour Court.* *– Announced in a press release dated 26.08.2026 –* <u>Facts of the case</u>

The claimant had been working as a warehouse supervisor for the defendant, which is part of an online furniture retailer, since April 2019. The defendant terminated the employment contract on 20 January 2023 with effect from 28 February 2023, following which the claimant received unemployment benefit from March 2023.

The defendant sent the claimant six job offers advertised on an online portal and required him to secure interim earnings; however, the claimant did not apply for any of these positions. He received four suggestions from the Jobcentre, for which he applied. Three of these applications were unsuccessful. No further interview took place because the defendant subsequently recognised the notice of termination as invalid and re-employed the claimant from 16 October 2023.

The claimant was seeking remuneration for the period from 1 March to 15 October 2023. He claimed that he had made intensive efforts to find new work. The defendant countered that he had wilfully failed to secure interim earnings. In its counterclaim, the defendant initially sought information on which job placements and vacancies had been offered to him by the Employment Agency or the Jobcentre, and what independent job-seeking efforts he had made – in each case including details of the role, working hours, place of work and remuneration – as well as the outcomes of his applications. In a second step, the claimant was to certify under oath that this information was complete and accurate. In the defendant's view, the right to information also extended to the specific 'how' of the applications. The claimant should have set out his application documents and described the course of the application procedures. The principles governing the graduated burden of pleading and proof did not preclude this.

The claimant, on the other hand, was of the opinion that he had applied properly. In the case of the posts suggested by the defendant, he had in some cases lacked the necessary qualifications, whilst in others he had been overqualified for them.

The decision of the Federal Labour Court

Following the defendant's appeal, the Fifth Senate of the Federal Labour Court set aside the Regional Labour Court's judgment on procedural grounds and remitted the case. The partial judgment should not have been delivered because the counterclaim was subject to an inadmissible condition.

In the continued appeal proceedings, the Regional Labour Court must take into account that the employer's right to information under Section 242 of the Civil Code (BGB) (good faith), in relation to the defence under Section 11(2) KschG (Protection Against Unfair

		Dismissal Act), covers only the disclosure of the circumstances necessary to trigger the employee's secondary burden of proof in proceedings concerning default of acceptance. In principle, the employer must demonstrate that the employee wilfully failed to seek alternative opportunities for employment. If the employer wishes to rely on job placement proposals from the state employment service in this regard, it knows neither whether such proposals were made nor what their content was. Consequently, on the basis of Section 242 of the German Civil Code (BGB), the employer is entitled to a claim against the employee – which may, where appropriate, be enforceable as a separate claim – for information regarding any job placement proposals and their content. However, there is no further right to information as to whether, how and with what result the employee applied for jobs. The employee must first provide this information as part of their secondary burden of proof. The employer does not require the requested information in order to raise its defence under Section 11(2) KschG. Consequently, there is equally no right to information regarding the employee's own efforts to find alternative employment.
Federal Social Court		
Commuting Accident Insurance when turning back after forgetting a work key	25.08.2026 - B 2 U 5/24 R -	**For the purposes of cover under the Commuting Accident Insurance, the decisive factor is the objective action tendency taken by the injured person at the time of the accident. If an employee turns back to fetch a work key they have left at home, the way back may be covered in its own right if the work key is classified as a working tool.** *This was decided by the 2nd Senate of the Federal Social Court.* *– Announced in the hearing report dated 25.08.2026 –* Facts of the case The claimant was employed by a company. He was driving his private car early in the morning when he was involved in a road traffic accident near his home. Whilst turning off the road near a petrol station, he collided with an oncoming van. According to his account, he intended to turn round there to retrieve the work key he had left at home, which he absolutely needed to carry out his work.

		Neither the defendant nor the lower courts recognised the incident as an work accident. The claimant had already, upon leaving his residential area, failed to take the shortest route to his place of work in terms of distance and time, without any objectively verifiable reasons for doing so being established. At the time of the turning manoeuvre, he was therefore no longer on an insured route to his place of work. It was therefore irrelevant why he had intended to turn there. In his appeal, the claimant alleged a breach of Section 8(2)(1) of Book VII of the Social Code (SGB VII). <u>The decision of the Federal Social Court</u> The claimant's appeal was successful in the sense that the case was remitted. The Federal Social Court was unable to reach a final decision as to whether the claimant's road traffic accident should be recognised as a work accident. In the context of Commuting Accident Insurance, the causal link depends primarily on the objective action tendency of the injured person at the time of the accident. At that point in time, according to his own statements, the claimant no longer intended to proceed directly to his place of work, but rather to turn back to retrieve the work key he had left at home. This, at the very latest, would have interrupted any potential cover under the Commuting Accident Insurance. By contrast, the claimant's action tendency prior to turning off the road is not decisive. However, cover under the accident insurance scheme should not have been denied solely on the grounds of the longer distance or the longer journey time involved in the chosen route. The Regional Social Court must therefore, in the resumed appeal proceedings, examine whether the claimant's turning off the road was based on an independent, insured action tendency. If his objective action tendency had been directed towards retrieving the service key, it must also be clarified whether this is to be classified as a working tool and whether the return journey home was therefore once again independently covered by insurance.
Commuting Accident Insurance in the event of an illness-related deviation from the usual route home	25.08.2026 - B 2 U 6/24 R -	**If an insured person deviates from the insured route home due to an involuntary medical condition that is beyond their control and affects their ability to make decisions, the insurance cover does not lapse.** *This was decided by the 2nd Senate of the Federal Social Court.*

– Announced in the hearing report dated 25.08.2026 –

Facts of the case

The claimant was employed by Deutsche Post AG. He is a diabetic who requires insulin. Whilst driving home, he drove past the turn-off to his home in his car and, a short time later, collided with an oncoming lorry. He sustained serious injuries in the accident. The emergency services diagnosed him with hypoglycaemia.

Whilst the defendant contended that the accident had occurred whilst the claimant was on an uninsured detour, the Social Court assumed that is insurance cover remained in force due to the continuity of his action tendency. The court held that, by the time he drove past the turn-off, the claimant was no longer in a position to make a conscious decision regarding the direction of travel due to his hypoglycaemia. The Regional Social Court, however, dismissed the claim, reasoning that, for insurance cover on a detour, the cause of the deviation from the route was particularly decisive. Deviating from the direct route home as a result of insulin-induced hypoglycaemia was not due to a work-related cause but to an internal one, which was attributable to the claimant's private, personal sphere. Extending Commuting Accident Insurance to cover deviations caused by illness would go beyond its intended scope of protection.

In his appeal, the claimant alleged a breach of Section 8(2)(1) of Book VII of the Social Code (SGB VII).

The decision of the Federal Social Court

The claimant's appeal was successful. The Federal Social Court upheld the Social Court's view that the incident constituted a commuting accident.

According to the binding findings of the Regional Social Court, the claimant was no longer in a position, due to hypoglycaemia caused by his illness, to adjust his driving behaviour in order to turn off towards his home. Although this meant that, objectively speaking, he deviated from his route and moved away from his place of residence, the insurance cover remained in force. The deviation from the insured route was not, in fact, due to a deliberate departure from the insured route as an expression of a newly adopted, self-action tendency, but rather to an involuntary medical condition which the claimant was unable to control and which had rendered him incapable of making a decision. The factual connection with the insured activity was therefore not interrupted at any point in a manner within the claimant's control.

Upcoming decisions

With the following overview of upcoming decisions in the following month, you will be informed in advance about which legal issues will be decided shortly and what consequences this may have for legal practice!

Subject	Date/ AZ	Remark/ note for practice
Federal Labour Court		
General Act on Equal Treatment: Scope of liability in the event of a final and binding decision on liability for compensation	10.09.2026 - 8 AZR 153/25 -	The dispute concerns claims for damages relating to the years 2020 to 2023. In March 2009, the claimant unsuccessfully applied to the defendant, an insurance company, for a trainee programme in the legal sector. He received a rejection by email on 19 April 2009; four female applicants were appointed. According to data collected in 2020, an average of 60 per cent of trainees were still employed by the defendant ten years after completing the programme. In 2009, the claimant brought an action alleging discrimination on the grounds of his age and gender. He sought a declaration that the defendant must compensate him for all future pecuniary losses incurred as a result of his non-appointment. After the Federal Labour Court had made a request for a preliminary ruling to the European Court of Justice (8 AZR 848/13 (A)) and the case had been referred back to the Hessian Regional Court, the latter ruled in a final and binding judgement of 18 June 2018 (7 Sa 851/17) that “the defendant is obliged to compensate the claimant for all future material losses incurred as a result of the defendant’s failure to recruit him on 19 April 2009”. Subsequently, the claimant brought a further claim seeking €340,000 in damages and approximately €93,000 euros for ‘tax-related loss’. After the Local Court had dismissed the claim, the parties reached a settlement before the Regional Court (15 Sa 1497/20) in 2021. Under the terms of the settlement, the defendant paid “a total of €100,000.00 as further compensation pursuant to Section 15(2) of the General Act on Equal Treatment (AGG) to

		settle the legal dispute". The phrase 'as further compensation' was included at the claimant's request. In May 2022, the claimant brought a further action, claiming €236,000 for loss of earnings for the years 2020 to 2023. He argues that, on the basis of the final judgement of 2018, there is a claim for damages with no time limit under Section 15(1) AGG and Section 826 of the German Civil Code (BGB) in conjunction with Article 1 of the German Basic Law (GG), which, under European law, remains effective until he retires. The amount of damages is to be estimated in accordance with Section 287(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO). The defendant, however, maintains that the claims were already resolved by the 2021 settlement. It was clear that no further claims existed apart from the claim for damages, which is why a general settlement clause was not necessary. Furthermore, the claimant had not sufficiently demonstrated that, had there been no discriminatory conduct, he would actually have been recruited and employed on a permanent basis. Moreover, any potential damages arising from 2020 were no longer covered by Section 15(1) AGG. Rather, a time limit of three years on the claim was appropriate. Finally, it sent the claimant job advertisements and requested information as to whether he had applied for these positions. The Local Court dismissed the claim, and the Regional Court dismissed the claimant's appeal. The claimant is pursuing his claim by filing an appeal on points of law.
Classification of a legal and notarial assistant within a service unit	16.09.2026 - 4 AZR 141/25 -	The dispute concerns the correct pay classification of the claimant, who is employed by the defendant State. The claimant is a qualified legal and notarial assistant and has been employed by the defendant State since 1 January 1985. The collective agreements for the public service (TV-L) apply to her employment relationship. Since 12 April 2019, she has been recognised as a person with a severe disability, with a degree of disability of 50%. As part of the reform of the notarial system, she was transferred to a Local Court on 1 January 2018 and assigned there to the service units of the Probate Court. This is divided into four teams with different tasks, as set out in the work allocation plan. At the time of her transfer, the claimant was remunerated in accordance with pay grade 5 of the TV-L. The claimant worked predominantly in Team 4 (document preparation) and, on Wednesdays, for two and a half hours in Team 1 (information desk, telephone, post). Two other members of staff in Team 4, who had also been transferred to the Probate Court in 2018, received remuneration under pay grade 6 of the TV-L, unlike the claimant, by virtue of grandfathering provisions.

Following new case law, the defendant State corrected the pay grading classification of employees in service units. The two other employees from Team 4 were subsequently assigned to pay grade 9a under the TV-L. The claimant, however, remained in pay grade 5 under the TV-L. She has been on partial retirement since March 2022 and is now in the leave-of-absence phase.

As early as 2003, the claimant had unsuccessfully demanded a higher classification into pay grade 9a under the TV-L. In her claim, she is seeking this remuneration retrospectively from 1 January 2020, including interest on the corresponding back payments. In support of her claim, she argues that she had already been performing duties corresponding to the higher pay grade prior to her transfer in 2018 and had subsequently continued to do so without change. She also took on challenging duties within a service unit at the Probate Court. Furthermore, she invokes the principle of equal treatment under employment law, as the two other employees in Team 4 are remunerated in accordance with pay grade 9a of the TV-L, despite performing the same tasks and covering for one another. The claimant also refers to her severe disability and the defendant State's special duty of care. As all the employees in her team who are not severely disabled have been placed in a higher pay grade, she considers it possible that she has been disadvantaged on account of her severe disability.

The defendant State rejects a higher pay classification. It argues that the claimant was primarily engaged in clerical work and, within Team 4, merely took on individual tasks which did not constitute 'difficult tasks' within the meaning of the collective agreement. Nor does the principle of equal treatment apply, as the other two employees had already been performing duties in pay grade 6 under the TV-L when they transferred to the department.

The Local Court dismissed the claim, and the Regional Court dismissed the claimant's appeal. The claimant is pursuing her claim by filing an appeal on points of law.

Legislative initiatives, important notifications & applications

This section provides a concise summary of major initiatives, press releases and publications for the month, so that you are always informed about new developments and planned projects.

Subject	Timeline	Remark/ note for the practice
Amendment to the Act on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts in Academia	29.07.2026	On 29 July 2026, the Federal Cabinet approved the draft bill on the Modernisation of the Law on Fixed-Term Contracts in the Academic Sector. In particular, amendments to the Act on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts in Academia (WissZeitVG) are to be implemented. The aim is to make career paths in academia more reliable. <u>Contents of the Regulation</u> ▪ Minimum contract durations for the first employment contract before (3 years) and after (2 years) the PhD ▪ Priority is given to fixed-term contracts for the purpose of academic qualification over fixed-term contracts funded by third-party grants ▪ The possibility of extending the maximum permitted duration of a fixed-term contract by two years, even in cases where the holder is caring for relatives in need of care within the meaning of the Care Leave Act (Pflegezeitgesetz) ▪ Unused periods of fixed-term employment from the phase prior to the PhD may no longer be carried over to the phase following it; a new fixed-term period of up to six years begins with the start of the PhD. ▪ The option of a fixed-term contract for the purpose of academic qualification is now only available for positions covering at least 25 % of a full-time position. ▪ The maximum duration of fixed-term contracts for student assistants has been increased to eight years.

		▪ Employment relationships during a study programme are now exempt from the prohibition on successive fixed-term contracts under the Part-Time and Limited Term Employment Act. ▪ Standardised fixed-term contracts for employment in medical and psychotherapeutic further training, including at universities, in accordance with the Act on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts for Doctors in Further Training (instead of the Act on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts in Academia)
Statutory Health Insurance Contribution Stabilization Act	30.07.2026	The Act on the Stabilization of Contribution Rates in Statutory Health Insurance came into force on 30 July 2026. <u>Contents of the Regulation</u> ▪ Introduction of partial inability to work from 1 January 2028 in steps of 25, 50 or 75 %, provided the doctor, employer and employee agree: The company pays a proportionate wage for the hours actually worked; the health insurance fund pays a partial sickness benefit for the hours not worked. ▪ Reduction of sickness benefit from the previous 70% to 65% of regular pay: the upper limit is reduced accordingly from 90% to 85% of net renumeration. Furthermore, the benefit period is limited to a maximum of 78 weeks within a three-year period, regardless of the diagnosis. ▪ Increase in the flat-rate employer's contribution for those in marginal employment to the general contribution rate of 14.6% plus the average supplementary contribution rate ▪ One-off increase in the monthly contribution assessment ceiling as of 1 January 2027 by approximately 300 EUR. ▪ Restrictions on non-contributory family insurance for spouses: From 2028, the non-contributory co-insurance of spouses will be gradually restricted, and a 2.5% contribution surcharge will be introduced for cases of non-privileged status. Non-contributory co-insurance will only remain in place for spouses with children under the age of twelve, with disabled children, with relatives requiring care, and after reaching the standard retirement age.

Objectives of the coalition agreement	Implementation
Minimum wage ▪ The Minimum Wage Commission will base its decision on an overall assessment of both wage developments and 60% of the gross median wage of full-time employees. ▪ Increase in the minimum wage to **15 euros** from 2026.	27.06.2025: Decision of the Minimum Wage Commission: The minimum wage is to rise to 13.90€ per hour in 2026. An increase to 14.60€ is planned for 2027. 29.10.2025: Federal Cabinet passes 5th Minimum Wage Adjustment Ordinance: Minimum wage to be raised to 13.90€ per hour on 01.01.2026 and to 14.60€ on 01.01.2027.
Collective agreements ▪ Adoption and implementation of the **Bundestariftreuegesetz** (German Federal Collective Bargaining Compliance Act). ▪ The awarding of public contracts at federal level should be dependent on collective bargaining coverage and apply to contracts worth EUR 50,000 or more at federal level and to start-ups offering innovative services in the first four years after their establishment, with a threshold of EUR 100,000. ▪ Collectively agreed wages should once again become the rule rather than the exception. ▪ Strengthening collective bargaining autonomy through **digital access rights for trade unions** to companies. ▪ Increasing the attractiveness of trade union membership through tax incentives for members.	06.08.2025: Draft bill of the government on the Collective Agreement Compliance Act
Co-determination ▪ In addition to **online works council meetings**, enable **online works meetings** in particular. ▪ Eliminate discussions and uncertainties between the parties within the company as to whether and to what extent digital or hybrid meetings are already permitted under current law.	17.06.2025: Federal Council discusses resolution proposal on the modernisation of co-determination in companies. 11.07.2025: Federal Council calls on the federal government to adapt the rights

	and opportunities of works councils to current developments.
Occupational safety & flexibility ▪ Option of **weekly** instead of daily **maximum working hours** in accordance with the European Working Time Directive (Art. 6 Directive 2003/88/EC), particularly with a view to improving work-life balance. ▪ Extension of the possibilities for Sunday and public holiday work in accordance with Section 10 of the Working Hours Act (ArbZG) to include the bakery business. ▪ Maintenance of the level of occupational safety. ▪ Prevention of mental illness through the necessary occupational safety measures. ▪ Improvement of working conditions in the courier, express and parcel delivery sector.	30.07.2025: Removal of the time limit on the provisions of the Parcel Delivery Protection Act
Working hours ▪ Express provision on the **obligation to record working hours** in light of the rulings of the European Court of Justice (14 May 2019 – C-55/18) and the Federal Labour Court (13 September 2022 – 1 ABR 22/21). ▪ **Electronic recording**, the specific introduction of which in companies is likely to be subject to co-determination (Section 87 (1) No. 6 BetrVG). Appropriate transitional rules are to be established for small and medium-sized enterprises. ▪ Retention of the option of **trust-based working time without time recording** in accordance with the EU Working Time Directive. ▪ Improvement of public services through more flexible working time models and better opportunities for part-time management.	
Tax incentives for overtime pay and increased working hours ▪ Tax relief for overtime pay: Overtime pay that exceeds the full-time working hours agreed in collective agreements or based on collective agreements shall be exempt from tax. The lower limit for full-time work, exceeding which can trigger overtime pay if agreed, should be 34 hours for collectively agreed working hours and 40 hours for working hours not specified or agreed in collective agreements. ▪ Creation of tax incentives for employers who pay bonuses to increase the working hours of part-time employees.	
Implementation of EU-Directives ▪ 'Low-bureaucracy' transformation into national law of the Remuneration Transparency Directive (EU Directive 2023/970), which already came into force in June 2023.	03.09.2025: The Federal Cabinet passes a law amending the Supply Chain Due Diligence Act, which

▪ To this end, a commission will be set up to develop proposals by the end of 2025, before the legislative process is initiated 'without delay'. ▪ The implementation deadline is 7 June 2026. ▪ Replacement of the national Supply Chain Due Diligence Act with a law on international corporate responsibility that implements the European Supply Chain Directive (EU Directive 2024/1760) in a bureaucracy-free and enforcement-friendly manner. ▪ Abolition of reporting obligations.	provides in particular for the abolition of the reporting obligations under Section 10 (2) LkSG.
Pensions and old-age provision ▪ Strengthening occupational pension schemes and promoting their widespread use, particularly in small and medium-sized enterprises and among low-income earners. ▪ In addition to digitisation, simplification, transparency and debureaucratisation, **portability** of occupational pension schemes and pension entitlements. ▪ No increase in the retirement age: maintaining the option of retiring without deductions after 45 years of contributions. ▪ Creating financial incentives for voluntary longer working lives: those who continue to work voluntarily after reaching the statutory retirement age should receive up to 2,000 euros per month tax-free. ▪ Repeal of the prohibition on previous employment under Section 14 (2) sentence 2 of the Part-Time and Fixed-Term Employment Act (TzBfG) to enable people to return to and continue working for their previous employer after retirement.	06.08.2025: Pension Package 2025 – the prohibition on prior employment for fixed-term contracts without objective grounds is to be lifted for persons who have reached the standard retirement age (entered into force on 01.01.2026) 16.10.2025: Federal Cabinet passes draft law on tax incentives for employees of retirement age (Active Pension Act)
Amendment of the special temporary employment law for scientific and research institutions ▪ Amendment of the Academic Fixed-Term Contract Act by mid-2026. ▪ Introduction of **minimum contract terms before and after doctoral studies**. ▪ Extension of **safeguard clauses to fixed-term contracts funded by third parties**. ▪ Legally certain and practicable regulations on working time recording at universities. ▪ Exemption of employment relationships during studies from the prohibition on subsequent employment.	29.07.2026: The Federal Government adopts an amendment to the Act on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts in Academia
Securing skilled labour ▪ Accelerated issuance of work permits to combat the shortage of skilled labour. ▪ Removal of bureaucratic hurdles for qualified immigration.	11.07.2025: Federal Council decides to introduce a law on the early integration

▪ Establishment of a ‘work and stay agency’ in cooperation with the Federal Employment Agency, which will serve as a central point of contact for foreign skilled workers via a central IT platform.	of asylum seekers into the labour market 19.11.2025: Federal Cabinet introduces "Benefit Law Amendment Act" to the Bundestag to enable people from Ukraine to integrate quickly and sustainably into work and society
Reduction of bureaucracy ▪ Reduction of written form requirements and reform of the formal requirements of Sections 126 et seq. of the German Civil Code (BGB). ▪ Abolition of the obligation to appoint company representatives in small and medium-sized enterprises. ▪ ‘Significant’ reduction in training, further education and documentation requirements.	27.10.2025: Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs presents bureaucracy reduction concept in occupational safety to make occupational safety regulations more efficient and digital. 05.11.2025: The Federal Government’s Bureaucracy Reduction Cabinet adopts measures to reduce bureaucracy. 15.07.2026: Second Bureaucracy Reduction Cabinet adopts a further 10 measures to reduce bureaucracy
Other ▪ Alignment of salaries paid by statutory health insurance funds, medical services and other stakeholders with the public sector collective agreement (TVöD). ▪ Prevention of abuse of the telephone sick note system, which will remain in place, e.g. by prohibiting private online platforms from issuing sick notes.	

- Reform of the AGG (General Equal Treatment Act).
- Merger of the PflegeZG (Care Leave Act) and FPfZG (Family Care Leave Act): making leave entitlements more flexible and expanding the circle of relatives.
- Introduction of maternity leave for self-employed mothers.
- Reform of the status determination procedure (deemed approval).
- Open-ended evaluation of the law on the legalisation of cannabis in autumn 2025.

Local presence: your contacts

Dr. Alexander Insam, M.A.

Head of labour and employment law
Ulmenstrasse 30
60325 Frankfurt am Main
P: +49 69 170000 160
ainsam@goerg.de

Dr. Thomas Bezani

Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
P: +49 221 33660 544
tbezani@goerg.de

Dr. Axel Dahms

Partner
Kantstrasse 164
10623 Berlin
P: +49 30 884503 122
adahms@goerg.de

Burkhard Fabritius, MBA

Partner
Alter Wall 20 – 22
20457 Hamburg
P: +49 40 500360 755
bfabritius@goerg.de

Dr. Dirk Freihube

Partner
Ulmenstrasse 30
60325 Frankfurt am Main
P: +49 69 170000 159
dfreihube@goerg.de

Dr. Ralf Hottgenroth

Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
P: +49 221 33660 504
rhottgenroth@goerg.de

Dr. Martin Hörtz

Partner
Ulmenstrasse 30
60325 Frankfurt am Main
P: +49 69 170000 165
mhoertz@goerg.de

Dr. Ulrich Fülbier

Partner
Prinzregentenstrasse 22
80538 Munich
P: +49 89 3090667 62
ufuelbier@goerg.de

Dr. Christoph J. Müller

Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
P: +49 221 33660 524
cmueller@goerg.de

Dr. Marcus Richter

Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
P: +49 221 33660 534
mrichter@goerg.de

Dr. Frank Wilke

Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
P: +49 221 33660 508
fwilke@goerg.de

Pia Pracht

Counsel
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Köln
T: +49 221 33660 524
ppracht@goerg.de

Jens Völksen

Counsel
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
T: +49 221 33660 504
jvoelksen@goerg.de

Dr. Franz Hürdler, LL.M

Associated Partner
Kantstraße 164
10623 Berlin
T: +49-30-884503527
fhuerdler@goerg.de

Rolf-Alexander Markgraf

Associated Partner
Alter Wall 20 – 22
20457 Hamburg
T: +49 40 500360 755
markgraf@goerg.de

Phillip Raszawitz

Associated Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
T: +49 221 33660 544
praszawitz@goerg.de

Meganush Schiller

Associated Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
T: +49 221 33660 534
mschiller@goerg.de

Sebastian Schäfer

Associated Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
T: +49 221 33660 534
sebschaefer@goerg.de

Dr. Friederike Hoffmeister

Associated Partner
Kantstraße 164
10623 Berlin
T: +49 30 884503 122
fhoffmeister@goerg.de

Sarah Lahmer

Associated Partner
Ulmenstraße 30
60325 Frankfurt am Main
T: +49-69-170000161
slahmer@goerg.de

Dr. Alberto Povedano Peramato

Associated Partner
Kennedyplatz 2
50679 Cologne
T: +49-221-33660549
apovedano@goerg.de

Sandra Schramm

Associated Partner
Alter Wall 20 – 22
20457 Hamburg
T: +49-40-500360765
sschramm@goerg.de

Florian Seidl

Associated Partner
Ulmenstraße 30
60325 Frankfurt am Main
T: +49-69-170000158
fseidl@goerg.de

Dr. Julian Stassek

Associated Partner
Prinzregentenstraße 22
80538 Munich
T: +49-89-309066736
jstassek@goerg.de