7th Annual *Avoir Fiscal*Anniversary EU Tax Conference

"The Application of EU Law on the Greek Tax System: two recent cases"

Katerina Perrou IALS, London 27 January 2012

Outline

- Introduction
- ◆ 1. Court of Justice, C-155/09, Commission v Greece, 20 January 2011: exemption from real estate transfer tax and free movement of persons
- ◆ 2. European Commission, C 16/2010, 25 May 2011: aid to certain Greek casinos.

Introduction

- Domestic legislation aiming at facilitating the acquisition of first residential real state
- Exemption from real estate transfer tax for the acquisition of first residential real property
- Benefit granted to
 - Greek residents irrespective of nationality
 - Greek nationals non-residents

- Persons covered
 - Residents
 - Irrespective of nationality
 - Application to all EU nationals BUT under different conditions: a 12moth uninterrupted period of residence is required to have been completed before the acquisition
 - Different = more burdensome condition
 - Non-EU nationals: administrative practice denies application BUT courts grant the exemption.

Non-residents

- Exemption granted to non residents Only if
 - Greek nationals or
 - of Greek origin
 - Provided that they are registered in a municipal registry in Greece

Problems

- The residency criterion relaxed ONLY for Greek nationals
- The requirement of registration in a registry: easier to satisfy by Greek nationals than other EU nationals

- Analysis
 - 1. Which Freedom Applies? (EC + EEA)
 - Non-discrimination on grounds of nationality (Art. 12 EC)
 - Right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States (Art. 18 EC)
 - Free movement of workers (Art. 39 EC)
 - Freedom of establishment (Art. 43 EC)

- 2. Is there discrimination and/or restriction?
 - Different treatment of current residents v future residents
 - Case of covert discrimination: the distinction is drawn on the basis of residence or ordinary residence; that requirement is liable to operate mainly to the detriment of nationals of other MS (paras. 45-47)
 - The provision places at a disadvantage persons willing to reside in Greece, has a deterrent effect and is liable to impede the freedom of movement (paras. 48-50)

• The different treatment of non-residents (Greek nationals are eligible, non-Greek nationals are not) constitutes prohibited direct discrimination on the basis of nationality (paras.67-72).

- 3. Is the discrimination and/or restriction justified? NO
 - Discrimination based on nationality may only be justified by Treaty provisions: no such justification exists
 - Arguments of the Greek government
 - Facilitate Greeks residents to acquire ownership of their homes
 - Facilitate the repatriation of Greeks living abroad
 - Real link with the state of residence (Greece)

- There are other less restrictive measures:
 - eg entry on the tax register, entry on the land register, written declarations by the purchaser, implementation of checks by the tax authorities etc.
 - Conclusion: legislation is not proportional

- Implementation of the judgment:
 - Extension of the exemption to all **EU citizens**: effective 31 March 2011 (Law 3943/2011)
 - Extension of the exemption to all EEA
 nationals: tax bill approved by Parliament on 24/01/2012, pending publication in the OJ

The measure

- Fixing of a uniform levy of 80% on the price of admission tickets
- Setting of two unequal regulated prices of admission tickets at EUR 6 and EUR 15 respectively for publicly (+one privately held)* and privately owned casinos
- Competitive disadvantage for the latter =>
 Complaint

- Grounds for initiating the procedure
 - Art. 107(1) TFEU: unlawful state aid
 - The measure is not a general measure
 - The measure resulted in a loss of State resources for the Greek State
 - The measure is selective
 - The measure is liable to distort competition

- Presence of state aid (Art.107(1)TFEU)
 - Advantage, which relieves the beneficiary of charges normally borne from their budgets:
 - Privately owned casinos pay 15EUR X 80% = 12 EUR tax on each admission ticket
 - Publicly owned casinos pay 6 EUR X 80% = 4.8 EUR tax on each admission ticket
 - Customary commercial practice of Greek casinos to waive the admission fee, but pay the tax due on it.

- Presence of state aid (Art.107(1)TFEU)
 - State resources and imputability to the State:
 - Fiscal discrimination established by a number of law, decrees, ministerial decisions, regulations etc.
 - The State forgoes revenues that would otherwise have to collect from the Casinos, in normal circumstances
 - In this case: reduces tax base for the state-owned casinos (6EUR) as compared to private ones (15 EUR)

- Presence of state aid (Art.107(1)TFEU)
 - Selectivity:
 - The measure constitutes a departure from the application of the general tax system that applies to all casinos
 - The Greek Government could not justify the selective nature of the measure; the lower or higher admission fee was not connected to any objective factor

Implementation

- No official/public information
- The amount to be recovered is estimated at EUR 140 million
- * Tragic irony: among the "victims", there was a privately owned casino that had claimed the application of a MFN clause and had been assimilated to the publicly owned ones.

- Presence of state aid (Art.107(1)TFEU)
 - Distortion of competition and effect on trade:
 - It is sufficient that the undertaking receiving the aid competes with other undertakings on markets open to the competition in the internal market.

- Compatibility of the aid (Art.106-107 TFEU)
 - No exemption applies No compatibility

- Legality of the aid
 - No prior notification
 - The measure constitutes new and unlawful aid

- Quantification and recovery
 - For the past: Any aid granted from 21 October 1999 (complaint) until the adoption of the decision (24 May 2011) should be recovered (+interest)
 - For the future: All related outstanding fiscal discrimination cancelled with effect from 24 may 2011.

7th Annual *Avoir Fiscal* Anniversary EU Tax Conference

THANK YOU!