

Romana Schuster

Romana Schuster is Chief Knowledge Officer and a Tax Director at KPMG Tax in Romania. In addition, she oversees the KPMG Tax Academy program while also assisting multinational corporations and local entrepreneurs on tax matters. She has over 25 years of experience in taxation as a tax inspector and expert in Direct Taxation at the Romanian Ministry of Finance and Tax Knowledge Management of Tax & Legal Department of PwC Romania. She is also a member of the Romanian Tax Chamber. Romana obtained an MBA from Ajou University in South Korea and completed a PhD ABD in Accounting at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. She has held a lecturer of management accounting position with the Technology Department of Technical University Eindhoven. She has published over 100 tax-related articles as well as several academic papers in peer reviewed journals.

Daniël Smit

Daniël Smit first studied piano at the Royal Conservatory in The Hague. He subsequently obtained his LLM degree in Dutch law and Dutch tax law (cum laude) in 2004 from Erasmus University Rotterdam. He obtained his PhD in 2011 at Tilburg University, where he was a member of the Tax Institute Tilburg from 2007 until 2021. Daniël is currently Professor by Special Appointment at the University of Amsterdam (supported by EY). He is the author of more than a hundred national and international publications, particularly in the fields of international and European tax law. In addition, he is a frequent speaker at national and international conferences, seminars and (guest) lectures. His PhD thesis was awarded the European Tax Thesis Award 2012.

Claus Staringer

Prof. Dr Claus Staringer has been a Professor of Tax Law at the Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law of WU (Vienna University of Economics and Business) since 2003. He was also a partner with the international law firm Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer.

Dinis Tracana

Dinis Tracana is a managing associate in the Lisbon office of PLMJ Law Firm. He focuses on inbound and outbound international tax planning, international structuring and disputes, domestic and cross-border restructuring and M&A transactions, financial products and real estate investments. He holds a Master's in Tax Law (University of Lisbon) and an Advanced LLM in International Tax (International Tax Center Leiden). Dinis lectures and publishes regularly in International and European Tax Law at several European Universities, and is a guest lecturer at the Center for Judiciary Studies. He is also a research associate at the Centre for Research into European, Economic, Financial and Tax Law (CIDEFF) Faculty of Law of the University of Lisbon.

Anne Mieke Vandekerkhove

Anne Mieke Vandekerkhove is a PhD researcher at the KU Leuven Tax Law Institute, Belgium.

Melchior Wahelet

Melchior Wathelet was born in 1949 in Petit-Rechain (Belgium), where he still lives. He holds the qualifications “licencié en droit” (1972), “licencié en Science économique” Liège University (1974), and Master of Laws Harvard University (1976). After three years as Research Fellow at the Liège University (European Law and Economics), he was elected as a Member of the Belgian House of Representatives (1977) and appointed as a Member of the Belgian Federal Government (1980-1981). Between 1981 and 1995, he served both as a Member of the Walloon Government, and thereafter again as a Member of the Belgian Federal Government (namely as Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Defence). His career as a university professor began in 1985 at the University of Louvain-la-Neuve. Between 1995 and 2018, he has been Judge and later First Advocate General at the Court of Justice of the European Union.

Bertil Wiman

Bertil Wiman is Professor of Fiscal Law at Uppsala University, Sweden and Director of the research foundation, Uppsala Center for Tax Law. He has previously been professor at Stockholm School of Economics (1996-2008) and Umeå University (1994-1995). He is a member of the Royal Society of Sciences in Uppsala and was a founding member of the European Association of Tax Law Professors (EATLP), serving as its Treasurer 1999-2005 and its Chairman 2012-2015. He was Vice President of the International Fiscal Association (IFA) and a member of its Executive Committee 2012-2018. Bertil was the chairman of the Swedish IFA Branch for many years and is now a member of the board of IFA Sweden.

Alejandro Zubimendi Cavia

He holds a degree in Law from the University of Deusto and an LLM in International Taxation from the University of Florida. He is PhD in Law from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid with the thesis “Double non-taxation as a result of the use of hybrid entities and hybrid financial instruments”. He also practiced as a tax lawyer in several national and international law firms. He is currently Assistant Professor of financial and tax law at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. He is the author of a monograph and multiple articles and book chapters in tax law, mainly in the field of international taxation and EU Law.

Content

Preface	V
List of Authors	VII
<i>Roland Ismer/Sophia Piotrowski</i> AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd (C-627/22)	1
<i>Alexander Rust</i> Germany: Familienstiftung C-142/24	7
<i>Guglielmo Maisto</i> Italy: Banca Mediolanum (Case C-92/24, C-93-24, C-94/24) (pending)	11
<i>Eivind Furuseth</i> Norway – group contribution – interest deduction rules	19
<i>Werner Haslehner</i> Luxembourg Cases – Engie, Amazon, and Barreau de Luxembourg	49
<i>Emer Hunt</i> The tax relationship between Ireland and Apple: under the State aid microscope	73
<i>Philip Goeth</i> Recent and Pending Cases at the Court Justice of the EU on Direct Taxation – United Kingdom – Joined cases C-555/22 P, C-556/22 P and C-564/22 P Description of the Case	91
<i>Claus Staringer</i> Austria: Revised “interim tax” regime for private foundations with non-resident beneficiaries	101
<i>Filip Debelva/Anne Mieke Vandekerkhove</i> Belgium: Recent and Pending CJEU Cases	113
<i>Matej Kačaljak/Renáta Bláhová</i> Slovakia: A.En. Slovensko v. Finančné riaditeľstvo (Request C-201/24)	135
<i>Marilyne Sadowsky</i> Declaration of foreign accounts and free movement of capital	141
<i>Daniel S. Smit/Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren</i> The Netherlands I: X BV, case C-585/22; Impact of Lexel AB on Dutch Interest Limitation Rule	157

Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren

The Netherlands II: Taxation of Cross-Border Transfers of Pension Claims – Cases C-360/22 and C-459/22 (European Commission v The Netherlands): inconsistent caselaw but enhancing the internal market	171
---	-----

Katia Cejic

Comparability in Regard of Public Pension Funds: KEVA and Others	207
--	-----

Bertil Wiman

Swedish Bank Risk Tax and State Aid	219
---	-----

Aistė Medelienė

Lithuania: CJEU pending case – Nordcurrent Group C-228/24	223
---	-----

Nevia Čičin-Šain

Bourse Erasmus+ (Case C 277/23) – is there any room left for Member States to legislate in the field of direct taxes?	239
---	-----

Agata Grabowicz

Poland: Recent and Pending CJEU Cases	253
---	-----

Alejandro Zubimendi Cavia

Spain: Recent CJEU Cases	273
--------------------------------	-----

Aurelian Opre/Romana Schuster/Ana Puscas

Romania	293
---------------	-----

Dinis Tracana/Andreia Alves Macedo/Bernardo Rodrigues

Portugal – Recent and Pending cases on direct taxation	315
--	-----

Ivan Lazarov

Entain Services (C-287/23), Order	333
---	-----

Mateja Babič

Slovenia: GCEU decision on Annulment of Commission Decision under appeal (C-447/22)	341
---	-----

Melchior Wathelet

Recent trends in ECJ case law	351
-------------------------------------	-----

AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd (C-627/22)

Roland Ismer/Sophia Piotrowski

1. Background
2. Facts of the Case and Referral Question
3. Opinion of AG Campos Sánchez-Bordona as of 16 November 2023
4. Judgement by the CJEU as of 30 May 2024
5. Comments

1. Background

The case *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, which was decided by the CJEU in May 2024,¹ concerns the guarantees under the EU-Swiss Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons (AFMP)² as it pertains to the taxation of cross-border employees. The AFMP was concluded between the European Communities and its Member States on the one hand and the Swiss Confederation on the other, and forms part of the Union legal order (Arts. 216 and 217 TFEU). It is binding upon the institutions of the EU and its Member States (Art. 216 para. 2 TFEU).³

Employees working in Germany are subject to German wage tax which is levied as a withholding tax. German resident employees may opt for voluntary tax assessment.⁴ If they choose to do so, income-related expenses can be deducted, and the wage tax previously paid is credited to the final tax liability. Following the CJEU's judgement in *Schumacker*,⁵ cross-border commuters can – under certain conditions – also choose to file a tax assessment. They can then deduct income-related expenses, and in particular profit from joint tax assessment with a non-

1 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431. On this case see e.g. the case note by S. Piotrowski, EuGH v. 30.05.2024 – C-627/22, Abkommen zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft über die Freizügigkeit – Arbeitnehmer eines Mitgliedstaats, der seinen Wohnsitz in die Schweiz verlegt hat, Internationale Steuer-rundschau 2024, p. 278. For comments on the Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, see R. Ismer/S. Piotrowski/S. Güllich in G. Kofler et al. (eds.), *CJEU Recent Developments in Direct Taxation 2023* (Vienna: Linde, 2024) 1, 5 et seqq.

2 Agreement of 21 June 1999 between the European Community and its Member States, of the one part, and the Swiss Confederation, of the other, on the free movement of persons – Final Act – Joint Declarations, which entered into force on 01 June 2002, ABl. 2002, L 114, p. 6.

3 See on the AFMP e.g. R. Ismer, in: C. Hermann et. al. para. (eds.), *Einkommensteuer- und Körperschaft-steuergesetz* (Köln: Otto Schmidt Verlag, 2020) Einführung zum EStG, m.n. 566 et seqq.; K. Spies, *Die Wirkung des Freizügigkeitsabkommens EU/Schweiz im Steuerrecht*, StuW 2017, p. 48 et seqq.

4 Under Sec. 46 para 2 no. 8 of the EStG.

5 CJEU, 14 February 1995, C-279/93, *Finanzamt Köln-Alstadt v Schumacker*, ECLI:EU:C:1995:31, para. 49.

resident spouse. In its 2013 judgement in *Ettwein*, the CJEU decided that this privilege had to be extended to cross-border Swiss cases.⁶

In all other cases, non-resident taxpayers deriving employment income in Germany are subject to limited tax liability. The wage tax is then, in principle, final. However, EU/EEA nationals residing in an EU/EEA State may apply for tax assessment,⁷ which at least allows them to deduct income-related expenses. The question at issue in this case is whether this voluntary assessment must also be possible for Swiss residents deriving employment income in Germany.

2. Facts of the Case and Referral Question

The German national AB, a manager of a German company, had lived in Switzerland since 2016.⁸ From 2017 to 2019, he derived employment income from his German employer. While living in Switzerland, AB either travelled to Germany by car or worked remotely from home in Switzerland. AB was subject to limited tax liability in Germany. His employer withheld wage tax and remitted it to the German tax authorities. AB incurred income-related expenses as he used a private car purchased under a leasing contract for business travel to Germany. He also owned two immovable properties located in Germany from which he derived rental income.

AB filed an income tax return declaring both income from the immovable properties and employment income. As to the latter, AB sought the benefit of Sec. 50 para 2 sent. 2 no. 4 lit. b EStG which allows for a voluntary tax assessment. The provision allows employees to receive a tax refund as the German wage tax does not take into account income-related expenses. However, since this provision only applies to EU/EEA nationals residing in another EU or EEA State,⁹ the notice of assessment issued by the tax authorities did not include AB's employment income (and hence the related expenses). AB lodged an administrative appeal and ultimately took legal action before the *Finanzgericht Köln* (Financial Court of Cologne).

The *Finanzgericht Köln* referred a question on the interpretation of the AFMP to the CJEU. It asked whether the denial of a voluntary tax assessment infringes upon Arts. 7 and 15 AFMP in conjunction with Art. 9 para 2 of annex 2 to the AFMP. In this, the Court referred to two potentially relevant comparators, namely first German or EU/EEA nationals residing in Germany and second Ger-

6 CJEU, 28 February 2013, C-425/11, *Ettwein*, ECLI:EU:C:2013:121. See on this judgement e.g. A. Cloer, *Ausdehnung der Schumacker-Rechtsprechung auch auf Schweizer Grenzgänger*, DB 2013, p. 1141 et seqq.

7 See Sec. 50 para 2 sent. 1 and 2 sent. 2 no. 4 EStG.

8 See Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, paras. 20 et seqq.

9 Sec. 50 para. 2 sent. 7 EStG.

man or EU/EEA nationals residing in an EU/EEA Member State other than Germany. Both comparators can voluntarily opt for a tax assessment under national law and thus deduct income-related expenses, ultimately resulting in a tax refund.

3. Opinion of AG Campos Sánchez-Bordona as of 16 November 2023

The Advocate General (AG) had opined that the denial of a voluntary tax assessment infringed upon Arts. 7 and 15 AFMP in conjunction with Art. 9 para 2 of annex 2 to the AFMP.¹⁰ He argued that the AFMP also extends to differences in treatment arising from the place of residence of employed persons covered by the AFMP, even when they are not typical frontier workers.¹¹ He then explained that the term ‘tax concession’ within the meaning of Art. 9 para. 2 of Annex I to the AFMP encompasses options available under national law for calculating tax liability in a more favourable way, such as voluntary assessment.¹² While Art. 21 para. 2 AFMP allows residence-based distinctions between taxpayers that are not comparable, he considered that such comparability exists because Germany has allowed EU/EEA nationals residing outside of Germany – and that are therefore subject to limited tax liability – to file for voluntary assessment.¹³ The AG then elaborated that the differential treatment could not be justified by the need to ensure the imposition, payment and effective recovery of income tax in Germany, and the objective to forestall tax evasion.¹⁴ Finally, the AG rejected the claim by the German government that the standstill clause of Art. 13 of the AFMP, under which the Contracting Parties undertake not to adopt any further restrictive measures vis-à-vis each other’s nationals, could be read as allowing for old restrictions (that existed at the time of the conclusion of the AFMP) to continue to exist.¹⁵

4. Judgement by the CJEU as of 30 May 2024

The Court followed the Advocate General’s opinion and decided that the denial of a voluntary tax assessment infringed upon Arts. 7 and 15 AFMP in conjunction

10 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, para. 68 et seqq. On this see R. Ismer/ S. Piotrowski/ S. Güllich in G. Kofler et al. (eds.), *CJEU Recent Developments in Direct Taxation 2023* (Vienna: Linde, 2024) 1, 5 et seqq.

11 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, para. 68 et seqq.

12 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, para. 71.

13 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, paras. 78–80.

14 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, paras. 87–89.

15 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, paras. 95–99.

with Art. 9 para 2 of Annex 1 to the AFMP. It first explains that AB falls within the category of persons referred to in Articles 1 and 2 of the AFMP.¹⁶ For that purpose, it refers to its case law, according to which Article 2 of the AFMP prohibits any discrimination on grounds of nationality, including against nationals of one Contracting Party who are lawfully resident in the territory of another Contracting Party.

AB also falls within the material scope of Annex I to the AFMP.¹⁷ Even if AB were not an employed frontier worker in the sense of Article 7 of Annex I, the non-discrimination clause of Article 9 para. 2 of Annex I would still apply, as it does not distinguish between employed persons and employed frontier workers.

Given that the right to opt for voluntary assessment makes it possible to claim the deduction of occupational expenses incurred in obtaining income from employment and that any excessive tax withheld in the withholding tax procedure may be refunded, such right constitutes a tax concession.¹⁸ The fact that the right is not available to Swiss residents marks a difference in treatment, as the AFMP also applies to all covert forms of discrimination which, by the application of other distinguishing criteria, such as the criterion of residence, in fact lead to the same result.¹⁹ Article 21(2) AFMP then requires comparability. Generally, residents and non-residents are not in a comparable situation. Yet, the court nevertheless arrives at comparability through a two-pronged argument. First, it points to the possibility that residents of other EU Member States or of a State party to the EEA Agreement may request a voluntary assessment. It concludes that the German legislation accepts comparability between non-residents and residents.²⁰ Second, the court rejects the arguments brought forward by the German government pertaining to the lack of comparability.²¹ The possibility to record professional expenses in the withholding tax procedure is not a fully-fledged alternative. This is because it operates under shorter time limits and requires predictions, which, in case they turn out to be wrong, require, under threat of criminal sanctions, additional action by the taxpayer. Moreover, the voluntary assessment at issue here does not concern personal circumstances. And finally, any arguments regarding impediments to collecting taxes abroad fail to convince as the taxes have already been withheld.

The discrimination cannot be justified under Article 21(3) of the AFMP.²² As observed above, the voluntary assessment concerns taxes that have already been

16 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 52 et seqq.

17 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 58 et seqq.

18 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 79 et seqq.

19 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 82 et seqq.

20 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 93 et seqq.

21 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 95 et seqq.

22 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 103 et seqq.

paid and thus do not need to be recovered. Nor does a justification by the overriding reason in the general interest relating to the need to preserve fiscal coherence apply.²³

Finally, the court held that the discrimination is not permissible under Article 13 of the AFMP.²⁴ Under that provision, the Contracting Parties undertake not to adopt any further restrictive measures vis-à-vis each other's nationals in fields covered by that agreement. Despite its heading (standstill clause), the provision does not contain a standstill clause that would be comparable to the substantially different Article 64 TFEU. This is because the wording of the provision apart from its heading does not point to such a result. Neither would such a far-reaching consequence be in accordance with the purpose of the AFMP.

5. Comments

As stated previously, the *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd* case is yet another small piece of the puzzle that is the CJEU's case law on the AFMP in the area of taxation. Nevertheless, the case provides food for thought regarding the correct approach to interpreting the AFMP,²⁵ in particular regarding the right comparator and comparability, which have to be seen in light of the limit of Art. 16 para. 2 AFMP.

The AG in his opinion had repeatedly mentioned that the discriminatory tax treatment would have to be verified “*by comparison with that afforded to employed persons who, while pursuant an activity similar to that of AB, live in Germany or in other Member States of the European Union or the EEA*”.²⁶ In a later passage, in discussing comparability under Art. 21 para. 2 AFMP, he had explicitly limited the analysis to the horizontal comparator, i.e. residents of EU/EEA States that are nationals of one of these States.²⁷ However, in *Wächtler*, the CJEU had already clarified that only the former comparator is valid under the AFMP.²⁸

The CJEU departs from the AG's reasoning, as it seems to choose a vertical comparator and establishes comparability between the resident and non-resident situations. Yet in doing so, it takes an interesting path: it establishes comparability based on German legislation which treats particular cases of non-residents (EU/EEA cases) and residents alike. The German resident and the Swiss resident are in a compara-

23 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 107 et seqq.

24 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 110 et seqq.

25 See also R. Ismer/ S. Piotrowski/ S. Güllich in G. Kofler et al. (eds.), *CJEU Recent Developments in Direct Taxation 2023* (Vienna: Linde, 2024) 1, 10 et seqq.

26 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, para. 72, see also paras. 74 et seq.

27 Opinion of Advocate General Campos Sánchez-Bordona, 16 November 2023, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2023:882, para. 78.

28 CJEU, 26 February 2019, C-581/17, *Wächtler*, ECLI:EU:C:2019:138, para. 56. By contrast, blurry in this respect: CJEU, 21 September 2016, C-478/15, *Radgen*, ECLI:EU:C:2016:706, para. 42.

ble situation because the German legislator has decided to treat German residents and EU/EEA residents alike. One may doubt, however, that this truly was the German legislator's decision. The German rule was amended following the CJEU's decision in *Gerritse* as the previous rule did not fully comply with the requirements under EU law.²⁹ Can there really be voluntary comparability under duress? Or, inverting the perspective: If the Swiss legislator is not under an obligation to grant equal treatment between residents and non-residents from legal sources outside the AFMP, does this imply that it would not have to treat residents and non-residents alike under the AFMP? If taken seriously, this would result in a rather interesting asymmetry, which would not be in line with the public international law principle of reciprocity.

The court's travails seem to go back to Article 16(2) AFMP, according to which only the CJEU's case law prior to the date of signature of the AFMP shall be taken into account for the interpretation of the AFMP. This rule apparently led the Advocate General to base his reasoning on the *Schumacker* decision. Commendably, the court avoids this pitfall. As indicated, the facts of the case at hand correspond to the *Gerritse* case rather than the *Schumacker* case. Admittedly, the *Gerritse* case was decided after the signature of the AFMP and is thus not directly relevant for the interpretation of the AFMP. A reference to the *Gerritse* case thus seems to be ruled out by Article 16(2) AFMP. Yet, the core of that ruling can already be found in the *Asscher* case.³⁰ While in contrast to the Advocate General, the court does refer to that ruling,³¹ it should have been clearer regarding the significance of the *Asscher* decision for the present case. In future, the CJEU should be more transparent on the limit of Article 16 (2) AFMP and carefully explain the transferability. In the eyes of the court, this may admittedly amount to a *probatio diaboli*, given that the CJEU considers that it discovers the law rather than makes it. Nevertheless, the distinction underlies Article 16(2) of the AFMP and should be taken seriously.

29 See E. Reimer, in: P. Brandis/B. Heuermann (eds.), *Ertragsteuerrecht*, (Munich, Vahlen: 2024), § 50 EStG, para 103.

30 CJEU, 27 June 1996, C-107/94, *Asscher*, ECLI:EU:C:1996:251, para. 47.

31 CJEU, 30 May 2024, C-627/22, *AB v Finanzamt Köln-Süd*, ECLI:EU:C:2024:431, paras. 86 et seq.