ACADEMY OF
TAX LAW
learn • share • connect

TP CASE
SUMMARY

ENGIE/ LUXEMBOURG vs EUROPEAN UNION

MAY 2021

ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

PUBLISHING SERVICES

This Publication is copyrighted under the Berne Convention.

No reproduction or use of this material is allowed without prior permission

Copyright©, 2024 - Academy of Tax Law (Division of International Institute for Tax And Finance)

First Edition Published on 25 October 2024

Published by Academy Of Tax Law

CONTACT US
www.academyoftaxlaw.com | info@academyoftaxlaw.com

HEAD OF ACADEMICS

Welcome to the Academy of Tax Law's case and judgment summaries. These documents have been carefully curated to support professionals, students, and researchers navigating the complex landscape of international tax and transfer pricing. At the Academy, we understand that tax law is ever-evolving, with key rulings continuously shaping its practice.

Each summary you'll find here is designed to provide not just the facts, but the context and implications of pivotal legal decisions. These case summaries are created to serve as a valuable resource for legal teams, multinationals, revenue authorities, and academics, offering insights that go beyond the surface. Our goal is to ensure you remain informed and prepared, whether you are dealing with tax planning, dispute resolution, or risk management.

We believe that knowledge is the foundation of sound decision-making, and with these resources, we hope to empower you in your professional journey. As you delve into the analysis, remember that staying ahead in tax law requires not just understanding the rules but how to apply them in a dynamic, global environment.

Thank you for choosing the Academy of Tax Law as your partner in this ongoing learning experience.

Sincerely,
Dr. Daniel N Erasmus

PART 1

SUMMARY

JUDGEMENT SUMMARY

CASE OVERVIEW

Court:	European Court of Justice
Case No:	Joined Cases T-516/18 and T-525/18
Applicant:	Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and ENGIE
Defendant:	European Commission
Judgment Date:	12 May 2021 (rectified 16 September 2021)
Full Judgment:	https://academyoftaxlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/CELEX_62018TJ0516_EN_TXT.pdf
View Online:	https://academyoftaxlaw.com/state-aid-luxembourg-engie-tax-rulings/

JUDGMENT SUMMARY

This case involves the European Commission's ruling that Luxembourg's tax rulings for ENGIE constituted unlawful state aid, creating tax advantages that contravened the competitive balance required under EU law. The Commission's decision centered on Luxembourg's application of specific tax rulings allowing ENGIE to transfer profits within the group tax-free, using zero-interest loans known as "ZORAs" (Zero-Coupon, Obligatory, Redeemable at Maturity or earlier if converted to equity). By applying ZORAs and other intra-group arrangements, ENGIE was able to avoid paying substantial corporate tax on profits generated within Luxembourg.

The Commission argued that the Luxembourg rulings effectively circumvented normal tax rules by structuring a financing mechanism that achieved minimal tax liabilities on almost all Luxembourg profits. Luxembourg and ENGIE challenged this, asserting the tax treatment was consistent with Luxembourg's corporate tax framework and that no selective advantage was granted.

The General Court upheld the Commission's position, finding that the arrangements led to a significant reduction in ENGIE's Luxembourg tax base without a corresponding basis in Luxembourg tax law. The court also determined that Luxembourg's tax authority should have applied anti-abuse provisions, which, if enforced, could have prevented this tax outcome. In line with the decision, Luxembourg was required to recover the unpaid taxes from ENGIE, estimated to amount to hundreds of millions of euros. The ruling reinforces the EU's firm stance against state aid that disrupts fair competition, especially in tax matters, and sets a precedent for the treatment of similar tax arrangements within the EU.

In the end, the ECJ upheld the General Court's decision, reaffirming the Commission's assessment that Luxembourg's tax ruling conferred a selective advantage to Fiat Chrysler Finance Europe and that the aid granted was unlawful. Consequently, Luxembourg was required to recover the aid from Fiat Chrysler.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

BACKGROUND

The origin of the case dates back to the European Commission's investigation into Luxembourg's tax rulings for the ENGIE group, an energy and utility company with complex internal structures. In 2018, the Commission found that Luxembourg had issued rulings that endorsed the use of ZORAs and allowed ENGIE to avoid paying tax on almost all its Luxembourg-sourced profits. Specifically, Luxembourg's tax rulings permitted ENGIE group companies to establish tax-deductible ZORAs between subsidiary entities and holding companies, effectively shifting profits in ways that reduced Luxembourg's corporate tax revenue.

The European Commission initiated formal investigations in 2016, as part of a broader push to curb harmful tax practices within EU jurisdictions. Following extensive analysis, it concluded in 2018 that Luxembourg's rulings breached EU rules on state aid by creating selective advantages that distorted competition in the internal market. The Commission's decision mandated Luxembourg to recover the state aid from ENGIE, prompting both Luxembourg and ENGIE to appeal to the General Court, asserting that the arrangements aligned with Luxembourg's tax laws and did not constitute an advantage exclusive to ENGIE.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

CORE DISPUTE

The core legal question was whether Luxembourg's tax rulings created a "selective advantage" for ENGIE, contrary to Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The European Commission argued that by allowing ENGIE to offset profits via tax-deductible ZORAs, Luxembourg granted a benefit unavailable to other companies subject to normal tax treatment in Luxembourg. This advantage, the Commission claimed, enabled ENGIE to escape most of its corporate tax obligations on profits generated by its subsidiaries in Luxembourg.

Luxembourg and ENGIE countered that the tax rulings were based on standard Luxembourg tax laws, particularly the participation exemption regime, which allows subsidiaries to transfer profits without a corresponding tax liability under specific conditions. They argued that the ZORA structure was a legitimate financing mechanism and not a means to confer an exclusive advantage to ENGIE. Thus, the case's crux revolved around whether the tax rulings constituted an unlawful state aid or a legitimate application of Luxembourg tax law.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

COURT FINDINGS

The General Court found that Luxembourg's tax rulings did, in fact, provide ENGIE with an advantage that deviated from normal corporate tax treatment, primarily due to the structure of the ZORA arrangements. By endorsing intra-group transactions that resulted in nearly all profits escaping taxation, the Luxembourg tax authorities created a situation where ENGIE's Luxembourg subsidiaries minimized their taxable base, reducing the effective tax rate to levels inconsistent with the intent of Luxembourg tax law.

The court determined that Luxembourg's failure to apply anti-abuse provisions was instrumental in allowing ENGIE to benefit from an unintended tax reduction. The court further observed that by endorsing the ZORA arrangement, Luxembourg effectively allowed ENGIE to benefit from a tax advantage reserved exclusively for entities engaged in such structured arrangements, which were unavailable to comparable businesses. This finding of selectivity underscored the incompatibility of the tax rulings with EU state aid law.

KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

OUTCOME

The court upheld the European Commission's ruling, concluding that Luxembourg's tax treatment of ENGIE amounted to state aid incompatible with EU law. Luxembourg was ordered to reclaim the state aid granted, corresponding to the taxes avoided by ENGIE through the application of ZORAs. This decision emphasized that national tax provisions must align with EU state aid rules, especially in cases where internal measures may provide selective benefits that disrupt market competition. The ruling effectively means Luxembourg will recover millions of euros in unpaid taxes from ENGIE and avoid similar arrangements in the future.

The judgment sends a strong message to EU Member States regarding the boundaries of national tax autonomy in the context of state aid. Tax rulings that disproportionately benefit specific companies may be subjected to rigorous scrutiny, and revenue services must ensure that all corporate tax policies comply with EU competition law principles.

TP METHOD
HIGHLIGHTED (IF ANY)

This case did not explicitly involve a transfer pricing method but rather focused on Luxembourg's tax treatment of ZORAs within the group structure. The ZORA arrangements allowed ENGIE subsidiaries to shift profits internally without realizing a tax event. Although this wasn't a classic transfer pricing arrangement, the method enabled ENGIE to control intra-group profits, emphasizing the need for transparent and defensible intra-group financing structures, especially where tax deferrals or exemptions are involved.

PART 2

SIGNIFICANCE

MAJOR ISSUES

AREAS OF CONTENTION

Significant areas of contention included the definition and application of “selective advantage” in the context of Luxembourg’s tax law. ENGIE and Luxembourg argued that the rulings adhered to Luxembourg’s participation exemption framework and did not exclusively benefit ENGIE. Another critical point of contention was the Commission’s stance that the ZORA arrangements constituted an abuse of Luxembourg’s tax system, designed specifically to reduce ENGIE’s tax obligations. The legal and tax treatment of such arrangements questioned whether Member States retain autonomy over tax rulings that conform to their legal structures, especially if such rulings are perceived to grant disproportionate benefits to certain multinationals.

EXPECTED
OR CONTROVERSIAL?

The decision was both anticipated and controversial. The case aligns with the EU's ongoing initiative to curb aggressive tax practices, particularly those involving state aid disguised as legitimate tax rulings. Luxembourg's sovereignty in determining its tax policies came under question, as did the EU's authority to rule on Member State tax issues, intensifying existing debates around fiscal sovereignty within the EU.

The controversy lay primarily in the interpretation of selective advantage; Luxembourg and ENGIE viewed the Commission's intervention as an encroachment on national tax policy, while the EU upheld it as necessary to preserve fair competition. This decision exemplifies the tension between national tax autonomy and EU oversight, as aggressive tax planning becomes increasingly scrutinized within the EU framework.

SIGNIFICANCE
FOR MULTINATIONALS

For multinationals, this ruling underscores the EU's firm stance against tax structures that exploit local laws for substantial tax reductions. It serves as a warning to MNEs that tax rulings, even those issued by a state authority, could be retroactively deemed illegal if they selectively benefit the business. This case is particularly relevant for multinational corporations operating in countries offering tax incentives, encouraging them to adopt sustainable tax practices aligned with both local and EU requirements. Multinationals may need to revisit their tax strategies and consult experts in transfer pricing to mitigate risks associated with similar tax rulings in the future.

SIGNIFICANCE

FOR REVENUE SERVICES

Revenue services in EU Member States are encouraged to scrutinize tax rulings that may provide selective advantages and potentially lead to a loss of tax revenue. The ruling reaffirms the need for rigorous application of anti-abuse rules and transparency in corporate taxation. As the EU increases its oversight on state aid issues, revenue services must assess the compatibility of their tax policies with EU competition laws, especially where tax advantages could be perceived as selective. This ruling advocates for harmonized practices that ensure consistent tax application, which is crucial for maintaining equitable competition in the internal market.

SIMILAR CASES

APPLE/ IRELAND VS EU (T-892/16)

This case involved the European Commission's decision that Ireland had granted Apple unlawful state aid through favorable tax rulings. The Commission ordered Ireland to recover €13 billion in back taxes. Apple and Ireland appealed, arguing that the tax rulings were in line with Irish law. The General Court annulled the Commission's decision, but the case highlighted the Commission's use of state aid rules to target tax rulings and transfer pricing arrangements.

https://academyoftaxlaw.com/apple-tax-ruling-cjeu-2024/

AMAZON/ LUXEMBOURG VS EU (T-816/17)

In this case, the Commission ruled that Luxembourg had granted Amazon illegal state aid by allowing the company to shift profits to a Luxembourg-based holding company, thereby reducing its tax liability. The General Court ruled in favor of Amazon, annulling the Commission's decision. However, the case reinforced the scrutiny applied to tax rulings involving multinational corporations and the arm's length principle.

https://academyoftaxlaw.com/amazon-luxembourg-tax-ruling/

FIAT FINANCE VS EU (C-898/19 P)

Similar to the ENGIE case, Fiat benefited from tax rulings in Luxembourg that effectively reduced its tax burden through a transfer pricing methodology, raising issues of selective advantage under state aid law.

https://academyoftaxlaw.com/fiat-chrysler-state-aid-transfer-pricing/

PART 3

PREVENTION

ENGAGING EXPERTS

Given the complexity and increased scrutiny surrounding cross-border transactions, it is crucial for MNEs to engage transfer pricing experts. These experts can help ensure that intra-group transactions are not only priced at arm's length but also supported by genuine economic substance, reducing the risk of tax disputes. Transfer pricing experts play a critical role in:

- Structuring transactions in a way that complies with both transfer pricing regulations and anti-abuse rules.
- Preparing robust documentation that demonstrates the commercial rationale behind cross-border transactions.
- Helping businesses navigate the complex web of national and international tax laws to avoid potential tax risks.

PREVENTATIVE

MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

TAX RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Implementing a comprehensive tax risk management process is essential to identify, assess, and mitigate tax risks associated with cross-border transactions. This process should involve:

- Regular reviews of intra-group transactions to ensure they have genuine economic substance.
- Proactive engagement with tax authorities to seek clarity on the application of anti-abuse rules.
- Thorough documentation of the business rationale for each transaction to support

DOWNLOAD FREE BOOK

TAX INTELLIGENCE: THE 7 HABITUAL TAX MISTAKES MADE BY COMPANIES

Tax Intelligence: The 7 Habitual Tax Mistakes Made by Companies" by Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus is a must-read for businesses seeking to navigate the intricate world of tax compliance and risk management. By highlighting common pitfalls and offering strategic solutions, Erasmus equips companies with the knowledge to improve their tax practices and secure financial stability.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/tax-intelligence-by-prof-dr-daniel-n-erasmus/

PREVENTATIVE

MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

TAX STEERING COMMITTEE

Establishing a tax steering committee can help ensure that tax policies are aligned with the broader business strategy and that transactions are vetted for both commercial and tax implications. A tax steering committee can:

- Review all significant cross-border transactions before they are executed.
- Ensure that tax decisions are made in the context of overall business objectives, not solely for tax savings.
- Monitor changes in international tax laws to ensure ongoing compliance and avoid disputes like the X BV case.

DOWNLOAD FREE E-BOOK

DRIVING TAX COMPLIANCE: THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF THE TAX STEERING COMMITTEE

The eBook "Driving Tax Compliance: The Essential Role of a Tax Steering Committee" by Prof. Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus, Renier van Rensburg, and Gilbert Ferreira, emphasizes the critical importance of establishing a Tax Steering Committee (TSC) within multinational corporations to ensure tax compliance and manage tax-related risks effectively.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/essential-role-of-the-tax-steering-committee/

TP CASE
SUMMARY

ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

Copyright © 2024/2025
International Institute for Tax and Finance Ltd (I/I/T/F) Academy of Tax Law

This publication was accurate at time of publishing.
It may be necessary for reasons beyond the control of the organisers to alter the content.