www.pwc.com/eudtg 20 December 2018



PwC's EU Direct Tax Group

EUDTG is PwC's pan-European network of EU law experts. We specialise in all areas of direct tax, including the fundamental freedoms, EU directives and State aid rules. You will be only too well aware that EU direct tax law is moving quickly, and it's difficult to keep up. But, it is crucial that taxpayers with an EU or EEA presence understand the impact as they explore their activities, opportunities and investment decisions. Find out more on: www.pwc.com/eudtg

Interested in receiving our free EU tax news? Send an e-mail to eudtg@nl.pwc.com with "subscription EU Tax News".

For more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Emmanuel Raingeard de la Blétière -**PwC France** +33 1 56 57 40 14 emmanuel.raingeard@pwcavocats.com

Jonathan Hare – PwC UK +44 77 40 96 86 88 jonathan.hare@pwc.com

Arne Schnitger – PwC Germany +49 30 26 36 54 66 arne.schnitger@pwc.com

Björn Bodewaldt – PwC Germany +49 40 63 78 10 23 bjoern.bodewaldt@pwc.com

Or contact any of the other members of PwC's State Aid Working Group or your usual PwC contact



EU Direct Tax Newsalert CJEU holds German RETT exemption for group restructurings not to be State aid in upstream merger case

On 19 December 2018, the Court of Justice CJEU decison of the European Union (CJEU) issued its judgment in the case of A-Brauerei (C-374/17).

Background

In December 2009, Germany introduced an exemption from Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) for group restructurings in section 6a of the RETT Act. At that time, lawmakers intended to facilitate reorganisations of company groups that had become necessary because of the financial crisis. The new law took effect from 1 January 2010.

A-Brauerei was a German stock corporation, which acquired all assets and liabilities of its 100% subsidiary by an upstream merger carried out on 1 August 2012. As the merged subsidiary owned German real estate, RETT would have been triggered if the tax exemption under section 6a RETT Act had not come into play. The provision ap-

- (i) A restructuring that is regulated by the German Restructuring Law or any equivalent (company) law of a Member State of the EU or the European Economic Area (i.e. any type of reorganisation of a group that is governed by other laws is not covered by section 6a, e.g. the mere sale of assets);
- (ii) Entities involved in the restructuring that form part of the same group (i.e. there must be a common parent, which - directly or indirectly - holds at least 95% of the shares in all entities involved; the parent itself may also be part of the restructuring);
- (iii) Restructurings where the participation(s) of at least 95% exist during the five years before and after the transaction.

All requirements must be met cumulatively. A-Brauerei and the German tax authorities had a dispute, which ended up in litigation on whether the RETT exemption was applicable. Finally, the Federal Fiscal Court decided that the benefits of the RETT exemption had to be granted to A-Brauerei unless the rule constituted illegal State aid. On 30 May 2017, the Federal Fiscal Court referred the case to the CJEU expressing doubts in respect of section 6a RETT and its compatibility with EU State aid rules.

When the CJEU examined the selectivity of section 6a of the RETT Act, the Court held that the general rule (reference framework) in this case was that, in principle, all transfers of ownership in German real estate triggered RETT.

The CJEU concluded that the provision is a derogation from the reference framework as it exempts group restructurings from the RETT levy even if another entity acquires the property. Entities that are involved in group restructurings covered by section 6a RETT and entities that perform other types of ownership transfers or do not form part of a group are, furthermore, in a comparable situation in the light of the objective of the general rule. The provision was, therefore, found to be a priori selective (i.e. in this respect, the CJEU did not agree with the Advocate General who had opined on 19 September 2018 that there was no derogation from a reference framework as the RETT exemption was generally available to all undertakings irrespective of their size, activity, location etc.).

However, the CJEU found that the derogation can be justified by the nature or general scheme of the German tax system and the intention of the German provision to prevent double taxation. The CJEU held that in an upstream merger case like the one at hand it can be assumed that the taxpayer (parent) already paid RETT when it integrated the subsidiary with the property into the group because the parent owns more than 95% of the shares in the subsidiary (i.e. the acquisition of such amount of shares in a property owning company is an event triggering German RETT). Exempting such a parent from the second RETT levy is therefore justified by the objective to prevent double taxation. As regards requirement (iii) relating to the duration of the holding, the Court found it to be justified by the objective to prevent abuse. The CJEU did not comment on requirement (i).

Takeaway

The RETT exemption granted in the case at hand for an upstream merger did not infringe the State aid rules.

© 2018 PwC. All rights reserved. PwC refers to the PwC network and/or one or more of its member firms, each of which is a separate legal entity. Please see www.pwc.com/structure for further details. This content is for general information purposes only, and should not be used as a substitute for consultation with professional advisors. PwC helps organisations and individuals create the value they're looking for. We're a network of firms in 157 countries with more than 195,000 people who are committed to delivering quality in assurance, tax and advisory services. Find out more and tell us what matters to you by visiting us at www.pwc.com