

The Structure and Organization of EU Law in the Field of Direct Taxes

Marcel Guido Herwig Schaper

Thesis
submitted to Maastricht University
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor

Degree awarded on 18 December 2012



Volume 27
IBFD Doctoral Series

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	xv
-------------------------	----

List of Abbreviations	xvii
------------------------------	------

Part I Introduction

Chapter 1: General Introduction	3
1.1. Aim	3
1.2. Research question	4
1.3. Research framework	6
1.4. Synopsis	9
1.5. Limits	11
1.6. Guidance to the reader	13

Part II The Structure and Organization of the Case Law

Chapter 2: Introduction to Part II	17
2.1. Introduction	17
2.2. Research questions	19
2.3. Theoretical background	20
2.3.1. Normative background	20
2.3.1.1. Choice against an attitudinal model of judicial decision making	20
2.3.1.2. Montesquieu and the role of the judge	21
2.3.1.3. A view from European political science on judicial governance	24
2.3.2. Positive law background	26
2.3.2.1. The authority of precedent in EU law	26
2.3.2.2. Acte éclairé and acte clair	29
2.3.2.3. Member State liability for disregard of precedent	31
2.3.2.4. A self-imposed constraint	33
2.3.2.5. Overruling and distinguishing by the CJEU	35

2.4. Method	37
2.4.1. Preliminary remarks	37
2.4.2. SNA and law	38
2.4.3. Related work on courts and law	41
2.4.4. Self-organization of complex networks	43
2.4.4.1. Growth	44
2.4.4.2. Preferential attachment	44
2.4.4.3. Ageing	45
2.4.4.4. Competition	46
2.5. Data	48
2.5.1. What are direct taxes in EU law?	48
2.5.2. The sample of cases	52
2.6. Synthesis	54
Chapter 3: Properties of the Case Law	57
3.1. Introduction	57
3.2. General trends in activity	57
3.3. Member States before the Court	62
3.3.1. Proceedings by Member States	62
3.3.2. Preliminary references by national court	67
3.4. Subject matter of the proceedings	69
3.4.1. National subject matter	70
3.4.1.1. Subject matter by OECD classification	70
3.4.1.2. The relevance of double tax conventions	72
3.4.2. EU law subject matter	73
3.4.2.1. The interpretation of the TFEU	74
3.4.2.1.1. The basic rights of articles 18 and 21 of the TFEU	75
3.4.2.1.2. The freedom of establishment	79
3.4.2.1.3. The free movement of capital	80
3.4.2.1.4. The third country dimension to freedom of movement	82
3.4.2.1.5. The freedom to provide services	98
3.4.2.1.6. The free movement of workers	99
3.4.2.2. The interpretation of the EU direct tax directives	99
3.4.2.2.1. The Parent-Subsidiary Directive (90/435/EEC)	100
3.4.2.2.2. The Mergers Taxation Directive (2009/133/EC)	102
3.4.2.2.3. Other EU directives	103

3.5. Procedural properties	104
3.5.1. Bench hearing action	104
3.5.2. Opinions of the AGs	108
3.5.3. Duration	110
3.5.4. Form of rulings	110
3.6. Outcomes of the proceedings	111
3.6.1. Taxpayer rate of success	111
3.6.2. Grounds held against taxpayers	114
3.6.2.1. EU law does not confer the invoked right	115
3.6.2.2. The legal effects do not amount to a restriction	119
3.6.2.2.1. Allocation of taxing powers and disparities	124
3.6.2.2.2. Objective differences	125
3.6.2.2.3. No disadvantage	127
3.6.2.3. The restriction is justified	128
3.6.2.3.1. Cohesion of the tax system	129
3.6.2.3.2. Effectiveness of fiscal supervision	130
3.6.2.3.3. The balanced allocation of taxing powers	131
3.6.2.3.4. The need to prevent tax avoidance and evasion	132
3.7. Reception in the academic literature	133
3.8. Synthesis and discussion	138
Chapter 4: A Network Analysis of the Case Law	143
4.1. Introduction	143
4.2. Global network properties	144
4.2.1. Connectedness	144
4.2.2. The small-world effect	146
4.2.3. Degree distribution	152
4.3. Community structure	155
4.3.1. Community detection	155
4.3.2. Qualitative expectations	158
4.3.3. Girvan-Newman method	160
4.3.3.1. Method	160
4.3.3.2. Results	161
4.3.4. Louvain method	163
4.3.4.1. Method	163
4.3.4.2. Results	164

4.3.5. Subcommunities	170
4.3.5.1. Introduction	170
4.3.5.2. Results	170
4.3.5.3. Qualitative analysis of community 1	173
4.3.5.3.1. Preliminary remarks	173
4.3.5.3.2. Prelude to <i>Schumacker</i>	176
4.3.5.3.3. The <i>Sotgiu/Schumacker</i> line of authority	177
4.3.5.3.4. Capital movement and the EEA Agreement	188
4.3.5.3.5. Preferential tax rates and capital transactions	189
4.3.5.4. Qualitative analysis of community 3	191
4.3.5.5. Qualitative analysis of community 5	192
4.3.5.5.1. Preliminary remarks	192
4.3.5.5.2. The <i>Singh/De Groot</i> line of authority	193
4.3.5.5.3. Negative income and progressivity of tax rates	196
4.3.5.5.4. Tax benefits for private residences	198
4.3.5.5.5. <i>Renneberg and Commission v. Germany</i> (C-269/07)	199
4.3.5.5.6. Business deductions	205
4.3.5.6. Qualitative analysis of community 8	207
4.3.5.6.1. Preliminary remarks	207
4.3.5.6.2. Concepts of the Parent-Subsidiary Directive	207
4.3.5.7. Qualitative analysis of community 10	213
4.3.5.7.1. Preliminary remarks	213
4.3.5.7.2. Taxation of pensions and annuities	214
4.3.5.7.3. Cross-border investment and fiscal cohesion	218
4.3.5.7.4. Tax benefits solely for activities on national territory	223
4.3.5.7.5. Lotteries and charities	224
4.3.5.7.6. Effective fiscal supervision and cross-border investments	225
4.4. The most important precedents	227
4.4.1. Method	227
4.4.2. Results	229
4.4.3. Evaluation	232

4.5. The most important judicial rules	233
4.5.1. Method	233
4.5.2. Results	237
4.5.2.1. General	237
4.5.2.2. DTC neutralization of restrictive dividend withholding taxes	238
4.5.2.2.1. Introduction	238
4.5.2.2.2. Origins	240
4.5.2.2.3. The criterion of regulatory control	244
4.5.2.2.4. Conditions of effective neutralization	247
4.5.2.2.5. The EFTA Court judgment in <i>Fokus Bank</i>	251
4.5.2.2.6. Comparison with prior research	253
4.5.2.2.7. Synthesis	254
4.5.3. Evaluation	255
4.6. The reception of rules of general EU law	256
4.6.1. Quantitative analysis	256
4.6.1.1. Structural openness but organizational closure	256
4.6.1.2. The most important non-tax precedents	260
4.6.2. Qualitative analysis	263
4.6.2.1. <i>Svensson and Gustavsson</i>	263
4.6.2.2. <i>Commission v. Belgium (C-478/98)</i>	264
4.6.2.3. <i>Fidium Finanz</i>	265
4.6.2.4. <i>Gebhard</i>	266
4.6.2.5. <i>Ospelt and Schlössle Weissenberg</i>	268
4.7. Synthesis and discussion	270

Part III

The Balanced Allocation of Taxing Powers

Chapter 5: Introduction to Part III	275
5.1. Introduction	275
5.2. Survey of prior research	276
5.3. Research questions	281
5.4. Methodology and data	282
5.5. Descriptive results	285
5.5.1. Properties of the network	285
5.5.2. Community structure	286
5.6. Synthesis	289

Chapter 6: The BAOTP Standard as Such	291
6.1. Introduction	291
6.2. The basic framework of the law	292
6.2.1. The principle of conferral as point of departure	292
6.2.2. The legitimate existence of the power to impose tax	295
6.2.3. The constrained exercise of the power to impose tax	298
6.3. A citation summary	299
6.3.1. Method	299
6.3.2. Results	301
6.4. Legal analysis	304
6.4.1. Two periods of legal evolution	304
6.4.2. Emergence	305
6.4.3. Reproduction	316
6.5. Fit within the basic framework of the law	331
6.5.1. The general case	331
6.5.2. Aims of the measure and the existence of a restriction	333
6.5.3. Compensation by other tax advantages	337
6.5.4. The specific case of grouping rules	344
6.6. Synthesis and discussion	346
 Chapter 7: Relations with Other Justifications	 349
7.1. Introduction	349
7.2. Preliminary review	350
7.2.1. Inductive generalization	350
7.2.2. Textual analysis	353
7.2.3. Interpretation of “taken together”	354
7.2.4. Hypotheses	357
7.3. Relation with the risk of double use of losses	358
7.3.1. Analysis of the case law	358
7.3.2. Synthesis and discussion	362
7.4. Relation with the prevention of tax avoidance	367
7.4.1. Introduction	367
7.4.2. EU law cannot be relied upon for abusive or fraudulent ends	368
7.4.3. Wholly artificial arrangements	372
7.4.4. The <i>Emsland-Stärke</i> standard of proof	379
7.4.5. Prevention of tax avoidance after <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	385
7.4.6. Synthesis and discussion	398
7.5. Relation with the cohesion of the tax system	402

7.5.1. Introduction	402
7.5.2. The requirements of the cohesion of the tax system	403
7.5.3. Comparison with the balanced allocation of taxing powers	404
7.5.4. Synthesis and discussion	414
7.6. Synthesis and discussion	415
Chapter 8: Proportionality	419
8.1. Introduction	419
8.2. The principle of proportionality	419
8.2.1. A general and judicial principle of EU law	419
8.2.2. Reception in the field of direct taxation	423
8.3. Proportionality in action	425
8.4. Synthesis and discussion	440
Chapter 9: Revisiting <i>Marks & Spencer</i>	443
9.1. Why the Court erred in <i>Marks & Spencer</i>	443
9.1.1. The error of fact on loss trafficking	443
9.1.2. The error cannot be mended by reinterpretation	445
9.2. Alternative solution: A system of deferral	448
9.2.1. Outline	448
9.2.2. Legality	450
9.2.3. Proportionality	452
9.3. Synthesis and discussion	454
Part IV	
Conclusion	
Chapter 10: General Conclusions	457
10.1. Summary of conclusions	457
10.2. Implications of the research	463
10.3. Avenues for future research	465
10.4. Final word	466
Annex A: Acte clair rules in the field of direct taxes	469
Bibliography	485
Table of Cases	515