



Action brought on 6 March 2026 – Corsica Ferries v Commission

(Case T-165/26)

(C/2026/2393)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Corsica Ferries (Bastia, France) (represented by: L. Ayache and S. Rodrigues, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- declare the present action admissible and well founded;
- annul Commission Decision (EU) 2025/2453 of 26 November 2024 in case SA.101557 (2023/NN, ex-2022/PN) – France — Maritime services to Corsica (2023-2030) ⁽¹⁾;
- order the defendant to bear all costs of the proceedings.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action, the applicant relies on three pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging several errors of law infringing the case-law in *TWD* and failing to take into account the principle of effective review of State aid.
2. Second plea in law, alleging infringement of the rights of the defence and of the right to an effective remedy.
 - The applicant puts forward, in a first sub-plea, that data essential for the verification of the Commission's reasoning was redacted.
 - The applicant maintains, in a second sub-plea, that the Commission based its analysis on documents not communicated or not made accessible.
 - The applicant takes the view, in a third sub-plea, that there was a lack of evidence.
3. Third plea in law, alleging infringement and incorrect application of Article 106(2) TFEU and the SGEI Framework.
 - In a first sub-plea, the applicant argues that the finding that a genuine SGEI existed is vitiated by manifest errors of assessment, methodology and calculation, a distortion of the facts, contradictory reasoning, reversal of the burden of proof and errors of law.
 - In a second sub-plea, the applicant maintains that the finding of the proportionate character and objective of the duration of the PSCs is vitiated by errors of law (infringement of paragraph 17 of the SGEI Framework and the rules applicable to concession agreements) and a distortion of the facts.
 - In a third sub-plea, the applicant takes the view that the analysis on compliance with EU rules applicable to public procurement is vitiated by a manifest error of assessment and an error of law (infringement of paragraph 19 of the SGEI Framework).
 - In a fourth sub-plea, the applicant submits that the analysis of the calculation of the compensation amount is vitiated by manifest errors of assessment and an error of law (infringement of paragraph 21 of the SGEI Framework).

⁽¹⁾ OJ, L/2025/2453, 30.12.2025.