

— in the alternative, annul that decision in so far as it imposes an obligation to recover the relief granted and in so far as it requires interest to be added to the amount of relief to be recovered for the periods taken into consideration in the judgment;

— order the Commission to pay the costs incurred both at first instance and on appeal.

### Grounds in law and main arguments

In support of the appeal, the appellant raises nine grounds of appeal:

**First ground:** the General Court erred in not taking into consideration the fact that the measures in question did not confer any advantage upon their beneficiaries given their compensatory nature.

**Second ground:** the Court erred in not excluding, or at least assessing, the likelihood that the measures in question would affect competition and intra-Community trade.

**Third ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogations in Article 87(2)(b) EC (now Article 107(2)(b) TFEU) and Article 87(3)(b) EC (now Article 107(3)(b) TFEU) were inapplicable.

**Fourth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogation in Article 87(3)(c) EC (now Article 107(3)(c) TFEU) was inapplicable.

**Fifth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogations in Article 87(3)(d) and (e) EC (now Article 107(3)(d) and (e) TFEU) were inapplicable.

**Sixth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogation in Article 86(2) EC (now Article 106(2) TFEU) was inapplicable.

**Seventh ground:** the Court erred in not recognising the existence of the aid, thus infringing Article 88(3) EC (now Article 108(3) TFEU) and Article 15 of Regulation No 659/1999. <sup>(1)</sup>

**Eighth ground:** the Court erred in finding that Article 14(1) of Regulation No 659/1999 did not apply to the recovery order.

**Ninth ground:** the Court erred in finding that Article 14(1) of Regulation No 659/1999 did not apply to the addition of interest.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 of 22 March 1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty (OJ 1999 L 83, p. 1).

### Appeal brought on 29 April 2013 by GE.AL.VE. Srl against the order of the General Court (Fourth Chamber) of 20 February 2013 in Joined Cases T-278/00 to T-280/00, T-282/00 to T-286/00 and T-288/00 to T-295/00 *Albergo Quattro Fontane and Others v Commission*

(Case C-229/13 P)

(2013/C 207/27)

*Language of the case: Italian*

### Parties

*Appellant:* GE.AL.VE. Srl (represented by: A. Bianchini and F. Busetto, avvocati)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Commission, Comitato 'Venezia vuole vivere'

### Form of order sought

— Set aside the order of the General Court under appeal

— Uphold the forms of order sought at first instance and, accordingly,

— annul, in so far as is reasonable and in so far as it concerns the appellant, European Commission Decision No 2000/394/EC of 25 November 1999 on aid to firms in Venice and Chioggia by way of relief from social security contributions under Laws Nos 30/1997 and 206/1995;

— in the alternative, annul that decision in so far as it imposes an obligation to recover the relief granted and in so far as it requires interest to be added to the amount of relief to be recovered for the periods taken into consideration in the judgment;

— order the Commission to pay the costs incurred both at first instance and on appeal.

### Grounds of appeal and main arguments

In support of the appeal, the appellant raises nine grounds of appeal:

**First ground:** the General Court erred in not taking into consideration the fact that the measures in question did not confer any advantage upon their beneficiaries given their compensatory nature.

**Second ground:** the Court erred in not excluding, or at least assessing, the likelihood that the measures in question would affect competition and intra-Community trade.

**Third ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogations in Article 87(2)(b) EC (now Article 107(2)(b) TFEU) and Article 87(3)(b) EC (now Article 107(3)(b) TFEU) were inapplicable.

**Fourth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogation in Article 87(3)(c) EC (now Article 107(3)(c) TFEU) was inapplicable.

**Fifth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogations in Article 87(3)(d) and (e) EC (now Article 107(3)(d) and (e) TFEU) were inapplicable.

**Sixth ground:** the Court erred in holding that the derogation in Article 86(2) EC (now Article 106(2) TFEU) was inapplicable.

**Seventh ground:** the Court erred in not recognising the existence of the aid, thus infringing Article 88(3) EC (now Article 108(3) TFEU) and Article 15 of Regulation No 659/1999. <sup>(1)</sup>

**Eighth ground:** the Court erred in finding that Article 14(1) of Regulation No 659/1999 did not apply to the recovery order.

**Ninth ground:** the Court erred in finding that Article 14(1) of Regulation No 659/1999 did not apply to the addition of interest.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 of 22 March 1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty (OJ 1999 L 83, p. 1).

**Appeal brought on 29 April 2013 by Metropolitan SpA, formerly Metropolitan Srl, against the order of the General Court (Fourth Chamber) of 20 February 2013 in Joined Cases T-278/00 to T-280/00, T-282/00 to T-286/00 and T-288/00 to T-295/00 *Albergo Quattro Fontane and Others v Commission***

(Case C-230/13 P)

(2013/C 207/28)

*Language of the case: Italian*

### Parties

*Appellant:* Metropolitan SpA, formerly Metropolitan Srl (represented by: A. Bianchini and F. Busetto, avvocati)

*Other parties to the proceedings:* European Commission, Comitato 'Venezia vuole vivere'

### Form of order sought

- Set aside the order of the General Court under appeal
- Uphold the forms of order sought at first instance and, accordingly,
  - annul, in so far as is reasonable and in so far as it concerns the appellant, European Commission Decision No 2000/394/EC of 25 November 1999 on aid to firms in Venice and Chioggia by way of relief from social security contributions under Laws Nos 30/1997 and 206/1995;
  - in the alternative, annul that decision in so far as it imposes an obligation to recover the relief granted and in so far as it requires interest to be added to the amount of relief to be recovered for the periods taken into consideration in the judgment;
- order the Commission to pay the costs incurred both at first instance and on appeal.

### Grounds of appeal and main arguments

In support of the appeal, the appellant raises nine grounds of appeal:

**First ground:** the General Court erred in not taking into consideration the fact that the measures in question did not confer any advantage upon their beneficiaries given their compensatory nature.

**Second ground:** the Court erred in not excluding, or at least assessing, the likelihood that the measures in question would affect competition and intra-Community trade.