

GENERAL COURT

Action brought on 13 March 2014 — Søndagsavisen A/S v European Commission

(Case T-167/14)

(2014/C 223/17)

Language of the case: Danish

Parties

Applicant: Søndagsavisen A/S (Søborg, Denmark) (represented by: M. Honoré and C. Fornø)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

- Annul the Commission's decision of 20 November 2013 not to raise objections to Denmark's production and innovation aid for written media (SA.36366);
- order the Commission to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

The applicant, a competitor of the recipients of the aid, submits that the Commission ought to have found that there was doubt as to the compatibility of the reported measure with the internal market and that the Commission therefore ought to have adopted a decision to open the formal investigation procedure: see Article 108(2) TFEU and Article 4(4) of the procedural regulation.⁽¹⁾ In failing to do so, the Commission has disregarded the applicant's procedural rights under Article 108(2) TFEU.

In support of the argument that there was reasonable doubt as to the scheme's compatibility with the internal market, the applicant relies on three pleas in law:

- the Commission failed entirely to examine whether the scheme was suitable for ensuring the expansion of news content provided to the Danish people, thereby supporting the democratic process;
- the contested decision in any event lacks a sufficient statement of reasons with regard to suitability; and
- the Commission failed to examine the competition-distorting effects of the scheme in the relationship between free newspapers and newspapers sold for money.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 of 22 March 1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 108 of the treaty on the functioning of the European Union (OJ 1999 L 83, p. 1).

Action brought on 15 April 2014 — Deutsche Edelstahlwerke v Commission

(Case T-230/14)

(2014/C 223/18)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicant: Deutsche Edelstahlwerke GmbH (Witten, Germany) (represented by: S. Altenschmidt and H. Janssen, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the decision of the European Commission of 18 December 2013 in State aid case SA.33995 (2013/C) — Support for renewable electricity and reduced EEG-surcharge for energy-intensive users;
- order the defendant to pay the 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: Infringement of Article 107(1) TFEU

- The applicant claims that the contested decision infringes Article 107(1) TFEU because the EEG-surcharge provided for in the Gesetz für den Vorrang erneuerbarer Energien (Law for the priority of renewable energy sources, hereinafter referred to as EEG) and the special compensation regime did not constitute an allocation of State or State-controlled resources. All the facts relevant to the qualification of those measures were determined in the preliminary proceedings between the Commission and the Federal Republic of Germany. There were no longer any doubts, which the Commission should have found in a proceeding pursuant to Article 108(2) TFEU and Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty.⁽¹⁾

2. Second plea in law: Infringement of Article 108(1) TFEU and the principle of legal certainty

- The applicant submits in that regard that the Commission infringed Article 108(1) TFEU and the principle of legal certainty by applying the procedure for new aid pursuant to Article 4(4) of Regulation No 659/1999 instead of the procedure for existing aid pursuant to Article 17 et seq. of Regulation No 659/1999 in order to review its provisional assessment of the EEG as aid. In that regard, the applicant observes in particular that, by decision of 22 May 2002, the Commission did not classify the 2000 EEG as aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU because there was no transfer of State resources. The changes from the 2000 EEG to the 2012 EEG were not substantial in comparison to the Commission decision of 22 May 2002. The Commission, therefore, could have asserted an amended legal opinion in a proceeding pursuant to Article 108(1) TFEU without impacting on the applicant.

3. Third plea in law: Infringement of Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the principle of audi alteram partem

- The applicant also claims that the defendant adopted the contested decision without previously giving the applicant the opportunity to provide comments.

⁽¹⁾ 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.

Action brought on 17 April 2014 — ArcelorMittal Hamburg and Others v Commission

(Case T-235/14)

(2014/C 223/19)

Language of the case: German

Parties

Applicants: ArcelorMittal Hamburg GmbH (Hamburg, Germany), Bregal Bremer Galvanisierungs GmbH (Bremen, Germany), ArcelorMittal Hochfeld GmbH (Duisburg, Germany) und ArcelorMittal Ruhrort GmbH (Duisburg) (represented by: H. Janssen and G. Engel, lawyers)

Defendant: European Commission