

**Action brought on 12 June 2014 — Grup Maritim TCB v Commission****(Case T-416/14)**

(2014/C 253/72)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties***Applicant:* Grup Maritim TCB, SL (Barcelona, Spain) (represented by: A. López Gómez, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- in the alternative, annul the decision categorising the measures which together constitute the ‘Spanish Tax Lease System’ (‘STLS’) as new State aid that is incompatible with the internal market;
- in the alternative, annul Articles 1 and 4 of the contested decision, which identify the investors in the Economic Interest Groupings (EIGs) as the only beneficiaries of the alleged aid and, consequently, as solely liable for its recovery;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the alleged aid in breach of general principles of EU law;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it makes a determination as to the lawfulness of private contracts between the investors and other entities, in full or in such a way as to limit the bar on passing on the burden of recovery to the profitability of the operations; and
- order the Commission to pay the costs of these proceedings.

**Pleas in law and main arguments**

The pleas in law and main arguments are those raised in Case T-401/14 Duro Felguera SA v Commission.

**Action brought on 12 June 2014 — Afar 4 v Commission****(Case T-417/14)**

(2014/C 253/73)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties***Applicant:* Afar 4, SL (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: A. López Gómez, lawyer)*Defendant:* European Commission**Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- in the alternative, annul the decision categorising the measures which together constitute the ‘Spanish Tax Lease System’ (‘STLS’) as new State aid that is incompatible with the internal market;
- in the alternative, annul Articles 1 and 4 of the contested decision, which identify the investors in the Economic Interest Groupings (EIGs) as the only beneficiaries of the alleged aid and, consequently, as solely liable for its recovery;

- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the alleged aid in breach of general principles of EU law;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it makes a determination as to the lawfulness of private contracts between the investors and other entities, in full or in such a way as to limit the bar on passing on the burden of recovery to the profitability of the operations; and
- order the Commission to pay the costs of these proceedings.

#### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

The pleas in law and main arguments are those raised in Case T-401/14 Duro Felguera SA v Commission.

---

### **Action brought on 12 June 2014 — Distribuidores y Transportistas de Productos Petrolíferos v Commission**

**(Case T-426/14)**

(2014/C 253/74)

*Language of the case: Spanish*

#### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Distribuidores y Transportistas de Productos Petrolíferos, SA (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: J. García Muñoz, J. Jiménez-Blanco Carrillo de Albornoz and J. Corral García, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

#### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision; and
- order the Commission to pay all the costs incurred in the proceedings.

#### **Pleas in law and main arguments**

The pleas in law and main arguments are those raised in Case T-392/14 Gutser v Commission.

---

### **Action brought on 12 June 2014 — Almoauto v Commission**

**(Case T-427/14)**

(2014/C 253/75)

*Language of the case: Spanish*

#### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Almoauto, SA (Alcorcón, Madrid, Spain) (represented by: J. García Muñoz, J. Jiménez-Blanco Carrillo de Albornoz and J. Corral García, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

#### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision; and
- order the Commission to pay all the costs incurred in the proceedings.