

**Action brought on 26 June 2014 — Caamaño Sistemas Metálicos and Others v Commission****(Case T-477/14)**

(2014/C 261/78)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

*Applicants:* Caamaño Sistemas Metálicos, SL (Coruña, Spain); Blumaq, SA (Castellón, Spain); Grupo Ibérica de Congelados, SA (Vigo, Spain); and Inversiones Rentaragon, SA (Zaragoza, Spain) (represented by: J.L. Buendía Sierra, E. Abad Valdenebro, R. Calvo Salinero, and A. Lamadrid de Pablo, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- annul the contested decision in so far as it categorises the measures which, according to that decision, together constitute the ‘Spanish Tax Lease System’ 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 beneficiaries of the alleged aid and as the sole addressees of the order for recovery;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the alleged aid;
- 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; 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-700/13 *Bankia v Commission*.

---

**Action brought on 26 June 2014 — Industrias Espadafor and Others v Commission****(Case T-478/14)**

(2014/C 261/79)

*Language of the case: Spanish***Parties**

*Applicants:* Industrias Espadafor, SA (Granada, Spain); Tutichip, SAU (Barcelona, Spain); Locales, Actividades y Exclusivas Comerciales, SA (Vigo, Spain); RNB, SL (La Pobla de Vallbona, Spain); and Inversiones Antaviana, SA (Valencia, Spain) (represented by: J.L. Buendía Sierra, E. Abad Valdenebro, R. Calvo Salinero, and A. Lamadrid de Pablo, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

**Form of order sought**

The applicants claim that the General Court should:

- annul the contested decision in so far as it categorises the measures which, according to that decision, together constitute the ‘Spanish Tax Lease System’ 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 beneficiaries of the alleged aid and as the sole addressees of the order for recovery;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the alleged aid;
- 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; 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-700/13 *Bankia v Commission*.

---

## **Action brought on 26 June 2014 — Banco de Caja España de Inversiones, Salamanca y Soria v Commission**

**(Case T-482/14)**

(2014/C 261/80)

*Language of the case: Spanish*

### **Parties**

*Applicant:* Banco de Caja España de Inversiones, Salamanca y Soria, SA (Madrid, Spain) (represented by: J.L. Buendía Sierra, E. Abad Valdenebro, R. Calvo Salinero and A. Lamadrid de Pablo, lawyers)

*Defendant:* European Commission

### **Form of order sought**

The applicant claims that the General Court should:

- annul the contested decision in so far as it categorises the measures which, according to that decision, together constitute the ‘Spanish Tax Lease System’ 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 beneficiaries of the alleged aid and as the sole addressees of the order for recovery;
- in the alternative, annul Article 4 of the contested decision, in so far as it orders recovery of the alleged aid;
- 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; 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-700/13 *Bankia v Commission*.

---