JUDGMENT OF THE BUNDESFINANZHOF XI R 24/09 15. 02. 2012

Panelist: Judge Friederike Grube

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

- $A \rightarrow cement B \rightarrow cement C (plaintiff)$
- $A \longrightarrow "money-off-coupons" \rightarrow ---C$

C bought cement from a taxable person named B who had bought the cement from A before. A gave a discount directly to C by using "money off coupons."

A rectified accordingly his taxable amount.

THE PROBLEM

- Is the plaintiff C obliged to rectify the "input" tax he deducted before?
- National VAT law (§ 17 Abs. 1 Satz 1 Nr. 2 UStG a.F.):
- "If the taxable amount for a taxable transaction has changed,
- **1**.the taxable person who has carried out the supply of goods or services has to rectify the payment of the tax and
- 2.the taxable person <u>being the direct customer</u> of those transactions has to rectify the "input" tax he had deducted before...."

THE SOLUTION

- C is not obliged to rectify the "input" tax he deducted before, because C was no direct customer of A, but of B
- No violation of the principle of primacy of European law
- No violation of the obligation to interpret the national regulation in the sense of the VAT-Directive 2006/112/EC

DISCUSSION

- Is a taxable person entitled to apply national law if the national law is better than European law?
- Problem: Principle of primacy of European Law
- Are there similar cases in other countries?

LAST COMMENTS

- New proposal of the European Commission about discounts and VAT with the aim to harmonize and simplify the regulations in the MS's of the European Union (10. 05. 2012 – Com (2012) 206)
- Thank you for your attention!