

GUIDE TO THE CASE LAW
of the European Court of Justice
on Articles 43 *et seq.* EC Treaty

FREEDOM OF
ESTABLISHMENT

European Commission
1/1/2001

PREFACE

The present guide forms part of a series of guides concerning the case law of the European Court of Justice. To date this series includes publications in English, French and German concerning Article 43 EC Treaty (freedom of establishment) and Article 49 EC Treaty (freedom to provide services).

The guidebooks are produced and updated by the European Commission, Internal Market Directorate-General, Unit D4 (Regulated professions (qualifications)).

This guide which concerns Article 43 EC Treaty aims to present the cases in a practical way by gathering together the essential passages of the cases, thus making it possible to find all the relevant parts of the judgment without having to consult the complete text of the case. The structure of the guide, following the recent case law, provides an approach to Article 43 intended to help not only academics, but also practitioners directly involved in detecting infringements and showing the possible need for harmonization.

*To highlight the essential passages, without ignoring their context, the reasoning of the Court is given without alteration, but the key words are shown in **bold and italics**. It must be pointed out that this method of presentation does not commit the Court, only the editors.*

Within each chapter, cases are cited in reverse chronological order starting with the most recent. The dynamic development of the interpretation by the Court of the concept of "restriction" on the freedom to provide services can thus be followed.

For further information concerning the Guides to the Case Law please contact the following:

<p>Copies can be obtained from: Mrs S. Caramanna Tel: (32.2) 295.01.83</p>
--

CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
CONTENTS.....	4
LIST OF CASES.....	7
1 FIELDS OF APPLICATION.....	13
1.1 NATURAL PERSONS	13
1.2 LEGAL PERSONS AND COMPANIES.....	13
1.2.1 Nationality of a company.....	13
1.2.2 Limits of application of the right of establishment	15
1.2.2.1 Variety in national legislation	15
1.2.2.2 Transfer of the central office by a national company	16
2 DEFINITION OF “ESTABLISHMENT”	17
2.1 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	17
2.2 PERMANENT ACTIVITY (OF A STABLE AND CONTINUOUS NATURE)	18
2.3 SELF-EMPLOYED ACTIVITIES.....	21
2.4 CROSS-BORDER CHARACTER	23
3 TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENT	25
3.1 PRIMARY ESTABLISHMENT.....	25
3.1.1 Natural persons - Possibility of an employee in one Member State working in a self-employed capacity in another Member State	25
3.1.2 Legal persons - Transfer of central management and control of a company to another Member State	25
3.2 SECONDARY ESTABLISHMENT (RIGHT TO MAINTAIN MORE THAN ONE PLACE OF WORK WITHIN THE COMMUNITY)	25
3.2.1 Natural persons	25
3.2.2 Legal persons	27
4 COROLLARIES OF THE FREEDOM OF ESTABLISHMENT	30
4.1 ENTRY AND RESIDENCE	30
4.2 RIGHT TO RESIDE AFTER CEASING AN ACTIVITY	31
4.3 OTHER RIGHTS OF THE FREEDOM OF ESTABLISHMENT	31

5	DEFINITION OF RESTRICTIONS.....	33
5.1	GENERAL PRINCIPLES	33
5.2	DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES.....	34
5.3	NON-DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES	37
5.4	ORIGIN OF RESTRICTIONS.....	40
5.4.1	Restrictions emanating from the state of destination	40
5.4.2	Restrictions emanating from the state of origin.....	45
5.4.3	Restrictions emanating from associations or organisations not governed by public law	48
6	JUSTIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS.....	49
6.1	DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES	49
6.1.1	Participation in the exercise of official authority (Art. 45 (formerly Art. 55)).....	49
6.1.2	Public policy, public security and public health (Art. 46 (formerly Art. 56)).....	52
6.2	NON-DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES	53
6.2.1	Measures justified by an imperative requirement in the general interest.....	53
6.2.2	Measures suitable for securing the attainment of the objective pursued and not going beyond what is necessary (proportionality).....	57
6.3	MEASURES AIMING TO PROHIBIT THE CIRCUMVENTION OF NATIONAL RULES	60
7	LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS	63
7.1	INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE 43 (FORMERLY ARTICLE 52) AS A “FUNDAMENTAL” PRINCIPLE OF COMMUNITY LAW	63
7.2	DIRECT APPLICABILITY OF ARTICLE 43 (FORMERLY ARTICLE 52).....	65
7.3	OBLIGATION OF MEMBER STATES TO MODIFY LAWS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE RIGHT OF ESTABLISHMENT.....	68
7.4	RIGHT TO REDRESS IN THE CASE OF DAMAGE ATTRIBUTABLE TO A MEMBER STATE	69
7.4.1	Principle of the right to reparation (corollary of direct effect)	69
7.4.2	The three pre-conditions for the right to redress (according to community law)	70
7.4.2.1	First condition: attribution of rights to individuals by the rule infringed	71
7.4.2.2	Second condition: breach sufficiently serious	72
7.4.2.3	Third condition: direct causal link between the breach of the obligation borne by the state and the damage sustained by the injured parties.....	73
7.4.3	Implementation of redress (according to national law)	73
8	PROCEDURAL GUARANTIES IN CONNECTION WITH RESTRICTIONS.....	75
8.1	OBLIGATION TO VERIFY AND COMPARE ON THE PART OF THE STATE OF DESTINATION.....	75
8.2	OTHER PROCEDURAL GUARANTIES: REASON FOR REFUSAL, RIGHT TO LEGAL PROCEEDINGS, PENALTIES.....	76

9	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS.....	77
9.1	RELATION TO OTHER PRIMARY LAW.....	77
9.1.1	Article 2 EC.....	77
9.1.2	Article 3 EC.....	78
9.1.3	Article 10 EC (formerly Article 5 EC).....	78
9.1.4	Article 12 EC (formerly Article 6 EC and Article 7 EEC).....	79
9.1.5	Article 18 EC (formerly Article 8A EC).....	80
9.1.6	Article 39 EC (formerly Article 48 EC).....	81
9.1.7	Article 44 EC (formerly Article 54 EC).....	82
9.1.8	Article 47 EC (formerly Article 57 EC).....	83
9.1.9	Article 48 EC (formerly Article 58 EC).....	85
9.1.10	Article 49 (formerly Article 59) et seq. EC.....	86
9.1.11	Article 293 EC (formerly Article 220 EC).....	89
9.1.12	Article 294 EC (formerly Article 221 EC).....	89
9.2	RELATION TO SECONDARY LAW.....	90
9.2.1	Absence of Harmonisation.....	90
9.2.2	During the Transitional Period.....	90
9.2.2.1	General Programmes.....	91
9.2.2.2	Role of Directives.....	91
9.2.3	After the Transitional Period.....	91
9.2.3.1	Role of Directives.....	92
9.2.3.2	Sector-based Directives.....	93
9.3	RELATION TO NATIONAL LAW.....	94
9.4	RELATION TO INTERNATIONAL LAW.....	99
10	SPECIFIC AREAS.....	100
10.1	GENERAL SYSTEM OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS.....	100
10.1.1	General principles.....	100
10.1.2	Role of directives.....	102
10.2	SOCIAL WELFARE.....	103
10.3	TAXATION.....	105
10.4	SPECIFIC PROFESSIONS.....	108
10.4.1	Law.....	108
10.4.2	Insurance.....	110
10.4.3	Architects.....	110
10.4.4	Medical and Dental Professions.....	111
10.4.5	Audit.....	112

LIST OF CASES

Title	Date	Case N°	Reference	§§	Page N°
Costa	15/07/1964	C-6/64	[1964] ECR 585	p596	67
Reyners	21/06/1974	C-2/74	[1974] ECR 631	10 12 13 14 15 16 18 19 20 21 24 25 26 30 31 32 40 42 43 44 45 46 47 51 52 54 55	67 67, 91 67, 83, 90 37 80 80 22 83, 91 85, 92, 98, 103 85, 90, 98 65 13, 67, 98 66 67, 92 92 67, 83, 92 110 50 50, 65 50 50 51 51 51 51, 110 51 51
Walrave	12/12/1974	C-36/74	[1974] ECR 1405	4 17 18	17, 77 48 48
Royer	08/04/1976	C-48/75	[1976] ECR 497	50	31
Donà	14/07/1976	C-13/76	[1976] ECR 1333	12	17, 77
Thieffry	28/04/1977	C-71/76	[1977] ECR 765	7 8 11 12 13 15 16 17 25 27	78 78 84, 103 57, 84 23 57 79, 97 84 98 24, 40, 45, 98, 109
Patrick	28/06/1977	C-11/77	[1977] ECR 1199	8 10 12 13 15 16 18	22 66 83, 84, 92 67, 92 34, 44, 102 103 37, 44, 110
Knors	07/02/1979	C-115/78	[1979] ECR 399	9 12 16 17 20 24 25 26	93 21 90 93 24, 47 23, 47 62, 97 94
Auer	07/02/1979	C-136/78	[1979] ECR 437	21	34, 97

Klopp	12/07/1984	C-107/83	[1984] ECR 2971	10 17 19 20 21 22	66 22 26, 29 109 26 44, 109
Commission v France	28/01/1986	C-270/83	[1986] ECR 273	13 14 21 22 24 25 26	64, 66 36 36 65 36 57 66
Commission v France	30/04/1986	C-96/85	[1986] ECR 1485	10 11 12 13 14	111 57, 111 111 112 112
Segers	10/07/1986	C-79/85	[1986] ECR 2375	15	44
Commission v Italy	15/10/1986	C-168/85	[1986] ECR 2945	11 13 14	69, 97 68 69
Commission v Germany	04/12/1986	C-205/84	[1986] ECR 3755	21 22	20, 64, 88, 110 62, 88
Commission v Italy	14/01/1988	C-63/86	[1988] ECR 29	14	32
Gullung	19/01/1988	C-292/86	[1988] ECR 111	15	93
Stanton	07/07/1988	C-143/87	[1988] ECR 3877	10 11 12 13 14	65 26 25 46 39, 46
Daily Mail	27/09/1988	C-81/87	[1988] ECR 5483	12 16 17 19 21 23 24 25 29	25 47 15, 29, 89 15 16, 86, 89 16 16, 86 16, 86 93
Steymann	05/10/1988	C-196/87	[1988] ECR 6159	9 12 13 14 16	17, 77 17 18 18 20, 82, 88
Cowan	02/02/1989	C-186/87	[1989] ECR 195	14 17 19	80 32 96
Commission v Greece	30/05/1989	C-305/87	[1989] ECR 1461	21 22	32 32, 90
Commission v Italy	05/12/1989	C-3/88	[1989] ECR 4035	8 11	39 59
Eleonora	03/10/1990	C-54-91/88 & 140/89	[1990] ECR 3537	11	24
Roux	05/02/1991	C-363/89	[1991] ECR I-273	9 10 23	30 30 82
Vlassopoulou	07/05/1991	C-340/89	[1991] ECR I-2357	10 13 14 15 16 17 18 23	108 66 79 39, 43 75 75 108 109
ERT	18/06/1991	C-260/89	[1991] ECR I-2925	24	53
Mediawet I	25/07/1991	C-288/89	[1991] ECR I-4007	11	53
Factortame	25/07/1991	C-221/89	[1991] ECR I-3905	20 21 22 23 32	20 17, 20 20 33 36

Ramrath	20/05/1992	C-106/91	[1992] ECR I-3351	6 16 17 21 22	112 30, 81 30, 81 26 26
Konstantinidis	30/03/1993	C-168/91	[1993] ECR I-1191	12 13 15 17	38 38 39 39, 43
Kraus	31/03/1993	C-19/92	[1993] ECR I-1663	15 16 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 42	23 24, 81 102 102 89 33, 38, 63, 95 63, 78 64, 66 64, 79 38, 43, 56, 58 62, 90 62 58 59 75, 101 22 76 59, 76
Commerzbank	13/07/1993	C-330/91	[1993] ECR I-4017	14 15	35, 37 37
Thijssen	13/07/1993	C-42/92	[1993] ECR I-4047	8 18	50 50
Halliburton	12/04/1994	C-1/93	[1994] ECR I-1137	15 20	35, 37 35
Peralta	14/07/1994	C-379/92	[1994] ECR I-3453	31	47
TV10	05/10/1994	C-23/93	[1994] ECR I-4795	21 22	87 88
Svensson	14/11/1995	C-484/93	[1995] ECR I-3955	15	53
Gebhard	30/11/1995	C-55/94	[1995] ECR I-4165	20 22 23 24 25 27 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	87 87 13, 15, 21, 63 26, 29 19, 63 19, 87 19, 87 21 21 22 22 108 108 56, 58 75, 101
Bosman	15/12/1995	C-415/93	[1995] ECR I-4921	73 82 83 97 104	17, 77 48 48 47 57
Inasti	15/02/1996	C-53/95	[1996] ECR I-703	8 9 10 11 12 13	81, 86 65 26 46 42 56
Skaniavi	29/02/1996	C-193/94	[1996] ECR I-929	20 21 22 36	79 80 80 76

Factortame III	05/03/1996	C-46/93 & 48/93	[1996] ECR I-1029	20 22 23 31 33 34 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 61 62 63 65 66 67 79 83 96	70 70 70 69 71 99 70 71 71 71 72 72 72 72 73 73 71 73 71 73 74
Commission v France	07/03/1996	C-334/94	[1996] ECR I-1307	13 14 18 19 21 22 24 30	79 35 89 28 30, 31 31 68 68
Semeraro	20/06/1996	C-418/93	[1996] ECR I-2975	30 31 32	93 93 33
USSL	16/01/1997	C-134/95	[1997] ECR I-195	19	23
Stöber & Piosa Pereira	30/01/1997	C-4/95 & 5/95	[1997] ECR I-511	38 39 40	35 35 95
France v Commission	20/03/1997	C-57/95	[1997] ECR I-1627	20	65, 91
Sutton	22/04/1997	C-66/95	[1997] ECR I-2163	31 32 33	69 70 73
Germany v Parliament & Council	13/05/1997	C-233/94	[1997] ECR I-2405	17 19 54	84 92 58
Futura & Singer	15/05/1997	C-250/95	[1997] ECR I-2471	19 22 24 26 31 43	33 33 15 55, 57 56 107
Commission v Ireland	12/06/1997	C-151/96	[1997] ECR I-3327	12 13 14	28, 35 30, 31 31
Shingara & Radiom	17/06/1997	C-65/95 & 111/95	[1997] ECR I-3343	28	52, 81
Sodemare	17/06/1997	C-70/95	[1997] ECR I-3395	24 25 26 27 32 33 34 35	19, 86 85 13, 15, 21, 63, 85 96 104 104 104 104
Commission v Greece	27/11/1997	C-62/96	[1997] ECR I-6725	18 19 20 22 23	28, 35 30, 31 31 99 21

Daihatsu	04/12/1997	C-97/96	[1997] ECR I-6843	18 19 20 21	82 82 82 82
Kapasalakalis	02/07/1998	C-225/95, 226/95 & 227/95	[1998] ECR I-0000	18	83, 91
ICI	16/07/1998	C-264/96	[1998] ECR I-0000	19 20 21 26 27 28 29 30 32 33 34 35	95 14, 28 46 61, 106 61 52, 55, 106 55, 107 107 78 78 68, 95 79
Commission v Spain	29/10/1998	C-114/97	[1998] ECR I-0000	31 34 35 36 37 44 45 46	34 49 49 49 49 34, 52 52 52
Centros Ltd	09/03/1999	C-212/97	[1999] ECR I-1459	17 18 19 20 21 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	13 27 14, 27 14, 27 42 60 60 60 61 61 61 42
Royal Bank of Scotland	29/04/1999	C-311/97	[1999] ECR I-2651	30	42, 106
Pfeiffer	11/05/1999	C-255/97	[1999] ECR I-2835	20 21 22	54 54 55
C.P.M. Meeusen	08/06/1999	C-337/97	[1999] ECR I-3289	27 28 29	41, 103 41, 104 41, 104
Fernández de Bobadilla	08/07/1999	C-234/97	[1999] ECR I-4773	16 17 20 22 23 31 32 33 34 35	102 94 95 95 95 100 100 101 101 101
Baxter and Others	08/07/1999	C-254/97	[1999] ECR I-4809	19 20	106 106
Commission v Belgium	08/07/1999	C-203/98	[1999] ECR I-4899	12 13	19 41
RISAN.	09/09/1999	C-108/98	[1999] ECR I-5219	23	23
Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt	21/09/1999	C-307/97	[1999] ECR I- 6161	42 43 50 53	40, 105 40, 105 54, 105 105
X AB, Y AB v Riksskatteverket	18/11/1999	C-200/98	[1999] ECR I- 8261	27 28	45 46
Fitzwilliam	10/02/2000	C-202/97	[2000] ECR I-0883	42 43	18 18
Commission v. Belgium	09/03/2000	C-355/98	[2000] ECR I- 1221	26 31	49 40
C. Baars	13/04/2000	C-251/98	[2000] ECR I- 2787	22 29 30 31	25 45 45 45
Haim	04/07/2000	C-424/97	[2000] ECR I-0000	59 60	53 54

Hocsman	14/09/2000	C-238/98	[2000] ECR I-0000	33 40	102 100
----------------	------------	----------	-------------------	----------	------------

1 FIELDS OF APPLICATION

1.1 NATURAL PERSONS

As regards Article 52 of the Treaty, read in conjunction with Article 58 thereof (third question), it must be borne in mind that *the right of establishment* with which those provisions are concerned *is granted* both *to natural persons* who are nationals of a Member State of the Community and to legal persons within the meaning of Article 58. Subject to the exceptions and conditions laid down, it allows all types of self-employed activity to be taken up and pursued on the territory of any other Member State, undertakings to be formed and operated and agencies, branches or subsidiaries to be set up (*Gebhard*, cited above, paragraph 23).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §26
See also: Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §23

As a reference to a set of legislative provisions effectively applied by the country of establishment to its own nationals, *this rule is, by its essence, capable of being directly invoked by nationals of all the other Member States.*

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §25

1.2 LEGAL PERSONS AND COMPANIES

1.2.1 Nationality of a company

In this respect, it should be noted that *a situation in which a company formed in accordance with the law of a Member State in which it has its registered office desires to set up a branch in another Member State falls within the scope of Community law.* In that regard, *it is immaterial that the company was formed in the first Member State only for the purpose of establishing itself in the second, where its main, or indeed entire, business is to be conducted* (see, to this effect, *Segers* paragraph 16).

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §17

As to the question whether, as Mr and Mrs Bryde claim, the refusal to register in Denmark a branch of their company formed in accordance with the law of another Member State in which it has its registered office constitutes an obstacle to *freedom of establishment*, it must be borne in mind that that freedom, *conferred by Article 52 of the Treaty on Community nationals, includes the right for them to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons and to set up and manage undertakings under the same conditions as are laid down by the law of the Member State of establishment for its own nationals. Furthermore, under Article 58 of the Treaty companies or firms formed in accordance with the law of a Member State and having their registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community are to be treated in the same way as natural persons who are nationals of Member States.*

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §19

The immediate consequence of this is that those companies are entitled to carry on their business in another Member State through an agency, branch or subsidiary. The location of their registered office, central administration or principal place of business serves as the connecting factor with the legal system of a particular State in the same way as does nationality in the case of a natural person (see, to that effect, Segers, paragraph 13, Case 270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273, paragraph 18, Case C-330/91 Commerzbank [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 13, and Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] I-4695, paragraph 20).

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §20

According to established case-law, *the freedom of establishment* which Article 52 grants to nationals of the Member States and which entails the right for them to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the Member State where such establishment is effected, *includes, pursuant to Article 58 of the Treaty, the right of companies or firms formed in accordance with the law of the Member State and having its registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community, to pursue their activities in the Member State concerned through a branch or agency. With regard to companies, it should be noted in this context that it is their corporate seat in the above sense that serves as the connecting factor with the legal system of a particular State, like nationality in the case of natural persons (Case 270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273, paragraph 18, and Case C-330/91 Commerzbank [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 13).*

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §20

As regards Article 52 of the Treaty, read in conjunction with Article 58 thereof (third question), it must be borne in mind that *the right of establishment* with which those provisions are concerned *is granted* both to natural persons who are nationals of a Member State of the Community and *to legal persons within the meaning of Article 58*. Subject to the exceptions and conditions laid down, *it allows all types of self-employed activity to be taken up and pursued on the territory of any other Member State, undertakings to be formed and operated and agencies, branches or subsidiaries to be set up* (*Gebhard*, cited above, paragraph 23).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §26
See also: Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §23

Such a condition may constitute a restriction, within the meaning of Article 52 of the Treaty, on the freedom of establishment of *a company or firm* which, in terms of Article 58 of the Treaty, *is to be treated in the same way as a natural person who is a national of a Member State, where that company or firm wishes to establish a branch in a Member State different from that in which it has its seat*.

Case C-250/95 Futura & Singer [1997] ECR I-2471 §24

In the case of a company, the right of establishment is generally exercised by the setting-up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries, as is expressly provided for in the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52. Indeed, that is the form of establishment in which the applicant engaged in this case by opening an investment management office in the Netherlands. *A company may also exercise its right of establishment by taking part in the incorporation of a company in another Member State*, and in that regard Article 221 of the Treaty ensures that *it will receive the same treatment* as nationals of that Member State as regards participation in the capital of the new company.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §17

1.2.2 Limits of application of the right of establishment

1.2.2.1 Variety in national legislation

In that regard it should be borne in mind that, unlike natural persons, companies are creatures of the law and, in the present state of Community law, *creatures of national law*. *They exist only by virtue of the varying national legislation which determines their incorporation and functioning*.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §19

The Treaty has taken account of that variety in national legislation. In defining, in Article 58, the companies which enjoy the right of establishment, *the Treaty places on the same footing, as connecting factors, the registered office, central administration and principal place of business of a company.* Moreover, Article 220 of the Treaty provides for the conclusion, so far as is necessary, of agreements between the Member States with a view to securing inter alia the retention of legal personality in the event of transfer of the registered office of companies from one country to another. No convention in this area has yet come into force.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §21

It must therefore be held that *the Treaty regards the differences in national legislation* concerning the required connecting factor and the question whether - and if so how - the registered office or real head office of a company incorporated under national law may be transferred from one Member State to another as problems *which are not resolved by the rules concerning the right of establishment but must be dealt with by future legislation or conventions.*

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §23

1.2.2.2 Transfer of the central office by a national company

Under those circumstances, *Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty cannot be interpreted as conferring on companies incorporated under the law of a Member State a right to transfer their central management and control and their central administration to another Member State while retaining their status as companies incorporated under the legislation of the first Member State.*

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §24

The answer to the first part of the first question must therefore be that in the present state of Community law *Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty, properly construed, confer no right on a company incorporated under the legislation of a Member State and having its registered office there to transfer its central management and control to another Member State.*

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §25

2 DEFINITION OF “ESTABLISHMENT”

2.1 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

In response to those arguments, it is to be remembered that, having regard to the objectives of the Community, *sport is subject to Community law only in so far as it constitutes an economic activity within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty* (see Case 36/74 *Walrave v Union Cycliste Internationale* [1974] ECR 1405, paragraph 4). This applies to the activities of professional or semi-professional footballers, where they are in gainful employment or provide a remunerated service (see Case 13/76 *Donà v Mantero* [1976] ECR 1333, paragraph 12).

Case C-415/93 *Bosman* [1995] ECR I-4353 §73
Case 13/76 *Donà* [1976] ECR 1333 §12
 see also: Case 36/74 *Walrave* [1974] ECR 1405, §4

Consequently, *the registration of a vessel does not necessarily involve establishment* within the meaning of the Treaty, *in particular where the vessel is not used to pursue an economic activity* or where the application for registration is made by or on behalf of a person who is not established, and has no intention of becoming established, in the State concerned.

Case C-221/89 *Factortame* [1991] ECR I-3905, §21

It must be observed *in limine* that, in view of the objectives of the European Economic Community, *participation in a community based on religion or another form of philosophy falls within the field of application of Community law only in so far as it can be regarded as an economic activity within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty*.

Case C-196/87 *Steymann* [1988] ECR 6159 §9

In a case such as the one before the national court it is impossible to rule out *a priori* the possibility that work carried out by members of the community in question constitutes an economic activity within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty. *In so far as the work, which aims to ensure a measure of self-sufficiency for the Bhagwan Community, constitutes an essential part of participation in that community*, the services which the latter provides to its members may be regarded as being an indirect *quid pro quo* for their work.

Case C-196/87 *Steymann* [1988] ECR 6159 §12

However, it must be observed, as the Court held in its judgment of 23 March 1982 in Case 53/81 *Levin v Staatssecretaris van Justitie* [1982] ECR 1035, ***that the work must be genuine and effective and not such as to be regarded as purely marginal and ancillary***. In this case the national court has held that the work was genuine and effective.

Case C-196/87 Steymann [1988] ECR 6159 §13

Accordingly, the answer given to the first question must be that Article 2 of the EEC Treaty must be interpreted as meaning that ***activities performed by members of a community based on religion or another form of philosophy as part of the commercial activities of that community constitute economic activities in so far as the services which the community provides to its members may be regarded as the indirect quid pro quo for genuine and effective work***.

Case C-196/87 Steymann [1988] ECR 6159 §14

2.2 PERMANENT ACTIVITY (OF A STABLE AND CONTINUOUS NATURE)

In order to determine whether an undertaking engaged in providing temporary personnel habitually carries on significant activities in the Member State in which it is established, the competent institution of that State must examine all the criteria characterising the activities carried on by that undertaking.

Case C-202/97 Fitzwilliam [2000] ECR I-0883 §42

Those criteria include the place where the undertaking has its seat and administration, the number of administrative staff working in the Member State in which it is established and in the other Member State, the place where posted workers are recruited and the place where the majority of contracts with clients are concluded, the law applicable to the employment contracts concluded by the undertaking with its workers, on the one hand, and with its clients, on the other hand, and the turnover during an appropriately typical period in each Member State concerned. That list cannot be exhaustive; the choice of criteria must be adapted to each specific case.

Case C-202/97 Fitzwilliam [2000] ECR I-0883 §43

Just as the Court has held in relation to registration of a ship (see Case C-221/89 *Factortame and Others* [1991] ECR I-3905, paragraph 22), it must be held that ***where an aircraft constitutes an instrument by which a Community national pursues an economic activity which involves a fixed establishment in another Member State, registration of that aircraft cannot be dissociated from the exercise of the freedom of establishment. The conditions laid down for the registration of aircraft must therefore not discriminate on grounds of nationality or form an obstacle to the exercise of that freedom.***

Case C-203/98 Commission v Belgium [1999] ECR I-4899 §12

Since the Luxembourg company is involved on a stable and continuous basis in the economic life of Italy, that situation falls within the provisions of the chapter on freedom of establishment, namely Articles 52 to 58, and not those of the chapter concerning services (see, to that effect, Case 2/74 Reyners v Belgian State [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 21, and Case C-55/94 Gebhard v Consiglio degli Avvocati e Procuratori di Milano [1995] ECR I-4165, paragraph 25).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §24

The concept of establishment within the meaning of the Treaty is therefore a very broad one, allowing a Community national ***to participate, on a stable and continuous basis, in the economic life of a Member State other than his State of origin and to profit therefrom***, so contributing to economic and social interpenetration within the Community in the sphere of activities as self-employed persons (see, to this effect, Case 2/74 *Reyners v Belgium* [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 21).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §25

.../...

As the Advocate General has pointed out, ***the temporary nature of the activities in question has to be determined in the light, not only of the duration of the provision of the service, but also of its regularity, periodicity or continuity.*** The fact that the provision of services is temporary does not mean that the provider of services within the meaning of the Treaty may not equip himself with some form of infrastructure in the host Member State (including an office, chambers or consulting rooms) in so far as such infrastructure is necessary for the purposes of performing the services in question.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §27

However, that situation is to be distinguished from that of Mr Gebhard who, as a national of a Member State, pursues ***a professional activity on a stable and continuous basis in another Member State where he holds himself out from an established professional base*** to, amongst others, nationals of that State. ***Such a national comes under the provisions of the chapter relating to the right of establishment*** and not those of the chapter relating to services.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §28

It must be observed in that regard that *the concept of establishment* within the meaning of Article 52 *et seq.* of the Treaty *involves the actual pursuit of an economic activity through a fixed establishment in another Member State for an indefinite period.*

Case C-221/89 Factortame [1991] ECR I-3905 §20

Consequently, *the registration of a vessel does not necessarily involve establishment* within the meaning of the Treaty, *in particular where the vessel is not used to pursue an economic activity* or where the application for registration is made by or on behalf of a person who is not established, and has no intention of becoming established, in the State concerned.

Case C-221/89 Factortame [1991] ECR I-3905, §21

However, where the vessel constitutes an instrument for pursuing an economic activity which involves a fixed establishment in the Member State concerned, *the registration of that vessel cannot be dissociated from the exercise of the freedom of establishment.*

Case C-221/89 Factortame [1991] ECR I-3905, §22

In that connection, the Netherlands Government and the Commission rightly observed that Articles 59 and 60 of the Treaty do not apply in such a case. *It is clear from the actual wording of Article 60 that an activity carried out on a permanent basis or, in any event, without a foreseeable limit to its duration does not fall within the Community provisions concerning the provision of services.* On the other hand, such activities may fall within the scope of Articles 48 to 51 or Articles 52 to 58 of the Treaty, depending on the case.

Case C-196/87 Steymann [1988] ECR 6159 §16

In that respect, it must be acknowledged that an insurance undertaking of another Member State which maintains a *permanent presence* in the Member State in question *comes within the scope of the provisions of the Treaty on the right of establishment, even if that presence does not take the form of a branch or agency, but consists merely of an office managed by the undertaking's own staff or by a person who is independent but authorised to act on a permanent basis for the undertaking, as would be the case with an agency.* In the light of the aforementioned definition contained in the first paragraph of Article 60, such an insurance undertaking cannot therefore avail itself of Articles 59 and 60 with regard to its activities in the Member State in question.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §21

That article further states what is to be understood by “*pursuing*” an activity, in particular by *fixing minimum periods during which it must have been practised*.

Case C-115/78 Knoods [1979] ECR 399 §12

2.3 SELF-EMPLOYED ACTIVITIES

Secondly, the argument of the Hellenic Government that its legislation is not an obstacle to the activities of nationals of other Member States is not relevant under the second paragraph of Article 52 of the Treaty. As the Court found in its judgment in *Factortame and Others*, cited above, at paragraph 25, *freedom of establishment includes, in the case of nationals of a Member State, ‘the right to take-up and pursue activities as self-employed persons ... under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where such establishment is effected ...’*.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §23

As regards Article 52 of the Treaty, read in conjunction with Article 58 thereof (third question), it must be borne in mind that *the right of establishment* with which those provisions are concerned is granted both to natural persons who are nationals of a Member State of the Community and to legal persons within the meaning of Article 58. Subject to the exceptions and conditions laid down, it *allows all types of self-employed activity to be taken up and pursued on the territory of any other Member State, undertakings to be formed and operated and agencies, branches or subsidiaries to be set up* (*Gebhard*, cited above, paragraph 23).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §26
See also: Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §23

The provisions relating to the right of establishment *cover the taking-up and pursuit of activities* (see, in particular, the judgment in *Reyners*, paragraphs 46 and 47). *Membership of a professional body* may be a condition of taking up and pursuit of particular activities. It *cannot itself be constitutive of establishment*.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §31

It follows that *the question whether it is possible for a national of a Member State to exercise his right of establishment and the conditions for exercise of that right must be determined in the light of the activities which he intends to pursue* on the territory of the host Member State.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §32

Under the terms of the second paragraph of Article 52, freedom of establishment is to be exercised *under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where establishment is effected*.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §33

In the event that the specific activities in question are not subject to any rules in the host State, so that a national of that Member State does not have to have any specific qualification in order to pursue them, a national of any other Member State is entitled to establish himself on the territory of the first State and pursue those activities there.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §34

Next, the authorisation procedure must be easy of access to interested parties, and should not, in particular, be dependent on the payment of excessive administration fees.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §39

It should be emphasised that under the second paragraph of Article 52 freedom of establishment includes access to and the pursuit of the activities of self-employed persons “*under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where such establishment is effected*.” It follows from that provision and its context that in the absence of specific Community rules in the matter each Member State is free to regulate the exercise of the legal profession in its territory.

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §17

Under the provisions of Article 52 of the Treaty, *freedom of establishment shall include the right to take up activities as self-employed persons and to pursue them 'under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where such establishment is effected'*.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §8
Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §18

In the general programme for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment, adopted on 18 December 1961 pursuant to Article 54 of the Treaty, the Council proposed to eliminate not only overt discrimination, but also any form of disguised discrimination, by designating in Title III(b) as restrictions which are to be eliminated, ‘any requirements imposed, pursuant to any provision laid down by law, regulation or administrative action or in consequence of any administrative practice, in respect of *the taking up or pursuit of an activity as a self-employed person* where, although applicable irrespective of nationality, their effect is exclusively or principally to hinder *the taking up or pursuit of such activity by foreign nationals*’ (OJ, English Special Edition, Second Series, ix, p.8).

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §13

2.4 CROSS-BORDER CHARACTER

The answer to be given to the first question must therefore be that *Article 55 of the Treaty does not apply in a situation* such as that in the main proceedings *in which all the facts are confined to within a single Member State and which does not therefore have any connecting link with one of the situations envisaged by Community law in the area of the freedom of movement for persons and freedom to provide services.*

Case C-108/98 RLSAN. [1999] ECR I-5219 §23

According to settled case-law, *Articles 48, 52 and 59 of the Treaty cannot be applied to activities which are confined in all respects within a single Member State* (Case C-41/90 *Höfner and Elser* [1991] ECR I-1979, paragraph 37; Case C-332/90 *Steen* [1992] ECR I-341, paragraph 9; and Joined Cases C-29/94 to C-35/94 *Aubertin and Others* [1995] ECR I-301, paragraph 9).

Case C-134/95 USSL [1997] ECR I-195 §19

Although the provisions in the Treaty relating to freedom of movement for persons do not apply to situations which are purely internal to a Member State, the Court has already held that Article 52 of the Treaty *may not be interpreted in such a way as to exclude from the benefit of Community law the nationals of a given Member State when, owing to the fact that they have lawfully resided on the territory of another Member State and have there acquired a vocational qualification which is recognised under Community law, they are, with regard to their State of origin, in a situation which may be assimilated to that of any other persons enjoying the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Treaty* (see judgments in Case 115/78 *Knors v Staatssecretaris voor Economische Zaken* [1979] ECR 399, paragraph 24, and in Case 61/89 *Bouchoucha* [1990] ECR I-3551, paragraph 13).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §15
Case C-115/78 Knors [1979] ECR 399 §24

The same reasoning must be followed as regards Article 48 of the Treaty. In its judgment in *Knors*, cited above (paragraph 20), the Court held that ***freedom of movement for workers and the right of establishment guaranteed by Article 48 and 52 of the Treaty were fundamental rights in the Community system, and would not be fully realised if the Member States were able to refuse to grant the benefit of the provisions of Community law to those of their nationals who had taken advantage of its provisions to acquire vocational qualifications in a Member State other than that of which they were nationals.***

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §16
Case C-115/78 Knors [1979] ECR 399 §20

As the Court stated in its judgment in Case 204/87 *Bekaert* [1988] ECR 2029, ***the absence of any element going beyond a purely national setting in a given case means, in matters of freedom of establishment, that the provisions of Community law are not applicable*** to such a situation.

Joined Cases C-54/88 & others Eleonora [1990] ECR 3537 §11

In these circumstances, the answer to the question referred to the Court should be that when ***a national of one Member State desirous of exercising a professional activity such as the profession of advocate in another Member State*** has obtained a diploma in his country of origin which has been recognised as an equivalent qualification by the competent authority under the legislation of the country of establishment and which has thus enabled him to sit and pass the special qualifying examination for the profession in question, the act of demanding the national diploma prescribed by the legislation of the country of establishment constitutes, even in the absence of the directives provided for in Article 57, a restriction incompatible with the freedom of establishment guaranteed by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §27

3 TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENT

3.1 PRIMARY ESTABLISHMENT

3.1.1 Natural persons - Possibility of an employee in one Member State working in a self-employed capacity in another Member State

That is also true in respect of a person *who is employed in one Member State and wishes, in addition, to work in another Member State in a self-employed capacity.*

Case C-143/87 Stanton [1988] ECR 3877 §12

3.1.2 Legal persons - Transfer of central management and control of a company to another Member State

With regard to the first part of the question, the applicant claims essentially that Article 58 of the Treaty expressly confers on the companies to which it applies the same right of primary establishment in another Member State as is conferred on natural persons by Article 52. *The transfer of the central management and control of a company to another Member State amounts to the establishment of the company in that Member State because the company is locating its centre of decision-making there, which constitutes genuine and effective economic activity.*

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §12

3.2 SECONDARY ESTABLISHMENT (RIGHT TO MAINTAIN MORE THAN ONE PLACE OF WORK WITHIN THE COMMUNITY)

3.2.1 Natural persons

It is clear from the second paragraph of Article 52 of the Treaty that *freedom of establishment includes the right to set up and manage undertakings*, in particular companies or firms, *in a Member State by a national of another Member State.* So, a national of a Member State who has a holding in the capital of a company established in another Member State which gives him definite influence over the company's decisions and allows him to determine its activities is exercising his right of establishment.

Case C-251/98 C. Baars [2000] ECR I- 2787 §22

As the Court has held (see in particular Case 107/83 *Ordre des Avocats du Barreau de Paris v Klopp* [1984] ECR 2971, paragraph 19), ***freedom of establishment is not confined to the right to create a single establishment within the Community but includes freedom to set up and maintain, subject to observance of the professional rules of conduct, more than one place of work within the territory of the Member States.***

Case C-53/95 Inasti [1996] ECR I- 703 §10
See also: Case C-143/87 Stanton [1988] ECR I-3351 §11
Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §19

It follows that a ***person may be established***, within the meaning of the Treaty, ***in more than one Member State*** - in particular, in the case of companies, through the setting-up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries (Article 52) and, as the Court has held, ***in the case of members of the professions, by establishing a second professional base*** (see Case 107/83 *Ordre des Avocats au Barreau de Paris v Klopp* [1984] ECR 2971, paragraph 19).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §24

It follows ***that the right of establishment precludes a Member State from requiring a person practising a profession to have no more than one place of business*** within the Community.

Case C-106/91 Ramrath [1992] ECR I-3351 §21

Consequently, the answer to the first question must be that the Treaty provisions on the right of establishment ***preclude a Member State from prohibiting a person from becoming established in its territory and practising as an auditor there on the grounds that that person is established and authorised to practise in another Member State.***

Case C-106/91 Ramrath [1992] ECR I-3351 §22

In that respect it must be pointed out that modern methods of transport and telecommunications facilitate proper contact with clients and the judicial authorities. Similarly, ***the existence of a second set of chambers in another Member State does not prevent the application of the rules of ethics in the host Member State.***

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §21

3.2.2 Legal persons

That Mrs and Mrs Bryde formed the company Centros in the United Kingdom for the purpose of avoiding Danish legislation requiring that a minimum amount of share capital be paid up has not been denied either in the written observations or at the hearing. That *does not, however, mean that the formation by that British company of a branch in Denmark is not covered by freedom of establishment for the purposes of Article 52 and 58 of the Treaty.* The question of the application of those articles of the Treaty is different from the question whether or not a Member State may adopt measures in order to prevent attempts by certain of its nationals to evade domestic legislation by having recourse to the possibilities offered by the Treaty.

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §18

As to the question whether, as Mr and Mrs Bryde claim, the refusal to register in Denmark a branch of their company formed in accordance with the law of another Member State in which its has its registered office constitutes an obstacle to *freedom of establishment*, it must be borne in mind that that freedom, *conferred by Article 52 of the Treaty on Community nationals, includes the right for them to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons and to set up and manage undertakings under the same conditions as are laid down by the law of the Member State of establishment for its own nationals. Furthermore, under Article 58 of the Treaty companies or firms formed in accordance with the law of a Member State and having their registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community are to be treated in the same way as natural persons who are nationals of Member States.*

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §19

The immediate consequence of this is that those companies are entitled to carry on their business in another Member State through an agency, branch or subsidiary. The location of their registered office, central administration or principal place of business serves as the connecting factor with the legal system of a particular State in the same way as does nationality in the case of a natural person (see, to that effect, *Segers*, paragraph 13, Case 270/83 *Commission v France* [1986] ECR 273, paragraph 18, Case C-330/91 *Commerzbank* [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 13, and Case C-264/96 *ICI* [1998] I-4695, paragraph 20).

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §20

According to established case-law, *the freedom of establishment* which Article 52 grants to nationals of the Member States and which entails the right for them to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the Member State where such establishment is effected, *includes, pursuant to Article 58 of the Treaty, the right of companies or firms formed in accordance with the law of the Member State and having its registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community, to pursue their activities in the Member State concerned through a branch or agency. With regard to companies, it should be noted in this context that it is their corporate seat in the above sense that serves as the connecting factor with the legal system of a particular State, like nationality in the case of natural persons* (Case 270/83 *Commission v France* [1986] ECR 273, paragraph 18, and Case C-330/91 *Commerzbank* [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 13).

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §20

It is clear from those decisions that as regards vessels used for the pursuit of an economic activity, each Member State must, in exercising its powers for the purpose of defining the conditions for the grant of its "nationality" to a ship, comply with the prohibition of discrimination against nationals of Member States on grounds of nationality and that a condition which stipulates that where a vessel is owned or chartered by natural persons they must be of a particular nationality and, in the case of a company, the shareholders and directors must be of that nationality is contrary to Article 52 of the Treaty. *A condition relating to registration or management of a vessel in the case of a secondary establishment such as an agency, branch or subsidiary is contrary to Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty* (see, in particular, *Commission v Ireland*, cited above, paragraph 12).

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §18

.../....

As regards vessels used for the pursuit of an economic activity, the Court noted that, in exercising its powers for the purpose of defining the conditions for the grant of its "nationality" to a ship, each Member State must comply with the prohibition of discrimination against nationals of Member States on grounds of their nationality and that a condition which stipulates that where a vessel is owned or chartered by natural persons they must be of a particular nationality and where it is owned by a company the shareholders and directors must be of that nationality is contrary to Article 52 of the Treaty (*Commission v France*, paragraph 14, referring to *Factortame and Others*, paragraphs 29 and 30). Furthermore, Irish *legislation is contrary to Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty in so far as it requires legal persons owning vessels to be established under and subject to Irish law and to have their principal place of business in Ireland and, therefore, precludes registration or management of a vessel in the case of a secondary establishment such as an agency, branch or subsidiary* (*Commission v France*, paragraph 19).

Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §12

See also: Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §19

It follows that a *person may be established*, within the meaning of the Treaty, *in more than one Member State* - in particular, *in the case of companies, through the setting-up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries* (Article 52) and, as the Court has held, in the case of members of the professions, by establishing a second professional base (see Case 107/83 *Ordre des Avocats au Barreau de Paris v Klopp* [1984] ECR 2971, paragraph 19).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §24

In the case of a company, the right of establishment is generally exercised by the setting-up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries, as is expressly provided for in the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52. Indeed, that is the form of establishment in which the applicant engaged in this case by opening an investment management office in the Netherlands. *A company may also exercise its right of establishment by taking part in the incorporation of a company in another Member State*, and in that regard Article 221 of the Treaty ensures that it will receive the same treatment as nationals of that Member State as regards participation in the capital of the new company.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §17

That freedom of establishment is not confined to the right to create a single establishment within the Community is confirmed by the very words of Article 52 of the Treaty, according to which *the progressive abolition of the restrictions on freedom of establishment applies to restrictions on the setting up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries by nationals of any Member State established in the territory of another Member State*. that rule must be regarded as a specific statement of a general principle, applicable equally to the liberal professions, according to which the right of establishment includes freedom to set up and maintain, subject to observance of the professional rules of conduct, more than one place of work within the Community.

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §19

4 COROLLARIES OF THE FREEDOM OF ESTABLISHMENT

4.1 ENTRY AND RESIDENCE

As regards vessels not used for the pursuit of an economic activity, the Court held in *Commission v Ireland*, cited above, paragraph 13, that, *under Community law, every national of a Member State is assured of freedom both to enter another Member State in order to pursue an employed or self-employed activity* and to reside there after having pursued such an activity. Access to leisure activities available in that Member State is a corollary to freedom of movement.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §19
See also: Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §13
Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §21

His position might therefore come within the chapter of the Treaty on workers, more particularly Article 48, or *within the chapters on the right of establishment and on services, in particular Articles 52, 56 and 59.*

Case C-106/91 Ramrath [1992] ECR I-3351 §16

Furthermore, *a comparison of those different provisions shows that they are based on the same principles as regards both the entry into and residence in the territory of the Member States* of persons covered by Community law and also the prohibition of all discrimination against them on grounds of nationality.

Case C-106/91 Ramrath [1992] ECR I-3351 §17

It should be pointed out that the Court has already held on several occasions that *the right of residence is a right conferred directly by the Treaty subject only to the condition that the person concerned is carrying on an economic activity within the meaning of Articles 48, 52 or 59 of the Treaty* (see in particular the judgment in Case 48/75 Royer [1976] ECR 497, at paragraph 31).

Case C-363/89 Roux [1991] ECR I-273 §9

Accordingly the registration of a national of another Member State of the Community with a *social security scheme established by the legislation of the host State cannot be imposed as a condition precedent to the exercise of the right of residence.*

Case C-363/89 Roux [1991] ECR I-273 §10

The questions put should therefore be answered in the sense that *the right of nationals of one Member State to enter the territory of another Member State and to reside there is conferred directly, on any person falling within the scope of Community law*, by the Treaty, especially Articles 48, 52 and 59 or, as the case may be, by its implementing provisions independently of any residence permit issued by the host State.

Case C-48/75 Rover [1976] ECR 497 §50

4.2 RIGHT TO RESIDE AFTER CEASING AN ACTIVITY

As regards vessels not used for the pursuit of an economic activity, the Court held in *Commission v Ireland*, cited above, paragraph 13, that, under Community law, every national of a Member State is assured of freedom both to enter another Member State in order to pursue an employed or self-employed activity *and to reside there after having pursued such an activity*. Access to leisure activities available in that Member State is a corollary to that freedom of movement.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §19
See also: Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §13
and: Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §21

4.3 OTHER RIGHTS OF THE FREEDOM OF ESTABLISHMENT

As regards vessels not used for the pursuit of an economic activity, the Court held in *Commission v Ireland*, cited above, paragraph 13, that, under Community law, every national of a Member State is assured of freedom both to enter another Member State in order to pursue an employed or self-employed activity and to reside there after having pursued such an activity. *Access to leisure activities available in that Member State is a corollary to freedom of movement*.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §19
See also: Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §13
Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §21

In paragraph 14 of that judgment, the Court concluded that *registration by such a national of a pleasure craft in the host Member State falls within the scope of the Community provisions relating to freedom of movement for persons*.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §20
See also: Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §14
Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §22

As the Court has held on several occasions (see, most recently, the judgment of 14 January 1988 in Case 63/86 *Commission v Italy* [1988] ECR 29), ***the said prohibition is concerned*** not solely with the specific rules on the pursuit of an occupation but ***also with rules relating to various general facilities which are of assistance in the pursuit of that occupation.***

Case C-305/87 *Commission v Greece* [1989] ECR 1461 §21

In particular as is apparent from Article 54(3)(e) of the Treaty and the General programme for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment of 18 December 1961 (Official Journal, English Special Edition, Second Series IX, p.7), ***the right to acquire, use or dispose of immovable property on the territory of a Member State is the corollary of freedom of establishment.***

Case C-305/87 *Commission v Greece* [1989] ECR 1461 §22

That reasoning cannot be accepted. When Community law guarantees a natural person the freedom to go to another Member State ***the protection of that person from harm in the Member State in question, on the same basis as that of nationals and persons residing there, is a corollary of that freedom of movement.*** It follows that the prohibition of discrimination is applicable to recipients of services within the meaning of the Treaty as regards protection against the risk of assault and ***the right to obtain financial compensation provided for by national law when that risk materialises.*** The fact that the compensation at issue is financed by the Public Treasury cannot alter the rules regarding the protection of the rights guaranteed by the Treaty.

Case C-186/87 *Cowan* [1989] ECR 195 §17

As is apparent from the general programmes which were adopted by the Council on 18 December 1961 (Journal Officiel 1962, pp. 32 and 36) and which, as the Court has pointed out on numerous occasions, provide useful guidance with a view to the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty relating to the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services, the aforesaid prohibition is concerned not solely with the specific rules on the pursuit of occupational activities ***but also with the rules relating to the various general facilities which are of assistance in the pursuit of those activities.*** Among the examples mentioned in the two programmes are ***the right to purchase, exploit and transfer real and personal property and the right to obtain loans and in particular to have access to the various forms of credit.***

Case C-63/86 *Commission v Italy* [1988] ECR 29 §14

5 DEFINITION OF RESTRICTIONS

5.1 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

According to settled case-law, although direct taxation falls within the competence of the *Member States*, the latter *must* none the less *exercise that competence consistently with Community law and therefore avoid any overt or covert discrimination on grounds of nationality* (Case C-279/93 *Schumacker* [1995] ECR I-225, paragraphs 21 and 26; Case C-80/94 *Wielockx* [1995] ECR I-2493, paragraph 16; and Case C-107/94 *Asscher* [1996] ECR I-3089, paragraph 36).

Case C-250/95 *Futura & Singer* [1997] ECR I-2471 §19

Such a system, which is in conformity with the fiscal principle of territoriality, cannot be regarded as entailing any discrimination, overt or covert prohibited by the Treaty.

Case C-250/95 *Futura & Singer* [1997] ECR I-2471 §22

As far as Article 52 is concerned, suffice it to state that, as has been found above, the legislation in question is applicable to all traders exercising their activity on national territory; that its purpose is not to regulate the conditions concerning the establishment of the undertakings concerned; *and that any restrictive effects which it might have on freedom of establishment are too uncertain and indirect for the obligation laid down to be regarded as being capable of hindering that freedom.*

Case C-418/93 *Semeraro* [1996] ECR I-2975 §32

On that point, it must however be stressed that *Community law sets limits to the exercise of those powers by the Member States in so far as provisions of national law adopted in that connection must not constitute an obstacle to the effective exercise of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty* (see, to that effect, the judgment in Case 222/86 *UNECTEF v Heylens and Others* [1987] ECR 4097, paragraph 11).

Case C-19/92 *Kraus* [1993] ECR I-1663 §28

It follows that *the conditions laid down for the registration of vessels must not form an obstacle to freedom of establishment* within the meaning of Article 52 *et seq.* of the Treaty.

Case C-221/89 *Factortame* [1991] ECR I-3905 §23

However, it may be seen from the provisions of Articles 54 and 57 of the Treaty that *freedom of establishment is not completely ensured by the mere application of the rule of national treatment*, as such application retains all obstacles other than those resulting from the non-possession of the nationality of the host State and, in particular, those resulting from the disparity of the conditions laid down by the different national laws for the acquisition of an appropriate professional qualification.

Case C-136/78 Auer [1979] ECR 437 §21

Thus *a Member State cannot, after 1 January 1973, make the exercise of the right to free establishment by a national of a new Member State subject to an exceptional authorisation in so far as he fulfils the conditions laid down by the legislation of the country of establishment for its own nationals.*

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §15

5.2 DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES

It must be observed first of all that *the nationality condition* imposed on undertakings by Article 7 of the Law *prevents undertakings established in other Member States from carrying on their activities in Spain through a branch or an agency*. Secondly *Article 10 of the Law precludes nationals of other Member States from carrying on permanently private security activities in Spain as employed persons or self-employed persons*. Finally, *those provisions prevent nationals of other Member States from providing private security services* in Spain.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §31

The rule according to which directors and managers of all security undertakings must reside in Spain constitutes an obstacle to freedom of establishment (see, in this regard, Case C-221/89 *Factortame* [1991] ECR I-3905, paragraph 32) and to the freedom to provide services.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §44

It is clear from those decisions that as regards vessels used for the pursuit of an economic activity, *each Member State must*, in exercising its powers for the purpose of defining the conditions for the grant of its "nationality" to a ship, *comply with the prohibition of discrimination against nationals of Member States on grounds of nationality and that a condition which stipulates that where a vessel is owned or chartered by natural persons they must be of a particular nationality and, in the case of a company, the shareholders and directors must be of that nationality is contrary to Article 52* of the Treaty. A condition relating to registration or management of a vessel in the case of a secondary establishment such as an agency, branch or subsidiary is contrary to Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty (see, in particular, *Commission v Ireland*, cited above, paragraph 12).

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §18
Case C-151/96 Commission v Ireland [1997] ECR I-3327 §12
 See also: Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §14

Accordingly, *that law treats nationals who have not exercised their right to free movement and migrant workers differently, to the detriment of the latter*, since it is primarily the latter's children who do not reside in the territory of the Member State granting the benefit in question.

Joined Cases C-4/95 and C-5/95 Stöber and Piosa Pereira [1997] ECR I-511 §38

In so far as the case-files contain no material capable of providing objective justification for that difference in treatment, *it must be regarded as discriminatory* and hence incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty.

Joined Cases C-4/95 and C-5/95 Stöber and Piosa Pereira [1997] ECR I-511 §39

Further, the Court has held (see Case C-330/91 *The Queen v Inland Revenue Commissioners, ex parte Commerzbank* [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 14) that *the rules regarding equality of treatment forbid not only overt discrimination by reason of nationality or, in the case of a company, its seat*, but all covert forms of discrimination which, by the application of other criteria of differentiation, lead in fact to the same result.

Case C-1/93 Halliburton [1994] ECR I-1137 §15
 See also Case C-330/91, Commerzbank [1993] ECR I-4017, §14

Although the *difference in treatment has only an indirect effect on the position of companies constituted under the law of other Member States, it constitutes discrimination on grounds of nationality* which is prohibited by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-1/93 Halliburton [1994] ECR I-1137 §20

As for the requirement for the owners, charterers, managers and operators of the vessel and, in the case of a company, the shareholders and directors to be resident and domiciled in the Member State in which the vessel is to be registered, it must be held that such a requirement, which is not justified by the rights and obligations created by the grant of a national flag to a vessel, ***results in discrimination on grounds of nationality. The great majority of nationals of the Member State in question are resident and domiciled in that State and therefore meet that requirement automatically, whereas nationals of other Member States would, in most cases, have to move their residence and domicile to that State in order to comply with the requirements of its legislation.*** It follows that such a requirement is contrary to Article 52.

Case C-221/89 Factortame [1991] ECR I-3905 §32

Article 52 is thus intended to ensure that all nationals of Member States who establish themselves in another Member State, even if that establishment is only secondary, for the purpose of pursuing activities there as a self-employed persons receive the same treatment as nationals of that State and it ***prohibits, as a restriction on freedom of establishment, any discrimination on grounds of nationality resulting from the legislation of the Member State.***

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §14

Notwithstanding the French government's argument to the contrary, the difference in treatment also cannot be justified by any advantages which branches and agencies may enjoy *vis-a-vis* companies and which, according to the French government, balance out the disadvantages resulting from the failure to grant the benefit of shareholders' tax credits. Even if such advantages actually exist, they cannot justify a breach of the obligation laid down in Article 52 to accord foreign companies the same treatment in regard to shareholders' tax credits as is accorded to French companies. ***It is also not necessary in this context to assess the extent of the disadvantages*** which branches and agencies of foreign insurance companies suffer as a result of the failure to grant them the benefit of shareholders' tax credits and to consider whether those disadvantages could have any effect on their tariffs, ***since Article 52 prohibits all discrimination, even if only of a limited nature.***

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §21

It must first be noted that the fact that the laws of the Member States on corporation tax have not been harmonised cannot justify the difference of treatment in this case. Although it is true that in the absence of such harmonisation, a company's tax position depends on the national law applied to it, ***Article 52 of the EEC Treaty prohibits the Member States from laying down in their laws conditions for the pursuit of activities by persons exercising their right of establishment which differ from those laid down for its own nationals.***

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §24

The answer to the question referred to the Court must therefore be that, with effect from 1 January 1973, a national of a new Member State who holds a qualification recognised by the competent authorities of the Member State of establishment as equivalent to the certificate issued and required in that State enjoys the right to be admitted to the profession of architect and to practise it *under the same conditions as nationals of the Member State of establishment without being required to satisfy any additional conditions.*

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §18

The Commission, in spite of doubts which it experiences on the subject of the direct effect of the provision to be interpreted - both in view of the reference by the Treaty to the 'general programme' and to the implementing directives and by reason of the tenor of certain liberalising directives already taken, which do not attain in every respect perfect equality of treatment - considers, however, that *Article 52 has at least a partial direct effect in so far as it specifically prohibits discrimination on grounds of nationality.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §14

5.3 NON-DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES

Further, the Court has held (see Case C-330/91 *The Queen v Inland Revenue Commissioners, ex parte Commerzbank* [1993] ECR I-4017, paragraph 14) that *the rules regarding equality of treatment forbid not only overt discrimination by reason of nationality or, in the case of a company, its seat, but all covert forms of discrimination which, by the application of other criteria of differentiation, lead in fact to the same result.*

Case C-1/93 Halliburton [1994] ECR I-1137 §15
See also: Case C-330/91 Commerzbank [1993] ECR I-4017 §14

Although it applies independently of a company's seat, *the use of the criterion of fiscal residence within national territory for the purpose of granting repayment supplement on overpaid tax is liable to work more particularly to the disadvantage of companies having, their seat in other Member States.* Indeed, it is most often those companies which are resident for tax purposes outside the territory of the Member State in question.

Case C-330/91 Commerzbank [1993] ECR I-4017 §15

On that point, it must however be stressed that *Community law sets limits to the exercise of those powers by the Member States* in so far as provisions of national law adopted in that connection must not constitute an obstacle to the effective exercise of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty (see, to that effect, the judgment in Case 222/86 *UNECTEF v Heylens and Others* [1987] ECR 4097, paragraph 11).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §28

Consequently, Articles 48 and 52 preclude any national measure governing the conditions under which an academic title obtained in another Member State may be used, *where that measure, even though it is applicable without discrimination on grounds of nationality, is liable to hamper or to render less attractive the exercise by Community nationals, including those of the Member State which enacted the measure, of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty*. The situation would be different only if such a measure pursued a legitimate objective compatible with the Treaty and was justified by pressing reasons of public interest (see to that effect, judgment in Case 71/76 *Thieffry v Conseil de l' Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris* [1977] ECR 765, paragraphs 12 and 15). It would however also be necessary in such a case for application of the national rules in question to be appropriate for ensuring attainment of the objective they pursue and not to go beyond what is necessary for that purpose (see judgment in Case C-106/91 *Ramrath v Ministre de la Justice* [1992] ECR I-3351, paragraphs 29 and 30).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §32

In answering that question, it must first be borne in mind that, as the Court has stated on numerous occasions, Article 52 of the Treaty constitutes one of the fundamental legal provisions of the Community. *By prohibiting any discrimination on grounds of nationality resulting from national laws, regulations or practices, that article seeks to ensure that, as regards the right of establishment, a Member State accords to nationals of other Member States the same treatment as it accords to its own nationals* (judgment in Case 197/84 *Steinhauser v City of Biarritz* [1985] ECR 1819, paragraph 14).

Case C-168/91 Konstantinidis [1993] ECR I-1191 §12

It must therefore be determined whether national rules relating to the transcription in Roman characters of the name of a Greek national in the registers of civil status of the Member State in which he is established are capable of placing him at *a disadvantage in law or in fact, in comparison with the way in which a national of that Member State would be treated in the same circumstances*.

Case C-168/91 Konstantinidis [1993] ECR I-1191 §13

Rules of that kind are to be regarded as incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty only in so far as their application causes a Greek national *such a degree of inconvenience as in fact to interfere with his freedom to exercise the right of establishment* enshrined in that article.

Case C-168/91 Konstantinidis [1993] ECR I-1191 §15

It should therefore be stated in reply to the national court that Article 52 of the Treaty must be interpreted as meaning that it is contrary to that provision for a Greek national to be obliged, under the applicable national legislation, to use, in the pursuit of his occupation, a spelling of his name whereby its pronunciation is modified and *the resulting distortion exposes him to the risk that potential clients may confuse him with other persons*.

Case C-168/91 Konstantinidis [1993] ECR I-1191 §17

It must be stated in this regard that, even if applied without any discrimination on the basis of nationality, *national requirements concerning qualifications may have the effect of hindering nationals of the other Member States in the exercise of their right of establishment* guaranteed to them by Article 52 of the EEC Treaty. That could be the case if the national rules in question took *no account of the knowledge and qualifications already acquired by the person concerned in another Member State*.

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §15

According to the Court's case-law *the principle of equal treatment*, of which Articles 52 and 59 of the Treaty embody specific instances, *prohibits* not only overt discrimination by reason of nationality but also *all covert forms of discrimination which, by the application of other criteria of differentiation, lead in fact to the same result* (see, in particular, the judgment of 29 October 1980 in Case 22/80 *Boussac v Gerstenmeier* ((1980)) ECR 3427).

Case C-3/88 Commission v Italy [1989] ECR 4035 §8

The legislation of a Member State which exempts persons whose principal occupation is employment in that Member State from the obligation to pay contributions to the scheme for self-employed persons but withholds such exemption from persons whose principal occupation is employment in another Member State *has the effect of placing at a disadvantage the pursuit of occupational activities outside the territory of that Member State*. Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty therefore preclude such legislation.

Case C-143/87 Stanton [1988] ECR 3877 §14

In these circumstances, the answer to the question referred to the Court should be that when a national of one Member State desirous of exercising a professional activity such as the profession of advocate in another Member State has obtained a *diploma in his country of origin which has been recognised as an equivalent qualification by the competent authority under the legislation of the country of establishment* and which has thus enabled him to sit and pass the special qualifying examination for the profession in question, *the act of demanding the national diploma prescribed by the legislation of the country of establishment constitutes*, even in the absence of the directives provided for in Article 57, *a restriction incompatible with the freedom of establishment* guaranteed by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §27

5.4 ORIGIN OF RESTRICTIONS

5.4.1 Restrictions emanating from the state of destination

The residence obligation imposed on both managers and staff of security firms and internal security services, save for administrative and logistical staff, constitutes a restriction on both the freedom of establishment (see *Commission v Spain*, cited above, paragraph 44) and the free movement of workers (see *Case C-350/96 Clean Car Autoservice v Landeshauptmann von Wien* [1998] ECR I-2521, paragraphs 27 to 30).

Case C-355/98 Commission v. Belgium [2000] ECR I- 1221 §31

In those circumstances, *the refusal to grant the tax concessions in question to the permanent establishments in Germany of non-resident companies makes it less attractive for those companies to have intercorporate holdings through German branches*, since under German law and double-taxation treaties the tax concessions in question can only be granted to German subsidiaries which, as legal persons, are subject to unlimited tax liability, *which thus restricts the freedom to choose the most appropriate legal form for the pursuit of activities in another Member State, which the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52 of the Treaty expressly confers on economic operators.*

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §42

The difference in treatment to which branches of non-resident companies are subject in comparison with resident companies as well as the restriction of the freedom to choose the form of secondary establishment must be regarded as constituting a single composite infringement of Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty.

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §43

In making natural and legal persons from Member States other than the Kingdom of Belgium subject to a special regime under which it is necessary to have been resident or established in Belgium for at least one year in order to have an aircraft registered there, the provisions of the Royal Decree which are in point here clearly constitute discrimination on grounds of nationality which impedes the exercise of the freedom of establishment of those persons.

Case C-203/98 Commission v Belgium [1999] ECR I-4899 §13

In that regard, it should be observed that *Article 52 of the Treaty confers on nationals of one Member State who wish to pursue activities as self-employed persons in another Member State the benefit of the same treatment as the host State's own nationals and prohibits any discrimination based on nationality* which hinders the taking up or pursuit of such activities. As the Court held in Case C-111/91 *Commission v Luxembourg* [1993] ECR I-817, paragraph 17, *that prohibition covers* not only specific rules on the pursuit of occupational activities, but also, as emerges from the General Programme for the abolition of restrictions on the freedom of establishment (OJ, English Special Edition, Second Series (IX), p. 7), *any measure which, pursuant to any provision laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in a Member State, or as the result of the application of such a provision, or of administrative practices, hinders nationals of other Member States in their pursuit of activities as self-employed persons* by treating nationals of other Member States differently from nationals of the country concerned.

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §27

That prohibition thus applies to the imposition of a residence requirement in respect of the grant of a social advantage where it has been established that that requirement is discriminatory in nature (*Commission v Luxembourg*, cited above, paragraph 18).

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §28

The principle of equal treatment thus laid down is also intended to prevent discrimination to the detriment of descendants who are dependent on a self-employed worker. It precludes, therefore, the imposition of a residence requirement such as that provided for in the national legislation concerned which, as stated in paragraph 23 of this judgment, must be regarded as discriminatory.

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §29

Consequently, *national legislation*, such as the Greek tax legislation, *which, for the purposes of taxing income, does not establish, as between companies having their seat in Greece and companies which, having their seat in another Member State, have a permanent establishment in Greece, any distinction such as to justify, in relation to the same taxation, a difference in treatment between the two categories of companies and which establishes a difference in treatment as regards the rate of income tax, introduces discrimination against companies having their seat in another Member State in so far as it imposes on them, irrespective of their legal form and the nature of the shares which they issue, a rate of taxation of 40% whereas the rate of 35% applies only to companies whose seat is in Greece.*

Case C-311/97 Royal Bank of Scotland [1999] ECR I-2651 §30

Where it is the practice of a Member State, in certain circumstances, to refuse to register a branch of a company having its registered office in another Member State, the result is that companies formed in accordance with the law of that other Member State are prevented from exercising the freedom of establishment conferred on them by Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty.

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §21

Accordingly, *the refusal of a Member State to register a branch of a company formed in accordance with the law of another Member State in which it has its registered office on the grounds that the branch is intended to enable the company to carry on all its economic activity in the host State, with the result that the secondary establishment escapes national rules on the provision for and the paying-up of a minimum capital, is incompatible with Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty, in so far as it prevents any exercise of the right freely to set up a secondary establishment which Articles 52 and 58 are specifically intended to guarantee.*

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §30

Legislation of a Member State which requires contributions to be made to the scheme for self-employed persons by persons already working as self-employed persons in another Member State where they have their habitual residence and are affiliated to a social security scheme inhibits the pursuit of occupational activities outside the territory of that Member State. Article 52 of the Treaty therefore precludes legislation of that kind unless it is duly justified.

Case C-53/95 Inasti [1996] ECR I-703 §12

Consequently, Articles 48 and 52 ***preclude any national measure governing the conditions under which an academic title obtained in another Member State may be used, where that measure***, even though it is applicable without discrimination on grounds of nationality, ***is liable to hamper or to render less attractive the exercise by Community nationals***, including those of the Member State which enacted the measure, of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty. The situation would be different only if such a measure pursued a legitimate objective compatible with the Treaty and was justified by pressing reasons of public interest (see to that effect, judgment in Case 71/76 *Thieffry v Conseil de l' Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris* [1977] ECR 765, paragraphs 12 and 15). It would however also be necessary in such a case for application of the national rules in question to be appropriate for ensuring attainment of the objective they pursue and not to go beyond what is necessary for that purpose (see judgment in Case C-106/91 *Ramrath v Ministre de la Justice* [1992] ECR I-3351, paragraphs 29 and 30).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §32

It should therefore be stated in reply to the national court that Article 52 of the Treaty must be interpreted as meaning that ***it is contrary to that provision for a Greek national to be obliged, under the applicable national legislation, to use, in the pursuit of his occupation, a spelling of his name whereby its pronunciation is modified and the resulting distortion exposes him to the risk that potential clients may confuse him with other persons.***

Case C-168/91 Konstantinidis [1993] ECR I-1191 §17

It must be stated in this regard that, even if applied without any discrimination on the basis of nationality, ***national requirements concerning qualifications may have the effect of hindering nationals of the other Member States in the exercise of their right of establishment*** guaranteed to them by Article 52 of the EEC Treaty. ***That could be the case if the national rules in question took no account of the knowledge and qualifications already acquired by the person concerned in another Member State.***

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §15

It is established that entitlement to reimbursement of sickness costs pertains to a person and not to a company. However, the requirement that a company formed in accordance with the law of another member state must be accorded the same treatment as national companies means that the employees of that company must have the right to be affiliated to a specific social security scheme. ***Discrimination against employees in connection with social security protection indirectly restricts the freedom of companies of another member state to establish themselves through an agency, branch or subsidiary in the member state concerned.*** That proposition is supported by the fact that according to the council's general programme for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment of 18 December 1961 (Official journal, English special edition, second series ix, p. 7), which provides useful guidance for the implementation of the relevant provisions of the treaty (see judgments of 28 April 1977, case 71/76 Thieffry (1977) ECR 765 and of 18 June 1985 in case 197/84 Steinhauser (1985) ECR 1819), all provisions and administrative practices which "deny or restrict the right to participate in social security schemes, in particular sickness . . . insurance schemes" are to be regarded as restrictions on the freedom of establishment.

Case C-79/85 Segers [1986] ECR 2375 §15

The question must therefore be answered to the effect that even in the absence of any directive co-ordinating national provisions governing access to and the exercise of the legal profession, ***Article 52 and seq. of the EEC Treaty prevent the competent authorities of a Member State from denying, on the basis of the national legislation and the rules of professional conduct which are in force in that State, to a national of another Member State the right to enter and to exercise the legal profession solely on the ground that he maintains chambers simultaneously in another Member State .***

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1983] ECR 2971 §22

Thus a Member State cannot, after 1 January 1973, make the exercise of the right to free establishment by a national of a new Member State subject to an exceptional authorisation in so far as he fulfils the conditions laid down by the legislation of the country of establishment for its own nationals.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §15

The answer to the question referred to the Court must therefore be that, with effect from 1 January 1973, ***a national of a new Member State who holds a qualification recognised by the competent authorities of the Member State of establishment as equivalent to the certificate issued and required in that State enjoys the right to be admitted to the profession of architect and to practise it under the same conditions as nationals of the Member State of establishment without being required to satisfy any additional conditions.***

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §18

In these circumstances, the answer to the question referred to the Court should be that when a national of one Member State desirous of exercising a professional activity such as the profession of advocate in another Member State *has obtained a diploma in his country of origin which has been recognised as an equivalent qualification by the competent authority under the legislation of the country of establishment* and which has thus enabled him to sit and pass the special qualifying examination for the profession in question, *the act of demanding the national diploma prescribed by the legislation of the country of establishment constitutes*, even in the absence of the directives provided for in Article 57, *a restriction incompatible with the freedom of establishment* guaranteed by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §27

5.4.2 Restrictions emanating from the state of origin

Article 52 of the Treaty likewise prohibits a Member State from hindering the establishment in another Member State of nationals of Member States residing on its territory.

Case C-251/98 C. Baars [2000] ECR I- 2787 §29

By refusing to grant the tax advantage conferred by the undertaking exemption to nationals of Member States residing in the Netherlands who, in exercise of their right of free establishment, manage a company having its seat in a Member State other than the Netherlands, while granting that advantage to nationals of Member States residing in the Netherlands who hold a substantial holding in a company having its seat in the Netherlands, the national legislation at issue in the main proceedings provides for a difference in treatment between taxpayers by adopting as its criterion the seat of the companies of which those taxpayers are shareholders.

Case C-251/98 C. Baars [2000] ECR I- 2787 §30

That difference in the treatment of taxpayers is in principle contrary to Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-251/98 C. Baars [2000] ECR I- 2787 §31

The legislation in question in the main proceedings does not allow Swedish companies which have used their right to free establishment to form subsidiaries in other Member States to receive certain tax concessions upon a type C intra-group transfer.

Case C-200/98 X AB, Y AB v Riksskatteverket [1999] ECR I- 8261 §27

Thus, *such legislation entails a difference of treatment between various types of intra-group transfers on the basis of the criterion of the subsidiaries' seat*. In the absence of justification, *that difference of treatment is contrary to the provisions of the Treaty concerning freedom of establishment*. It does not make any difference in this regard that the case-law of the Regeringsrätten allows type B transfers to be given the same treatment accorded to type A transfers.

Case C-200/98 X AB, Y AB v Riksskatteverket [1999] ECR I- 8261 §28

It should be pointed out that, even though, according to their wording, *the provisions concerning freedom of establishment* are directed mainly to ensuring that foreign nationals and companies are treated in the host Member State in the same way as nationals of that State, they *also prohibit the Member State of origin from hindering the establishment in another Member State of one of its nationals or of a company incorporated under its legislation* which comes within the definition contained in Article 58 (Case 81/87 *Daily Mail and General Trust* [1988] ECR 5483, paragraph 16).

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §21

The provisions of the Treaty relating to the free movement of persons are thus intended to facilitate the pursuit of occupational activities throughout the Community, and *preclude national legislation which might inhibit the extension of such activities beyond the territory of a single Member State* (*Stanton*, paragraph 13).

Case C-53/95 Inasti [1996] ECR I-703 §11

The provisions of the Treaty relating to the free movement of persons are thus intended to facilitate the pursuit by Community citizens of occupational activities of all kinds throughout the Community, and *preclude national legislation which might place Community citizens at a disadvantage when they wish to extend their activities beyond the territory of a single Member State*.

Case C-143/87 Stanton [1988] ECR 3877 §13
See also §§14-16

.../....

The Court has also stated, in Case 81/87 *The Queen v H.M. Treasury and Commissioners of Inland Revenue ex parte Daily Mail and General Trust plc* [1988] ECR 5483, paragraph 16, that even though the Treaty provisions relating to freedom of establishment are directed mainly to ensuring that foreign nationals and companies are treated in the host Member State in the same way as nationals of that State, ***they also prohibit the Member State of origin from hindering the establishment in another Member State of one of its nationals or of a company incorporated under its legislation which comes within the definition contained in Article 58. The rights guaranteed by Article 52 et seq. of the Treaty would be rendered meaningless if the Member State of origin could prohibit undertakings from leaving in order to establish themselves in another Member State.*** The same considerations apply, in relation to Article 48 of the Treaty, with regard to rules which impede the freedom of movement of nationals of one Member State wishing to engage in gainful employment in another Member State.

Case C-415/93 Bosman [1995] ECR I-4353 §97
see also: Case C-379/92 Peralta [1994] ECR I-3453 §31
and: Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §16

In fact, these liberties, which are fundamental in the Community system, could not be fully realised ***if the Member States were in a position to refuse to grant the benefit of the provisions of Community law to those of their nationals who have taken advantage of the facilities existing in the matter of freedom of movement and establishment*** and who have acquired, by virtue of such facilities, the trade qualifications referred to by the directive in a Member State other than that whose nationality they possess.

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §20

Although it is true that the provisions of the Treaty relating to establishment and the provision of services cannot be applied to situations which are purely internal to a Member State, the position nevertheless remains that the reference in Article 52 to “nationals of a Member State” who wish to establish themselves “in the territory of another Member state” ***cannot be interpreted in such a way as to exclude from the benefit of Community law a given Member State’s own nationals when the latter, owing to the fact that they have lawfully resided on the territory of another Member State and have there acquired a trade qualification which is recognised by the provisions of Community law, are, with regard to their state of origin, in a situation which may be assimilated to that of any other persons enjoying the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Treaty.***

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §24

5.4.3 Restrictions emanating from associations or organisations not governed by public law

Once the objections concerning the application of Article 48 of the Treaty to sporting activities such as those of professional footballers are out of the way, it is to be remembered that, as the Court held in paragraph 17 of its judgment in *Walrave*, cited above, *Article 48 not only applies to the action of public authorities but extends also to rules of any other nature aimed at regulating gainful employment in a collective manner.*

Case C-415/93 Bosman [1995] ECR I-4353 §82
Case C-36/74 Walrave [1974] ECR 1405 §17

The Court has held that *the abolition* as between Member States *of obstacles* to freedom of movement for persons and *to freedom to provide services would be compromised if the abolition of State barriers could be neutralised by obstacles resulting from the exercise of their legal autonomy by associations or organisations not governed by public law* (see *Walrave*, cited above, paragraph 18).

Case C-415/93 Bosman [1995] ECR I-4353 §83
Case C-36/74 Walrave [1974] ECR 1405 §18

6 JUSTIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS

6.1 DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES

6.1.1 Participation in the exercise of official authority (Art. 45 (formerly Art. 55))

The activities of security firms, security systems firms and internal security services are not normally directly and specifically connected with the exercise of official authority, and the Belgian Government has not adduced any evidence to permit the contrary to be established.

Case C-355/98 Commission v. Belgium [2000] ECR I- 1221 §26

As regards the exception provided for in the first paragraph of Article 55 combined, where appropriate with Article 66 of the Treaty, it must be remembered that, *as a derogation from the fundamental rule of freedom of establishment, it must be interpreted in a manner which limits its scope to what is strictly necessary for safeguarding the interests which that provision allows the Member States to protect* (Case 147/86 *Commission v Greece* [1988] ECR 1637, paragraph 7).

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §34

According to established case-law, *the derogation* for which it provides *must be restricted to activities which in themselves are directly and specifically connected with the exercise of official authority* (Case 2/74 *Reyners* [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 45, and Case C-42/92 *Thijssen* [1993] ECR I-4047, paragraph 8).

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §35

In the present case, it is clear from the evidence before the Court that *the activity of security undertakings and security staff is to carry out surveillance and protection tasks on the basis of relations governed by private law*.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §36

However, the exercise of that activity does not mean that security undertakings and security staff are vested with powers of constraint. *Merely making a contribution to the maintenance of public security*, which any individual may be called upon to do, *does not constitute exercise of official authority*.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §37

As a preliminary matter, it should be recalled that *the first paragraph of Article 55 of the Treaty excludes from the application of the provisions on freedom of establishment activities which in a Member State are connected, even occasionally, with the exercise of official authority*. Nevertheless, as the Court ruled in *Reyners* (cited above, at paragraph 45), *the derogation provided for in Article 55 must be restricted to activities which in themselves are directly and specifically connected with the exercise of official authority*.

Case C-42/92 Thijssen [1993] ECR I-4047 §8

As the Belgian Government emphasised in its submissions, *the activities of an internal auditor or "ordinary commissioner", as the Government describes it, are not connected with the exercise of official authority*. The duties of an ordinary commissioner consist in fact in auditing the finances and the annual accounts of the company and presenting to the general meeting a report on the audits so carried out on the basis of the documents and information which he is entitled to obtain from the responsible officers of the undertaking.

Case C-42/92 Thijssen [1993] ECR I-4047 §18

Under the terms of the first paragraph of *Article 55* the provisions of the chapter on the right of establishment *shall not apply* 'so far as any given Member State is concerned, *to activities which in that state are connected, even occasionally, with the exercise of official authority*'.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §42

Having regard to the fundamental character of freedom of establishment and the rule on equal treatment with nationals in the system of the Treaty, *the exceptions allowed by the first paragraph of Article 55 cannot be given a scope which would exceed the objective for which this exemption clause was inserted*.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §43

The first paragraph of Article 55 must enable Member States to exclude non-nationals from taking up functions *involving the exercise of official authority which are connected with one of the activities of self-employed persons provided for in Article 52*.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §44

This need is fully satisfied when *the exclusion of nationals is limited to those activities which, taken on their own, constitute a direct and specific connection with the exercise of official authority*.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §45

An extension of the exception allowed by Article 55 to a whole profession would be possible only in cases where such activities were linked with that profession in such a way that freedom of establishment would result in imposing on the Member State concerned the obligation to allow the exercise, even occasionally, by non-nationals of functions appertaining to official authority.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §46

This extension is on the other hand not possible when, within the framework of an independent profession, the activities connected with the exercise of official authority are separable from the professional activity in question taken as a whole.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §47

Professional activities involving contacts, even regular and organic, with the courts, including even compulsory co-operation in their functioning, do not constitute, as such, connection with the exercise of official authority.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §51

The most typical activities of the profession of avocat, in particular, such as consultation and legal assistance and also representation and the defence of parties in court, even when the intervention or assistance of the avocat is compulsory or is a legal monopoly, cannot be considered as connected with the exercise of official authority.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §52

It is therefore right to reply to the question raised that the exception to freedom of establishment provided for by the first paragraph of Article 55 must be *restricted* to those of the activities referred to in Article 52 which in themselves *involve a direct and specific connection with the exercise of official authority.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §54

In any case it is not possible to give this description, in the context of a profession such as that of avocat, to activities such as consultation and legal assistance or the representation and defence of parties in court, even if the performance of these activities is compulsory or there is a legal monopoly in respect of it.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §55

6.1.2 Public policy, public security and public health (Art. 46 (formerly Art. 56))

The rule according to which directors and managers of all security undertakings must reside in Spain *constitutes an obstacle to freedom of establishment* (see, in this regard, Case C-221/89 *Factortame* [1991] ECR I-3905, paragraph 35) and to the freedom to provide services.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §44

This condition is not necessary in order to ensure public security in the Member State concerned and *is not therefore covered by the derogation provided by Article 56(1)* combined, where appropriate, with Article 66 of the Treaty.

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §45

Recourse to this justification presupposes the existence of a genuine and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of society (see, as far as public policy is concerned, *Bouchereau*, cited above, paragraph 35).

Case C-114/97 Commission v Spain [1998] ECR I-0000 §46

In answer to the argument that revenue lost through the granting of tax relief on losses incurred by resident subsidiaries cannot be offset by taxing profits of non-resident subsidiaries, it must be pointed out that *diminution of tax revenue occurring in this way is not one of the grounds listed in Article 56* of the Treaty and cannot be regarded as a matter of overriding general interest which may be relied upon in order to justify unequal treatment that is, in principle, incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §28

.../...

As the Court of Justice held in Joined Cases 115/181 [*sic*] and 116/81 *Adoui and Cornuaille v Belgian State* [1982] ECR 1665, paragraph 7, *the reservations contained in Articles 48 and 56* of the EC Treaty *permit Member States to adopt*, with respect to the nationals of other Member States and on the grounds specified in those provisions, in particular grounds justified by the requirements of public policy, *measures which they cannot apply to their own nationals*, inasmuch as they have no authority to expel the latter from the national territory or to deny them access thereto.

Joined Cases C-65/95 and C-111/95 Shingara & Radiom [1997] ECR I-3343 §28

As stated in paragraph 12 above, the rule in question entails discrimination based on the place of establishment. ***Such discrimination can only be justified on the general interest grounds referred to in Article 56(1) of the Treaty***, to which Article 66 refers, and which do not include economic aims (see in particular Case C-288/89 *Stichting Collectieve Antennevoorziening Gouda and Others v Commissariaat voor de Media* [1991] ECR I-4007, paragraph 11).

Case C-484/93 Svensson [1995] ECR I-3955 §15

As the Court held in its judgment in Case 352/85 *Bond van Adverteerders* [1988] ECR 2085, at paragraphs 32 and 33, ***national rules which are not applicable to services without discrimination*** as regards their origin ***are compatible with Community law only if they can be brought within the scope of an express exemption, such as that contained in Article 56*** of the Treaty. It also appears from that judgment (paragraph 34) that economic aims cannot constitute grounds of public policy within the meaning of Article 56 of the Treaty.

Case C-288/89 Mediawet I [1991] ECR I-4007 §11

It should next be pointed out that the rules relating to the freedom to provide services preclude national rules which have such discriminatory effects unless those rules fall within the derogating provision contained in Article 56 of the Treaty to which Article 66 refers. ***It follows from Article 56, which must be interpreted strictly***, that discriminatory rules may be justified on grounds of public policy, public security or public health.

Case C-260/89 ERT [1991] ECR I-2925 §24

6.2 NON-DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES

6.2.1 Measures justified by an imperative requirement in the general interest

As the Advocate General notes in points 105 to 113 of his Opinion, ***the reliability of a dental practitioner's communication with his patient and with administrative authorities and professional bodies constitutes an overriding reason of general interest such as to justify making the appointment as a dental practitioner under a social security scheme subject to language requirements***. Dialogue with patients, compliance with rules of professional conduct and law specific to dentistry in the Member State of establishment and performance of administrative tasks require an appropriate knowledge of the language of that State.

Case C-424/97 Haim [2000] ECR I-0000 §59

However, it is important that language requirements designed to ensure that the dental practitioner *will be able to communicate effectively with his patients*, whose mother tongue is that of the Member State concerned, *and with the administrative authorities and the professional bodies of that State* do not go beyond what is necessary to attain that objective. In this respect, it is in the interest of patients whose mother tongue is not the national language that there exist a certain number of dental practitioners who are also capable of communicating with such persons in their own language.

Case C-424/97 Haim [2000] ECR I-0000 §60

It must be stated in response to that argument that *a reduction of revenue due to the impossibility of partially compensating for the reduction in tax yield brought about by the grant to foreign companies having a permanent branch in Germany of the various tax concessions in question is not one of the grounds listed in Article 56 of the EC Treaty (now, after amendment, Article 46 EC) and cannot be regarded as a matter of overriding general interest* which may be relied upon in order to justify unequal treatment that is in principle incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty (see, to this effect, the judgment in *ICI*, cited above, paragraph 28).

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §50

A restraining order of the type sought by the plaintiff in the main proceedings operates to the detriment of undertakings whose seat is in another Member State where they lawfully use a trade name which they would like to use beyond the boundaries of that State. Such an order is liable to constitute an impediment to the realisation by those undertakings of a uniform advertising concept at Community level since it may force them to adjust the presentation of the businesses they operate according to the place of establishment.

Case C-255/97 Pfeiffer [1999] ECR I-2835 §20

However, where such a restriction on the right of establishment is brought about by a provision of national law whose primary aim is to safeguard trade names against the risk of confusion, it is justified by overriding requirements in the general interest pertaining to the protection of industrial and commercial property (see, to that effect, Case 62/79 *Coditel and Others* [1980] ECR 881, paragraph 15).

Case C-255/97 Pfeiffer [1999] ECR I-2835 §21

No exception can be taken under Community law to the protection granted by a national law against the risk of confusion, since it corresponds to the specific subject-matter of a trade name, that is to say, protection of the proprietor of the trade name against that risk (see, to the same effect, on the subject of trade marks, Case C-317/91 *Deutsche Renault* [1993] ECR I-6227, paragraph 37).

Case C-255/97 Pfeiffer [1999] ECR I-2835 §22

In answer to the argument that revenue lost through the granting of tax relief on losses incurred by resident subsidiaries cannot be offset by taxing profits of non-resident subsidiaries, it must be pointed out that *diminution of tax revenue occurring in this way* is not one of the grounds listed in Article 56 of the Treaty and *cannot be regarded as a matter of overriding general interest which may be relied upon in order to justify unequal treatment* that is, in principle, incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §28

It is true that in the past the Court has accepted that the need to maintain *the cohesion of the tax systems could*, in certain circumstances, *provide sufficient justification for maintaining rules restricting fundamental freedoms* (see, to this effect, Case C-204/90 *Bachmann* [1992] ECR I-249 and Case C-300/90 *Commission v Belgium* [1992] ECR I-305). Nevertheless, in the cases cited, there was a direct link between the deductibility of contributions from taxable income and the taxation of sums payable by insurers under old-age and life assurance policies, and that link had to be maintained in order to preserve the cohesion of the tax system in question. In the present case, there is no such direct link between the consortium relief granted for losses incurred by a resident subsidiary and the taxation of profits made by non-resident subsidiaries.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §29

Consequently, the imposition of such a condition, which specifically affects companies or firms having their seat in another Member State, is in principle prohibited by Article 52 of the Treaty. *It could only be otherwise if the measure pursued a legitimate aim compatible with the Treaty and were justified by pressing reasons of public interest.* Even if that were so, it would have to be of such a nature as to ensure achievement of the aim in question and not go beyond what was necessary for that purpose (see, to this effect, the judgments in Case C-55/94 *Gebhard* [1995] ECR I-4165, paragraph 37; in Case C-19/92 *Kraus* [1993] ECR I-1663, paragraph 32; and in Case C-415/93 *Bosman* [1995] ECR I-4921, paragraph 104).

Case C-250/95 Futura & Singer [1997] ECR I-2471 §26

The Court has repeatedly held that *the effectiveness of fiscal supervision constitutes an overriding requirement of general interest capable of justifying a restriction* on the exercise of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty (see, for example, the judgment in Case 120/78 *REWE-Zentral* ('*Cassis de Dijon*') [1979] ECR 649, paragraph 8). A Member State may therefore apply measures which enable the amount of both the income taxable in that State and of the losses which can be carried forward there to be ascertained clearly and precisely.

Case C-250/95 Futura & Singer [1997] ECR I-2471 §31

Legislation of the kind at issue in the main proceedings affords no additional social protection to the persons concerned . Therefore, *the impediment to the pursuit of occupational activities in more than one Member State may not in any event be justified on that basis.*

Case C- 53/95 - Inasti [1996] ECR 703 §13

It follows, however, from the Court's case-law that national measures liable to hinder or make less attractive the exercise of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty must fulfil four conditions: they must be applied in a *non-discriminatory manner*; they must be *justified by imperative requirements in the general interest*; they must be suitable for securing the attainment of the objective which they pursue; and they must not go beyond what is necessary in order to attain it (see Case C-19/92 *Kraus v Land Baden-Wuerttemberg* [1993] ECR I-1663, paragraph 32).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §37

Consequently, Articles 48 and 52 preclude any national measure governing the conditions under which an academic title obtained in another Member State may be used, where that measure, even though it is applicable without discrimination on grounds of nationality, is liable to hamper or to render less attractive the exercise by Community nationals, including those of the Member State which enacted the measure, of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty. *The situation would be different only if such a measure pursued a legitimate objective compatible with the Treaty and was justified by pressing reasons of public interest* (see to that effect, judgment in Case 71/76 *Thieffry v Conseil de l' Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris* [1977] ECR 765, paragraphs 12 and 15). It would however also be necessary in such a case for application of the national rules in question to be appropriate for ensuring attainment of the objective they pursue and not to go beyond what is necessary for that purpose (see judgment in Case C-106/91 *Ramrath v Ministre de la Justice* [1992] ECR I-3351, paragraphs 29 and 30).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §32

However, *in so far as those rules have the effect of restricting* freedom of movement for workers, *the right of establishment* and the freedom to provide services within the Community, *they are compatible with the Treaty only if the restrictions which they entail are actually justified in view of the general obligations inherent in the proper practice of the professions in question* and apply to nationals and foreigners alike. That is not the case where the restrictions are such as to create discrimination against practitioners established in other member states or raise obstacles to access to the profession which go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve the intended goals.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR 1485 §11

Furthermore, *the risk of tax avoidance* cannot be relied upon in this context. *Article 52 of the EEC Treaty does not permit any derogation from the fundamental principle of freedom of establishment on such a ground.*

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §25

That Article is therefore directed towards reconciling freedom of establishment with the application of national professional rules justified by the general good, in particular rules relating to organisation, qualifications, professional ethics, supervision and liability, *provided that such application is effected without discrimination.*

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §12

It follows from *the provisions cited taken as a whole that freedom of establishment, subject to observance of professional rules justified by the general good, is one of the objectives of the Treaty.*

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §15

6.2.2 Measures suitable for securing the attainment of the objective pursued and not going beyond what is necessary (proportionality)

Consequently, the imposition of such a condition, which specifically affects companies or firms having their seat in another Member State, is in principle prohibited by Article 52 of the Treaty. It could only be otherwise if the measure pursued a legitimate aim compatible with the Treaty and were justified by pressing reasons of public interest. Even if that were so, *it would have to be of such a nature as to ensure achievement of the aim in question and not go beyond what was necessary for that purpose* (see, to this effect, the judgments in Case C-55/94 *Gebhard* [1995] ECR I-4165, paragraph 37; in Case C-19/92 *Kraus* [1993] ECR I-1663, paragraph 32; and in Case C-415/93 *Bosman* [1995] ECR I-4921, paragraph 104).

Case C-250/95 Futura & Singer [1997] ECR I-2471 §26
See also: Case C-415/93 Bosman [1995] ECR I-4921, §104

In response to those arguments it must be recalled that the Court has held that, *in order to establish whether a provision of Community law complies with the principle of proportionality, it must be ascertained whether the means which it employs are suitable for the purpose of achieving the desired objectives and whether they do not go beyond what is necessary to achieve it* (see, in particular, Case C-84/94 *United Kingdom v Council* [1996] ECR I-5755, paragraph 57).

Case C-233/94 Germany/Parliament and Council [1997] ECR I-2405 §54

It follows, however, from the Court's case-law that national measures liable to hinder or make less attractive the exercise of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty must fulfil four conditions: they must be applied in a non-discriminatory manner; they must be justified by imperative requirements in the general interest; *they must be suitable for securing the attainment of the objective which they pursue; and they must not go beyond what is necessary in order to attain it* (see Case C-19/92 *Kraus v Land Baden-Wuerttemberg* [1993] ECR I-1663, paragraph 32).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §37

Consequently, Articles 48 and 52 preclude any national measure governing the conditions under which an academic title obtained in another Member State may be used, where that measure, even though it is applicable without discrimination on grounds of nationality, is liable to hamper or to render less attractive the exercise by Community nationals, including those of the Member State which enacted the measure, of fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty. The situation would be different only if such a measure pursued a legitimate objective compatible with the Treaty and was justified by pressing reasons of public interest (see to that effect, judgment in Case 71/76 *Thieffry v Conseil de l' Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris* [1977] ECR 765, paragraphs 12 and 15). *It would however also be necessary in such a case for application of the national rules in question to be appropriate for ensuring attainment of the objective they pursue and not to go beyond what is necessary for that purpose* (see judgment in Case C-106/91 *Ramrath v Ministre de la Justice* [1992] ECR I-3351, paragraphs 29 and 30).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §32

It follows that the fact that a Member State establishes a procedure for the issue of *administrative authorisations*, to be obtained prior to using postgraduate academic titles awarded in another State, and prescribes *criminal penalties* for non-compliance with that procedure is not, in itself, *incompatible* with the requirements of Community law.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §36

However, in order to satisfy the requirements laid down by Community law *with respect to the observance of the principle of proportionality*, national rules of that kind must fulfil certain conditions.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §37

It follows that the answer to the question put by the national court must be that Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty must be interpreted as meaning that they do not preclude a Member State from prohibiting one of its own nationals, who holds a postgraduate academic title awarded in another Member State, from using that title on its territory *without having obtained an administrative authorisation for that purpose, provided that the authorisation procedure is intended solely to verify whether the postgraduate academic title was properly awarded, that the procedure is easily accessible and does not call for the payment of excessive administrative fees, that any refusal of authorisation is capable of being subject to proceedings, that the person concerned is able to ascertain the reasons for the decision and that the penalties prescribed for non-compliance with the authorisation procedure are not disproportionate to the gravity of the offence.*

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §42

In that regard it must be stated that the Italian Government had sufficient legal powers at its disposal to be able to adapt the performance of contracts to meet future and unforeseeable circumstances and to ensure compliance with the general interest, and that *in order to protect the confidential nature of the data in question the Government could have adopted measures less restrictive of freedom of establishment* and freedom to provide services than those in issue, in particular by imposing a duty of secrecy on the staff of the companies concerned, breach of which might give rise to criminal proceedings. There is nothing in the documents before the Court to suggest that the staff of companies none of whose share capital is in Italian public ownership could not comply just as effectively with such a duty.

Case C-3/88 Commission v Italy [1989] ECR 4035 §11

6.3 MEASURES AIMING TO PROHIBIT THE CIRCUMVENTION OF NATIONAL RULES
--

It is true that according to the case-law of the Court *a Member State is entitled to take measures designed to prevent certain of its nationals from attempting, under cover of the rights created by the Treaty, improperly to circumvent their national legislation or to prevent individuals from improperly or fraudulently taking advantage of provisions of Community law* (see, in particular, regarding freedom to supply services, Case 33/74 *Van Binsbergen v Bedrijfsvereniging Metaalnijverheid* [1974] ECR 1299, paragraph 13, Case C-148/91 *Veronica Omroep Organisatie v Commissariaat voor de Media* [1993] ECR I-487, paragraph 12, and Case C-23/93 *TV 10 v Commissariaat voor de Media* [1994] ECR I-4795, paragraph 21; regarding freedom of establishment, Case 115/78 *Knoors* [1979] ECR 399, paragraph 25, and Case C-61/89 *Bouchoucha* [1990] ECR I-3551, paragraph 14; regarding the free movement of goods, Case 229/83 *Leclerc and Others v 'Au Blé Vert' and Others* [1985] ECR 1, paragraph 27; regarding social security, Case C-206/94 *Brennet v Paletta* [1996] ECR I-2357, '*Paletta II*', paragraph 24; regarding freedom of movement for workers, Case 39/86 *Lair v Universität Hannover* [1988] ECR 3161, paragraph 43; regarding the common agricultural policy, Case C-8/92 *General Milk Products v Hauptzollamt Hamburg-Jonas* [1993] ECR I-779, paragraph 21, and regarding company law, Case C-367/96 *Kefalas and Others v Greece* [1998] ECR I-2843, paragraph 20).

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §24

However, although, in such circumstances, the national courts may, case by case, take account - on the basis of objective evidence - of abuse or fraudulent conduct on the part of the persons concerned in order, where appropriate, to deny them the benefit of the provisions of Community law on which they seek to rely, they must nevertheless assess such conduct in the light of the objectives pursued by those provisions (Paletta II, paragraph 25).

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §25

In the present case, the provisions of national law, application of which the parties concerned have sought to avoid, are rules governing the formation of companies and not rules concerning the carrying on of certain trades, professions or businesses. *The provisions of the Treaty on freedom of establishment are intended specifically to enable companies formed in accordance with the law of a Member State and having their registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community to pursue activities in other Member States through an agency, branch or subsidiary.*

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §26

That being so, *the fact that a national of a Member State who wishes to set up a company chooses to form it in the Member State whose rules of company law seem to him the least restrictive and to set up branches in other Member States cannot, in itself, constitute an abuse of the right of establishment.* The right to form a company in accordance with the law of a Member State and to set up branches in other Member States is inherent in the exercise, in a single market, of the freedom of establishment guaranteed by the Treaty.

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §27

In this connection, *the fact that company law is not completely harmonised in the Community is of little consequence.* Moreover, it is always open to the Council, on the basis of the powers conferred upon it by Article 54(3)(g) of the EC Treaty, to achieve complete harmonisation.

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §28

In addition, it is clear from paragraph 16 of *Segers* that *the fact that a company does not conduct any business in the Member State in which it has its registered office and pursues its activities only in the Member State where its branch is established is not sufficient to prove the existence of abuse or fraudulent conduct which would entitle the latter Member State to deny that company the benefit of the provisions of Community law relating to the right of establishment.*

Case C-212/97 Centros Ltd [1999] ECR I-1459 §29

As regards the *justification based on the risk of tax avoidance*, suffice it to note that *the legislation* at issue in the main proceedings *does not have the specific purpose of preventing wholly artificial arrangements, set up to circumvent United Kingdom tax legislation*, from attracting tax benefits, but applies generally to all situations in which the majority of a group's subsidiaries are established, for whatever reason, outside the United Kingdom. However, the establishment of a company outside the United Kingdom does not, of itself, necessarily entail tax avoidance, since that company will in any event be subject to the tax legislation of the State of establishment.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §26

Furthermore, *the risk of charges being transferred*, which the legislation at issue is designed to prevent, *is entirely independent of whether or not the majority of subsidiaries are resident in the United Kingdom.* The existence of only one non-resident subsidiary is enough to create the risk invoked by the United Kingdom Government.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §27

Community law does not preclude a Member State from adopting, in the absence of harmonisation, measures designed to prevent the opportunities created under the Treaty from being abused in a manner contrary to the legitimate interests of the State (see the judgment in *Knoors*, cited above, paragraph 25).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §34

The need to protect a public which will not necessarily be alerted to abuse of academic titles which have not been awarded according to the rules laid down in the country in which the holder of the title intends to make use of it *constitutes a legitimate interest such as to justify a restriction*, by the Member State in question, of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §35

Similarly, as the Court held in its judgment of 3 December 1974 (Case 33/74 *Van Binsbergen v Bedrijfsvereniging Metaalnijverheid* (1974) ECR 1299) *a Member State cannot be denied the right to take measures to prevent the exercise by a person providing services whose activity is entirely or principally directed towards its territory of the freedom guaranteed by Article 59 for the purpose of avoiding the professional rules of conduct which would be applicable to him if he were established within that State*. Such a situation may be subject to judicial control under the provisions of the chapter relating to the right of establishment and not of that on the provision of services.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §22

However, *it is not possible to disregard the legitimate interest which a Member State may have in preventing certain of its nationals*, by means of facilities created under the Treaty, *from attempting wrongly to evade the application of their national legislation* as regards training for a trade.

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §25

7 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE 43 (FORMERLY ARTICLE 52) AS A “FUNDAMENTAL” PRINCIPLE OF COMMUNITY LAW

As regards Article 52 of the Treaty, read in conjunction with Article 58 thereof (third question), it must be borne in mind that *the right of establishment* with which those provisions are concerned *is granted both to natural persons* who are nationals of a Member State of the Community *and to legal persons* within the meaning of Article 58. Subject to the exceptions and conditions laid down, *it allows all types of self-employed activity to be taken up and pursued on the territory of any other Member State, undertakings to be formed and operated and agencies, branches or subsidiaries to be set up* (*Gebhard*, cited above, paragraph 23).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §26
See also: Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §23

The concept of establishment within the meaning of the Treaty *is therefore a very broad one*, allowing a Community national *to participate, on a stable and continuous basis, in the economic life of a Member State other than his State of origin* and to profit therefrom, so contributing to economic and social interpenetration within the Community in the sphere of activities as self-employed persons (see, to this effect, Case 2/74 *Reyners v Belgium* [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 21).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §25

On that point, it must however be stressed that Community law sets limits to the exercise of those powers by the Member States in so far as provisions of national law adopted in that connection must not constitute an obstacle to the *effective exercise of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty* (see, to that effect, the judgment in Case 222/86 *UNECTEF v Heylens and Others* [1987] ECR 4097, paragraph 11).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §28

The Court has confirmed that Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty implement the fundamental principle contained in Article 3c of the Treaty in which it is stated that, for the purposes set out in Article 2, the activities of the Community are to include the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to freedom of movement for persons (see, in particular, judgments in Case 118/75 *Watson and Belmann* [1976] ECR 1185, paragraph 16; in *Heylens*, cited above, paragraph 8 and in Case C-370/90 *The Queen, ex parte Secretary of State for the Home Department v Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Surinder Singh* [1992] ECR I-4265).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §29

In stating that freedom of movement for workers and freedom of establishment are to be secured by the end of the transitional period, Articles 48 and 52 lay down a precise obligation of result. The performance of that obligation was to be facilitated by but not to be made dependent upon the implementation of Community measures. The fact that such measures have not yet been adopted does not authorise a Member State to deny to a person subject to Community law the practical benefit of the freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §30

Furthermore, *Member States are required*, in conformity with Article 5 of the Treaty, *to take all appropriate measures*, whether general or particular, *to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of the Treaty and to abstain from any measures which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives of the Treaty.*

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §31

In that respect, it must be acknowledged that an insurance undertaking of another Member State which maintains *a permanent presence* in the Member State in question comes within the scope of the provisions of the Treaty on the right of establishment, *even if that presence does not take the form of a branch or agency, but consists merely of an office managed by the undertaking's own staff or by a person who is independent but authorised to act on a permanent basis for the undertaking, as would be the case with an agency.* In the light of the aforementioned definition contained in the first paragraph of Article 60, such an insurance undertaking cannot therefore avail itself of Articles 59 and 60 with regard to its activities in the Member State in question.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §21

It must be stated firstly that *Article 52 of the EEC Treaty embodies one of the fundamental principles of the Community* and has been directly applicable in the Member States since the end of the transitional period. By virtue of that provision, freedom of establishment for nationals of one Member State on the territory of another includes the right to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons and to set up and manage undertakings under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where such establishment is effected. The abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment also applies to restrictions on the setting up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries by nationals of any Member State established in the territory of any Member State.

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §13

Furthermore, the fact that insurance companies whose registered office is situated in another Member State are at liberty to establish themselves by setting up a subsidiary in order to have the benefit of the tax credit cannot justify different treatment. *The second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52 expressly leaves traders free to choose the appropriate legal form in which to pursue their activities in another Member State and that freedom of choice must not be limited by discriminatory tax provisions.*

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §22

The rule on equal treatment with nationals is one of the fundamental legal provisions of the Community.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §24

Having regard to *the fundamental character of freedom of establishment* and the rule on equal treatment with nationals in the system of the Treaty, the exceptions allowed by the first paragraph of Article 55 cannot be given a scope which would exceed the objective for which this exemption clause was inserted.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §43

7.2 DIRECT APPLICABILITY OF ARTICLE 43 (FORMERLY ARTICLE 52)

In that regard, it should be noted that, *whilst those provisions, which have direct effect, prohibit imposing unjustified restrictions on the freedoms concerned, they are not sufficient in themselves to ensure elimination of all obstacles to free movement* of persons, services and capital, and that the directives provided for by the Treaty in this matter preserve an important scope in the field of measures intended to make easier the effective exercise of the rights arising out of those provisions (see, *as far as freedom of establishment is concerned, Case 2/74 Reyners* [1974] ECR 631, paragraphs 29, 30 and 31).

Case C-57/95 France v Commission [1997] ECR I-1627 §20

That article requires the abolition of restrictions on the freedom of establishment of nationals of a Member State in the territory of another Member State. *It is settled case-law that that is a directly applicable rule of Community law.* Member States were therefore under the obligation to observe that rule even though, in the absence of Community legislation on social security for self-employed persons, they retained competence to legislate in this field (*Stanton*, paragraph 10).

Case C-53/95 Inasti [1996] ECR I-703 §9
See also: Case C-143/87 Stanton [1988] ECR 3877 §10

In stating that freedom of movement for workers and *freedom of establishment* are to be secured by the end of the transitional period, Articles 48 and 52 lay down a precise obligation of result. *The performance of that obligation was to be facilitated by but not to be made dependent upon the implementation of Community measures*. The fact that such measures have not yet been adopted does not authorise a Member State to deny to a person subject to Community law the practical benefit of the freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §30

However, in laying down that freedom of establishment is to be attained by the end of the transitional period, *Article 52 of the Treaty thus imposes an obligation to attain a precise result, the fulfilment of which had to be made easier by, but not made dependent on, the implementation of a programme of progressive measures* (see the judgment in Case 11/77 Patrick v Ministre des Affaires Culturelles [1977] ECR 1199, paragraph 10).

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §13

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §10

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §10

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §26

It must be stated firstly that *Article 52 of the EEC Treaty* embodies one of the fundamental principles of the Community and *has been directly applicable in the Member States since the end of the transitional period. By virtue of that provision*, freedom of establishment for nationals of one Member State on the territory of another includes the right to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons and to set up and manage undertakings under the conditions laid down for its own nationals by the law of the country where such establishment is effected. The abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment also applies to restrictions on the setting up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries by nationals of any Member State established in the territory of any Member State.

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §13

Finally, the French government is wrong to contend that the difference of treatment in question is due to the double-taxation agreements. Those agreements do not deal with the cases here at issue as defined above. Moreover, *the rights conferred by Article 52 of the Treaty are unconditional and a Member State cannot make respect for them subject to the contents of an agreement concluded with another Member State*. In particular, that Article does not permit those rights to be made subject to a condition of reciprocity imposed for the purpose of obtaining corresponding advantages in other Member States.

Case C-270/83 Commission v France [1986] ECR 273 §26

After the expiry of the transitional period *the directives provided for by the chapter on the right of establishment have become superfluous with regard to implementing the rule on nationality, since this is henceforth sanctioned by the Treaty itself with direct effect.*

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §13
Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §30

In this respect, *Article 52 is a clear and complete provision, capable of producing a direct effect.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §10

At the end of the transitional period, the Member States no longer have the possibility of maintaining restrictions on the freedom of establishment, since *Article 52 has, as from this period, the character of a provision which is complete in itself and legally perfect.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §12

In these circumstances the 'general programme' and the directives provided for by Article 54 were of significance only during the transitional period, since the freedom of establishment was fully attained at the end of it.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §13

As a reference to a set of legislative provisions effectively applied by the country of establishment to its own nationals, *this rule is, by its essence, capable of being directly invoked by nationals of all the other Member States.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §25

It is right therefore to reply to the question raised that, since the end of the transitional period, *Article 52 of the Treaty is a directly applicable provision despite the absence in a particular sphere, of the directives prescribed by Articles 54(2) and 57(1) of the Treaty.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §32

(...) *It is therefore legally complete in itself and is consequently capable of producing direct effects on the relations between Member States and individuals.*
 (...)

Case C-6/64 Costa [1964] ECR 585 p.596

**7.3 OBLIGATION OF MEMBER STATES TO MODIFY LAWS INCOMPATIBLE
WITH THE RIGHT OF ESTABLISHMENT**

Accordingly, when deciding an issue concerning a situation which lies outside the scope of Community law, the national court is not required, under Community law, either to interpret its legislation in a way conforming with Community law or disapply that legislation. *Where a particular provision must be disapplied in a situation covered by Community law, but that same provision could remain applicable to a situation not so covered, it is for the competent body of the State concerned to remove that legal uncertainty in so far as it might affect rights deriving from Community rules.*

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §34

With regard to the first branch of the application, therefore, *it must be held that by retaining in force laws, regulations and administrative provisions restricting the right to register a vessel in the national register and to fly the national flag to vessels more than half the shares in which are owned by natural persons of French nationality or which are owned by legal persons having a seat in France or legal persons a certain proportion of whose directors, administrators or managers must be French nationals or, in the case of a private limited company, limited partnership, or general commercial or non-commercial partnership, more than half of whose capital must be held by French citizens or all of whose capital must be held by French persons who fulfil certain conditions, the French Republic has failed to fulfil its obligations under Articles 6, 48, 52, 58 and 221 of the Treaty, Article 7 of Regulation No 1251/70 and Article 7 of Council Directive 75/34.*

Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §24

It has *consistently* been held that *the incompatibility of national legislation with provisions of the Treaty, even provisions which are directly applicable, can be finally remedied only by means of national provisions of a binding nature which have the same legal force as those which must be amended.* Mere administrative practices, which by their nature are alterable at will by the authorities and are not given the appropriate publicity, *cannot be regarded as constituting the proper fulfilment of obligations under the Treaty* (Case 168/85 *Commission v Italy* [1986] ECR 2945, paragraph 13).

Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §30
Case C-168/85 Commission v Italy [1986] ECR 2945 §13

It must be observed in that regard that *directly applicable provisions of the Treaty are binding on all the authorities of the Member States and they must therefore comply with them without its being necessary to adopt national implementing provisions*. However, as the Court held in its judgment of 20 March 1986 in Case 72/85 (*Commission v Netherlands* (1986) ECR 1219), *the right of individuals to rely on directly applicable provisions of the Treaty before national courts is only a minimum guarantee and is not sufficient in itself to ensure the full and complete implementation of the Treaty*. It is clear from previous judgments of the Court, in particular its judgment of 25 October 1979, cited above, that if a provision of national law that is incompatible with a provision of the Treaty, even one directly applicable in the legal order of the Member States, is retained unchanged, this creates an ambiguous state of affairs by keeping the persons concerned in a state of uncertainty as to the possibility of relying on Community law and that maintaining such a provision in force therefore amounts to a failure by the state in question to comply with its obligations under the Treaty.

Case C-168/85 Commission v Italy [1986] ECR 2945 §11

Consequently, the Italian republic cannot escape from its obligation to amend its national law in accordance with the requirements of the Treaty by relying on the direct applicability of the provisions of the Treaty, on *the introduction of certain administrative practices or on the fact that Community citizens have, in its view, an increased awareness of their rights*. Indeed, *in this case, Community citizens remain in a state of uncertainty* not only because national provisions contrary to the Treaty have been maintained in force but also because new provisions, also contrary to the Treaty, were introduced in the field of tourism in 1983.

Case C-168/85 Commission v Italy [1986] ECR 2945 §14

7.4 RIGHT TO REDRESS IN THE CASE OF DAMAGE ATTRIBUTABLE TO A MEMBER STATE

7.4.1 Principle of the right to reparation (corollary of direct effect)

First of all, it should be noted that, as the Court has repeatedly held, *the principle that the State is liable for loss and damage caused to individuals as a result of breaches of Community law for which the State can be held responsible is inherent in the system of the Treaty* (judgments in *Frankovich and Others*, paragraph 35; Joined Cases C-46/93 and C-48/93 *Brasserie de Pêcheur and Factortame* [1996] ECR I-1029, paragraph 31; Case C-392/93 *the Queen v HM Treasury ex parte British Telecommunications* [1996] ECR I-1631, paragraph 38; Case C-5/94 *Hedley Lomas* [1996] ECR I-2553, paragraph 24; Joined Cases C-178/94, C-179/94, C-188/94 and C-190/94 *Dillenkofer and Others* [1996] ECR I-4845, paragraph 20).

Case C-66/95 Sutton [1997] ECR I-2163 §31

See also: Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §31

The Court has consistently held that the right of individuals to rely on the directly effective provisions of the Treaty before national courts is only a minimum guarantee and is not sufficient in itself to ensure the full and complete implementation of the Treaty (see, in particular, Case 168/85 *Commission v Italy* [1986] ECR 2945, paragraph 11, Case C-120/88 *Commission v Italy* [1991] ECR I-621, paragraph 10, and C-119/89 *Commission v Spain* [1991] ECR I-641, paragraph 9). The purpose of that right is to ensure that provisions of Community law prevail over national provisions. It cannot, in every case, secure for individuals the benefit of the rights conferred on them by Community law and, in particular, avoid their sustaining damage as a result of a breach of Community law attributable to a Member State. *As appears from paragraph 33 of the judgment in Francovich and Others, the full effectiveness of Community law would be impaired if individuals were unable to obtain redress when their rights were infringed by a breach of Community law.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §20

It is all the more so *in the event of infringement of a right directly conferred by a Community provision upon which individuals are entitled to rely before the national courts*. In that event, *the right to reparation is the necessary corollary of the direct effect of the Community provision whose breach caused the damage sustained.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §22

In this case, it is undisputed that the Community provisions at issue, namely Article 30 of the Treaty in Case C-46/93 and *Article 52* in Case C-48/93, *have direct effect in the sense that they confer on individuals rights upon which they are entitled to rely directly before the national courts. Breach of such provisions may give rise to reparation.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §23

7.4.2 The three pre-conditions for the right to redress (according to community law)

According to the abovementioned case-law, *a Member State's obligation to make reparation for the loss and damage so caused is subject to three conditions: the rule of law infringed must be intended to confer rights on individuals; the breach must be sufficiently serious; and there must be a direct causal link between the breach of the obligation resting on the State and the damage sustained by the injured parties Treaty* (judgments in *Brasserie de Pêcheur and Factortame*, paragraph 51; *British Telecommunications*, paragraph 39; *Hedley Lomas*, paragraph 25; *Dillenkofer and Others*, paragraph 21). *Those conditions are to be applied to each type of situation* (judgment in *Dillenkofer and Others*, paragraph 24).

Case C-66/95 Sutton [1997] ECR I-2163 §32
Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §51

In addition, in view of the fundamental requirement of the Community legal order that Community law be uniformly applied (see, in particular, Joined Cases C-143/88 and C-92/89 *Zuckerfabrik Suederdithmarschen and Zuckerfabrik Soest* [1991] ECR I-415, paragraph 26), ***the obligation to make good damage caused to individuals by breaches of Community law cannot depend on domestic rules as to the division of powers between constitutional authorities.***

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §33

Firstly, those conditions satisfy the requirements of ***the full effectiveness of the rules of Community law*** and of ***the effective protection of the rights which those rules confer.***

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §52

Secondly, ***those conditions correspond in substance to those defined by the Court in relation to Article 215*** in its case-law on liability of the Community for damage caused to individuals by unlawful legislative measures adopted by its institutions.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §53

The aforementioned three conditions are necessary and sufficient to found a right in individuals to obtain redress, although this does not mean that the State cannot incur liability under less strict conditions on the basis of national law.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §66

The obligation to make reparation for loss or damage caused to individuals ***cannot, however, depend upon a condition based on any concept of fault going beyond that of a sufficiently serious breach of Community law.*** Imposition of such a supplementary condition would be tantamount to calling in question the right to reparation founded on the Community legal order.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §79

7.4.2.1 First condition: attribution of rights to individuals by the rule infringed

The first condition is manifestly satisfied in the case of Article 30 of the Treaty, the relevant provision in Case C-46/93, and ***in the case of Article 52, the relevant provision in Case C-48/93.*** Whilst Article 30 imposes a prohibition on Member States, it nevertheless gives rise to rights for individuals which the national courts must protect (Case 74/76 *Iannelli & Volpi v Meroni* [1977] ECR 557, paragraph 13). Likewise, ***the essence of Article 52 is to confer rights on individuals*** (Case 2/74 *Reyners* [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 25).

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §54

7.4.2.2 Second condition: breach sufficiently serious

As to the second condition, as regards both Community liability under Article 215 and Member State liability for breaches of Community law, *the decisive test for finding that a breach of Community law is sufficiently serious is whether the Member State or the Community institution concerned manifestly and gravely disregarded the limits on its discretion.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §55

The *factors* which the competent court may take into consideration include the *clarity and precision of the rule breached*, the *measure of discretion* left by that rule to the national or Community authorities, whether the infringement and the damage caused was *intentional or involuntary*, whether any error of law was *excusable or inexcusable*, the fact that the *position taken by a Community institution may have contributed towards the omission, and the adoption or retention of national measures or practices contrary to Community law.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §56

On any view, *a breach of Community law will clearly be sufficiently serious if it has persisted despite a judgment finding the infringement in question to be established, or a preliminary ruling or settled case-law of the Court on the matter from which it is clear that the conduct in question constituted an infringement.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §57

The decision of the United Kingdom legislature to introduce in the Merchant Shipping Act 1988 provisions relating to the conditions for the registration of fishing vessels *has to be assessed differently* in the case of the provisions making registration subject to a nationality condition, which constitute direct discrimination manifestly contrary to Community law, and in the case of the provisions laying down residence and domicile conditions for vessel owners and operators.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §61

The latter conditions are *prima facie* incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty in particular, but the United Kingdom sought to justify them in terms of the objectives of the common fisheries policy. In the judgment in Factortame II, cited above, the Court rejected that justification.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §62

In order to determine whether the breach of Article 52 thus committed by the United Kingdom was sufficiently serious, the national court might take into account, *inter alia*, the legal disputes relating to particular features of the common fisheries policy, the attitude of the Commission, which made its position known to the United Kingdom in good time, and the assessments as to the state of certainty of Community law made by the national courts in the interim proceedings brought by individuals affected by the Merchant Shipping Act.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §63

7.4.2.3 Third condition: direct causal link between the breach of the obligation borne by the state and the damage sustained by the injured parties

As for the third condition, it is for the national courts to determine whether there is *a direct causal link between the breach of the obligation borne by the State and the damage sustained by the injured parties*.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §65

7.4.3 Implementation of redress (according to national law)

Finally, since the judgment in *Frankovich and Others*, it has been settled case law that, while the right to reparation is founded directly on Community law *where the three conditions set out above are fulfilled, the national law on liability provides the framework within which the State must make reparation for the consequences of the loss and damage caused, provided always that the conditions laid down by national law relating to reparation of loss and damage must not be less favourable than those relating to similar domestic claims and must not be so framed as to make it virtually impossible or excessively difficult to obtain reparation* (paragraphs 41 to 43).

Case C-66/95 Sutton [1997] ECR I-2163 §33
Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §67

In the absence of relevant Community provisions, *it is for the domestic legal system of each Member State to set the criteria for determining the extent of reparation*. However, those *criteria must not be less favourable* than those applying to similar claims based *on domestic law* and must not be such as in practice to make it impossible or excessively difficult to obtain reparation.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §83

Accordingly, the reply to the national court's question must be that the *obligation for Member States* to make good loss or damage caused to individuals by breaches of Community law attributable to the State *cannot be limited to damage sustained after the delivery of a judgment of the Court finding the infringement in question.*

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §96

8 PROCEDURAL GUARANTIES IN CONNECTION WITH RESTRICTIONS

8.1 OBLIGATION TO VERIFY AND COMPARE ON THE PART OF THE STATE OF DESTINATION

Likewise, in applying their national provisions, Member States may not ignore the knowledge and qualifications already acquired by the person concerned in another Member State (see Case C-340/89 *Vlassopoulou v Ministerium fuer Justiz, Bundes- und Europaangelegenheiten Baden-Wuerttemberg* [1991] ECR I-2357, paragraph 15). Consequently, they must take account of the equivalence of diplomas (see the judgment in *Thieffry*, paragraphs 19 and 27) and, if necessary, *proceed to a comparison of the knowledge and qualifications required by their national rules and those of the person concerned* (see the judgment in *Vlassopoulou*, paragraph 16).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §38

Thus, *the authorisation procedure must in the first place be intended solely to verify whether the postgraduate academic title obtained in another Member State was properly awarded*, following a course of studies which was actually completed, in an establishment of higher education which was competent to award it.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §38

Consequently, *a Member State* which receives a request to admit a person to a profession to which access, under national law, depends upon the possession of a diploma or a professional qualification *must take into consideration the diplomas, certificates and other evidence of qualifications which the person concerned has acquired in order to exercise the same profession in another Member State by making a comparison between the specialised knowledge and abilities certified by those diplomas and the knowledge and qualifications required by the national rules.*

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §16

That examination procedure must enable the authorities of the host Member State to assure themselves, on an objective basis, that the foreign diploma certifies that its holder has knowledge and qualifications which are, if not identical, at least equivalent to those certified by the national diploma. That assessment of the *equivalence* of the foreign diploma must be carried out *exclusively in the light of the level of knowledge and qualifications* which its holder can be assumed to possess in the light of that diploma, having regard to the nature and duration of the studies and practical training to which the diploma relates (see the judgment in Case 222/86 *UNECTEF v Heylens*, cited above, paragraph 13).

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §17

8.2 OTHER PROCEDURAL GUARANTIES: REASON FOR REFUSAL, RIGHT TO LEGAL PROCEEDINGS, PENALTIES

In the absence of Community rules governing the matter, the Member States remain competent to impose penalties for breach of such an obligation. However, it follows from settled case-law concerning non-compliance with formalities for establishing the right of residence of an individual enjoying the protection of Community law that *Member States may not impose a penalty so disproportionate to the gravity of the infringement that this becomes an obstacle to the free movement of persons; this would be especially so if the penalty consisted of imprisonment* (see, in particular, Case C-265/88 *Messner* [1989] ECR 4209, paragraph 14). In view of the effect which the right to drive a motor vehicle has on the actual exercise of the rights relating to the free movement of persons, the same considerations must apply with regard to breach of the obligation to exchange driving licences.

Case C-193/94 Skanavi [1996] ECR I-929 §36

Moreover, *verification of the academic title*, referred to in paragraph 38 of this judgment, *must be carried out by the national authorities in accordance with a procedure which is in conformity with the requirements of Community law as regards the effective protection of the fundamental rights conferred by the Treaty on Community nationals*. It follows that any *refusal of authorisation by the competent national authority must be capable of being subject to judicial proceedings* in which its legality under Community law can be reviewed and that *the person concerned must be able to ascertain the reasons for the decision taken with respect to him* (see judgment in *Heylens*, cited above, paragraphs 14 to 17, and judgment in Case 340/89 *Vlassopoulou v Ministerium für Justiz, Bundes-und Europaangelegenheiten Baden-Württemberg* [1991] ECR I-2357, paragraph 22).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §40

It follows that the answer to the question put by the national court must be that Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty must be interpreted as meaning that they do not preclude a Member State from prohibiting one of its own nationals, who holds a postgraduate academic title awarded in another Member State, from using that title on its territory without having obtained an administrative authorisation for that purpose, provided that the authorisation procedure is intended solely to verify whether the postgraduate academic title was properly awarded, *that the procedure is easily accessible and does not call for the payment of excessive administrative fees, that any refusal of authorisation is capable of being subject to proceedings, that the person concerned is able to ascertain the reasons for the decision and that the penalties prescribed for non-compliance with the authorisation procedure are not disproportionate to the gravity of the offence*.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §42

9 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

9.1 RELATION TO OTHER PRIMARY LAW

9.1.1 Article 2 EC

In response to those arguments, it is to be remembered that, having regard to the objectives of the Community, *sport is subject to Community law only in so far as it constitutes an economic activity within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty* (see Case 36/74 *Walrave v Union Cycliste Internationale* [1974] ECR 1405, paragraph 4). This applies to the activities of professional or semi-professional footballers, where they are in gainful employment or provide a remunerated service (see Case 13/76 *Donà v Mantero* [1976] ECR 1333, paragraph 12).

Case C-415/93 *Bosman* [1995] ECR I-4353 §73

It must be observed *in limine* that, in view of the objectives of the European Economic Community, *participation in a community based on religion or another form of philosophy* falls within the field of application of Community law only *in so far as it can be regarded as an economic activity* within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty.

Case C-196/87 *Steymann* [1988] ECR 6159 §9

Having regard to the objectives of the Community, *the practice of sport is subject to Community law only in so far as it constitutes an economic activity* within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty. This applies to the activities of professional or semi-professional football players, which are in the nature of gainful employment or remunerated service.

Case C-13/76 *Donà* [1976] ECR 1333 §12

Having regard to the objectives of the Community, *the practice of sport is subject to Community law only in so far as it constitutes an economic activity* within the meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty.

Case C-36/74 *Walrave* [1974] ECR 1405 §4

9.1.2 Article 3 EC

The Court has confirmed that Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty implement the fundamental principle contained in Article 3c of the Treaty in which it is stated that, for the purposes set out in Article 2, *the activities of the Community are to include the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to freedom of movement for persons* (see, in particular, judgments in Case 118/75 *Watson and Belmann* [1976] ECR 1185, paragraph 16; in *Heylens*, cited above, paragraph 8 and in Case C-370/90 *The Queen, ex parte Secretary of State for the Home Department v Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Surinder Singh* [1992] ECR I-4265).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §29

Under Article 3 of the Treaty, the activities of the Community include, *inter alia*, *the abolition of obstacles* to freedom of movement for persons and services.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §7

With a view to attaining this objective, the first paragraph of Article 52 provides that restrictions on the freedom of establishment of nationals of a Member State in the territory of another Member State shall be abolished *by progressive stages in the course of the transitional period*.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §8

9.1.3 Article 10 EC (formerly Article 5 EC)

It must be emphasised that *the difference of treatment applied according to whether or not the business of the holding company belonging to the consortium consists wholly or mainly in holding shares in subsidiaries having their seat in non-member countries lies outside the scope of Community law*.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §32

Consequently, *Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty do not preclude domestic legislation under which tax relief is not granted to a resident consortium member where the business of the holding company owned by that consortium consists wholly or mainly in holding shares in subsidiaries which have their seat in non-member countries. Nor does Article 5 apply*.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §33

Consequently, in circumstances such as those in point in the main proceedings, **Article 5** of the Treaty *does not require the national court to interpret its legislation in conformity with Community law or to disapply the legislation in a situation falling outside the scope of Community law.*

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §35

Furthermore, *Member States are required*, in conformity with Article 5 of the Treaty, *to take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of the Treaty and to abstain from any measures which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives of the Treaty.*

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §31

Moreover, it is also clear from the judgment in Case 71/76 Thieffry v Conseil de l'Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris [1977] ECR 765, at paragraph 16, that, in so far as Community law makes no special provision, the objectives of the Treaty, and in particular freedom of establishment, may be achieved by measures enacted by the Member States, which, under **Article 5 of the Treaty**, *must take "all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of this Treaty* or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community" and abstain from "any measure which could jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of this Treaty".

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR 2357 §14
Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §16

9.1.4 Article 12 EC (formerly Article 6 EC and Article 7 EEC)

The Court has held that *the general prohibition of discrimination on grounds of nationality laid down in Article 7 of the EEC Treaty has been implemented by Article 52* of that Treaty in the specific domain which it governs and that, consequently, any rules incompatible with the latter provision are also incompatible with Article 7 of the Treaty (*Commission v United Kingdom*, paragraph 18). Article 7 of the EEC Treaty has become Article 6 of the EC Treaty.

Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §13

The Court has consistently held that **Article 6** of the Treaty, which lays down the general principle of the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of nationality, *applies independently only to situations governed by Community law in respect of which the Treaty lays down no specific prohibition of discrimination* (see, in particular, Case C-18/93 *Corsica Ferries Italia v Corpo dei Piloti del Porto di Genova* [1994] ECR I-1783, paragraph 19).

Case C-193/94 Skanavi [1996] ECR I- 929 §20

The principle of non-discrimination was implemented and specifically laid down, in relation to the right of establishment, by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-193/94 Skanavi [1996] ECR I- 929 §21

Under Article 7 of the Treaty the prohibition of discrimination applies "within the scope of application of this Treaty" and "without prejudice to any special provisions contained therein". This latter expression refers particularly to other provisions of the Treaty in which the application of the general principle set out in that article is given concrete form in respect of specific situations. *Examples of that are the provisions concerning free movement of workers, the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services.*

Case C-186/87 Cowan [1989] ECR 195 §14

Article 7 of the Treaty, which forms part of the ‘principle’ of the Community, provides that within the scope of application of the Treaty and *without prejudice to any special provisions* contained therein, ‘*any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited*’.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §15

Article 52 provides for the implementation of this general provision in the special sphere of the right of establishment.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §16

9.1.5 Article 18 EC (formerly Article 8A EC)

Article 8a of the Treaty, which sets out generally the right of every citizen of the Union to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, *finds specific expression in Article 52 of the Treaty*. Since the facts with which the main proceedings are concerned fall within the scope of the latter provision, it is not necessary to rule on the interpretation of Article 8a.

Case C-193/94 Skanavi [1996] ECR I- 929 §22

9.1.6 Article 39 EC (formerly Article 48 EC)

As the Court of Justice held in Joined Cases 115/181 [*sic*] and 116/81 *Adoui and Cornuaille v Belgian State* [1982] ECR 1665, paragraph 7, ***the reservations contained in Articles 48 and 56*** of the EC Treaty ***permit Member States to adopt***, with respect to the nationals of other Member States and on the grounds specified in those provisions, in particular grounds justified by the requirements of public policy, ***measures which they cannot apply to their own nationals***, inasmuch as they have no authority to expel the latter from the national territory or to deny them access thereto.

Joined Cases C-65/95 and C-111/95 *Shingara & Radiom* [1997] ECR I-3343 §28

Furthermore, according to the order for reference, ***Mr Kemmler is not an employed person but a self-employed person with professional establishments in both Frankfurt and Brussels. His situation is not therefore covered by Articles 48 and 51*** of the Treaty, which concern the free movement of workers, or by Article 59, which concerns the freedom to provide services. ***Since Mr Kemmler has a stable and permanent establishment in both the Member States concerned, only Article 52, concerning the right of establishment, is relevant to the decision in the case.***

Case C-53/95 *Inasti* [1996] ECR I-703 §8

The same reasoning must be followed as regards Article 48 of the Treaty. In its judgment in *Knoors*, cited above (paragraph 20), the Court held that freedom of movement for workers and the right of establishment guaranteed by ***Article 48 and 52 of the Treaty were fundamental rights in the Community system***, and would not be fully realised if the Member States were able to refuse to grant the benefit of the provisions of Community law to those of their nationals who had taken advantage of its provisions to acquire vocational qualifications in a Member State other than that of which they were nationals.

Case C-19/92 *Kraus* [1993] ECR I-1663 §16

His position might therefore come within the chapter of the Treaty on workers, more particularly Article 48, ***or*** within the chapters on the right of establishment and on services, in particular Articles 52, 56 and 59.

Case C-106/91 *Ramrath* [1992] ECR I-3351 §16

Furthermore, ***a comparison of those different provisions shows that they are based on the same principles*** as regards both the entry into and residence in the territory of the Member States of persons covered by Community law and also the prohibition of all discrimination against them on grounds of nationality.

Case C-106/91 *Ramrath* [1992] ECR I-3351 §17

On that point it should be observed that *Articles 48 and 52 of the EEC Treaty afford the same legal protection* and that therefore the classification of an economic activity is without significance.

Case C-363/89 Roux [1991] ECR 273 §23

It is clear from the actual wording of Article 60 that *an activity carried out on a permanent basis* or, in any event, without a foreseeable limit to its duration does not fall within the Community provisions concerning the provision of services. On the other hand, such activities *may fall within the scope of Articles 48 to 51 or Articles 52 to 58 of the Treaty, depending on the case.*

Case C-196/87 Steymann [1988] ECR 6159 §16

9.1.7 Article 44 EC (formerly Article 54 EC)

It must be pointed out that *Article 54(3)(g) must be read in the light not only of Article 52 and 54 of the EC Treaty*, which clearly show that the *coordination of systems of company law forms part of the general programme for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment, but also of Article 3(h) of that Treaty* which provides that the *activities of the Community are to include the approximation of national laws to the extent required for the functioning of the common market.*

Case C-97/96 Daihatsu [1997] ECR I-6843 §18

Furthermore the very wording of Article 54(3)(g) of the Treaty refers to *the need to protect the interests of 'others' generally*, without distinguishing or excluding any categories falling within the ambit of that term.

Case C-97/96 Daihatsu [1997] ECR I-6843 §19

Consequently *the term 'others'*, as contemplated in Article 54(3)(g) of the Treaty *cannot be limited merely to creditors* of the company.

Case C-97/96 Daihatsu [1997] ECR I-6843 §20

Moreover, *the objective of abolishing restrictions on freedom of establishment*, which is assigned in very broad terms to the Council and the Commission by Article 54(1) and (2) of the Treaty, *cannot be circumscribed by the provisions of Article 54(3). Article 54(3) merely sets out a non-exhaustive list of measures to be taken in order to attain that objective*, as is borne out by the use in that provision of the words 'in particular'.

Case C-97/96 Daihatsu [1997] ECR I-6843 §21

It is not possible to invoke against the direct effect of the rule on equal treatment with nationals contained in Article 52 the fact that the Council has failed to issue the directives provided for by Articles 54 and 57 or the fact that certain of the directives actually issued have not fully attained the objectives of non-discrimination required by Article 52.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §12

In these circumstances *the ‘general programme’ and the directives provided for by Article 54 were of significance only during the transitional period*, since the freedom of establishment was fully attained at the end of it.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §13

For the purpose of achieving this objective by progressive stages during the transitional period *Article 54 provides for the drawing up by the Council of a ‘general programme’ and, for the implementation of this programme, directives intended to attain freedom of establishment* in respect of the various activities in question.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §19

It is right therefore to reply to the question raised that, *since the end of the transitional period, Article 52 of the Treaty is a directly applicable provision despite the absence in a particular sphere, of the directives prescribed by Articles 54(2) and 57(1) of the Treaty.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §32

9.1.8 Article 47 EC (formerly Article 57 EC)

It must be observed, first, that *the Directive*, which is based on Articles 49, 57(1) and 66 of the Treaty, *aims to facilitate freedom of movement of persons and services by allowing nationals of the Member States to pursue a profession, on a self-employed or employed basis, in a Member State other than that in which they have obtained their professional qualification.*

Joined Cases C-225/95, C-226/95 and C-227/95 Kapasalakis [1998] ECR I-0000 §18

Consequently, the Member States may in certain circumstances, adopt or maintain measures constituting an obstacle to free movement. *Article 57(2) of the Treaty authorizes the Community to eliminate obstacles of that kind in particular by coordinating the provisions laid down by law, regulation, or administrative action in Member States concerning the taking-up and pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.* Since coordinating measures are concerned, the Community is to have regard to the public interest aims of various Member States and to adopt a level of protection for that interest which seems acceptable in the Community.

Case C-233/94 Germany/Parliament and Council [1997] ECR I-2405 §17

It is not possible to invoke against the direct effect of the rule on equal treatment with nationals contained in Article 52 *the fact that the Council has failed to issue the directives provided for by Articles 54 and 57 or the fact that certain of the directives actually issued have not fully attained the objectives of non-discrimination required by Article 52.*

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §12

With a view to making it easier for persons to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons, Article 57 assigns to the Council the duty of issuing directives concerning, first, the mutual recognition of diplomas, and secondly, the co-ordination of the provisions laid down by law or administrative action in Member States concerning the taking up and pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §11

That Article is therefore directed towards *reconciling freedom of establishment with the application of national professional rules justified by the general good*, in particular rules relating to organisation, qualifications, professional ethics, supervision and liability, provided that such application is effected without discrimination.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §12

Consequently, if the freedom of establishment provided for by Article 52 can be ensured in a Member State either under the provisions of the laws and regulations in force, or by virtue of the practices of the public service or of professional bodies, *a person subject to Community law cannot be denied the practical benefit of that freedom solely by virtue of the fact that, for a particular profession, the directives provided for by Article 57 of the Treaty have not yet been adopted.*

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §17

Besides these liberalising measures, *Article 57 provides for directives intended to ensure mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications and in a general way for the co-ordination of laws with regard to establishment and the pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §20

It appears from the above that in the system of the chapter on the right of establishment the ‘general programme’ and the directives provided for by the Treaty are intended to accomplish two functions, the first being *to eliminate obstacles* in the way of attaining freedom of establishment during the transitional period, the second being *to introduce into the law of Member States a set of provisions intended to facilitate the effective exercise of this freedom* for the purpose of assisting economic and social interpenetration within the Community in the sphere of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §21

9.1.9 Article 48 EC (formerly Article 58 EC)

As regards Article 58 of the Treaty, taken in isolation (second question), it must be borne in mind that *the effect of that provision is to assimilate*, for the purpose of giving effect to the chapter relating to the right of establishment, *companies or firms* formed in accordance with the law of a Member State and having their registered office, central administration or principal place of business within the Community, *to natural persons* who are nationals of one of the Member States, although non-profit making companies are excluded from the benefit of that chapter (see Case 182/83 *Fearon v Irish Land Commission* [1984] ECR 3677, paragraph 8). *Since that provision does no more than define the class of persons to whom the provisions on the right of establishment apply*, it cannot preclude, as such, national rules of the kind at issue in the main proceedings.

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §25

As regards Article 52 of the Treaty, read in conjunction with Article 58 thereof (third question), it must be borne in mind that *the right of establishment* with which those provisions are concerned *is granted both to natural persons* who are nationals of a Member State of the Community *and to legal persons* within the meaning of Article 58. Subject to the exceptions and conditions laid down, *it allows all types of self-employed activity to be taken up and pursued on the territory of any other Member State, undertakings to be formed and operated and agencies, branches or subsidiaries to be set up* (*Gebhard*, cited above, paragraph 23).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §26

The Treaty has taken account of that variety in national legislation. In defining, in Article 58, the companies which enjoy the right of establishment, *the Treaty places on the same footing, as connecting factors, the registered office, central administration and principal place of business of a company*. Moreover, Article 220 of the Treaty provides for the conclusion, so far as is necessary, of agreements between the Member States with a view to securing inter alia the retention of legal personality in the event of transfer of the registered office of companies from one country to another. No convention in this area has yet come into force.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §21

Under those circumstances, *Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty cannot be interpreted as conferring on companies incorporated under the law of a Member State a right to transfer their central management and control and their central administration to another Member State while retaining their status as companies incorporated under the legislation of the first Member State*.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 § 24

The answer to the first part of the first question must therefore be that in the present state of Community law *Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty, properly construed, confer no right on a company incorporated under the legislation of a Member State and having its registered office there to transfer its central management and control to another Member State*.

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §25

9.1.10 Article 49 (formerly Article 59) et seq. EC

Since the Luxembourg company is involved on a stable and continuous basis in the economic life of Italy, that situation falls within the provisions of the chapter on freedom of establishment, namely Articles 52 to 58, and not those of the chapter concerning services (see, to that effect, Case 2/74 *Reyners v Belgian State* [1974] ECR 631, paragraph 21, and Case C-55/94 *Gebhard v Consiglio degli Avvocati e Procuratori di Milano* [1995] ECR I-4165, paragraph 25).

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §24

Furthermore, according to the order for reference, Mr Kemmler is not an employed person but a self-employed person with professional establishments in both Frankfurt and Brussels. His situation is not therefore covered by Articles 48 and 51 of the Treaty, which concern the free movement of workers, or by Article 59, which concerns the freedom to provide services. *Since Mr Kemmler has a stable and permanent establishment in both the Member States concerned, only Article 52, concerning the right of establishment, is relevant to the decision in the case.*

Case C-53/95 Inasti [1996] ECR I-703 §8

The situation of a *Community national who moves to another Member State of the Community in order there to pursue an economic activity is governed by the chapter of the Treaty on the free movement of workers, or the chapter on the right of establishment or the chapter on services, these being mutually exclusive.*

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §20

The provisions of the chapter on services are subordinate to those of the chapter on the right of establishment in so far, first, as the wording of the first paragraph of Article 59 assumes that the provider and the recipient of the service concerned are "established" in two different Member States and, second, *as the first paragraph of Article 60 specifies that the provisions relating to services apply only if those relating to the right of establishment do not apply.* It is therefore necessary to consider the scope of the concept of "establishment".

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §22

.../...

As the Advocate General has pointed out, the temporary nature of the activities in question has to be determined in the light, not only of the duration of the provision of the service, but also of its regularity, periodicity or continuity. *The fact that the provision of services is temporary does not mean that the provider of services within the meaning of the Treaty may not equip himself with some form of infrastructure in the host Member State* (including an office, chambers or consulting rooms) in so far as such infrastructure is necessary for the purposes of performing the services in question.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §27

However, that situation is to be distinguished from that of Mr Gebhard who, as a national of a Member State, pursues a *professional activity on a stable and continuous basis in another Member State where he holds himself out from an established professional base* to, amongst others, nationals of that State. *Such a national comes under the provisions of the chapter relating to the right of establishment* and not those of the chapter relating to services.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §28

It follows that a Member State may regard as a *domestic broadcaster a radio and television organisation which establishes itself in another Member State in order to provide services there which are intended for the first State's territory*, since the aim of that measure is to prevent organisations which establish themselves in another Member State from being able, by exercising the freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty, *wrongfully to avoid obligations under national law*, in this case those designed to ensure the pluralist and non-commercial content of programmes.

Case C-23/93 TV10 [1994] ECR I-4795 §21

In those circumstances it cannot be regarded as incompatible with the provisions of Articles 59 and 60 of the Treaty to treat such organisations as domestic organisations.

Case C-23/93 TV10 [1994] ECR I-4795 §22

In that connection, the Netherlands Government and the Commission rightly observed that Articles 59 and 60 of the Treaty do not apply in such a case. *It is clear from the actual wording of Article 60 that an activity carried out on a permanent basis or, in any event, without a foreseeable limit to its duration does not fall within the Community provisions concerning the provision of services.* On the other hand, such activities may fall within the scope of Articles 48 to 51 or Articles 52 to 58 of the Treaty, depending on the case.

Case C-196/87 Steymann [1988] ECR 6159 §16

In that respect, it must be acknowledged that *an insurance undertaking of another Member State which maintains a permanent presence in the Member State in question comes within the scope of the provisions of the Treaty on the right of establishment, even if that presence does not take the form of a branch or agency, but consists merely of an office managed by the undertaking's own staff or by a person who is independent but authorised to act on a permanent basis for the undertaking, as would be the case with an agency.* In the light of the aforementioned definition contained in the first paragraph of Article 60, such an insurance undertaking cannot therefore avail itself of Articles 59 and 60 with regard to its activities in the Member State in question.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §21

Similarly, as the Court held in its judgment of 3 December 1974 (Case 33/74 *Van Binsbergen v Bedrijfsvereniging Metaalnijverheid* [1974] ECR 1299) ***a Member State cannot be denied the right to take measures to prevent the exercise by a person providing services whose activity is entirely or principally directed towards its territory of the freedom guaranteed by Article 59 for the purpose of avoiding the professional rules of conduct which would be applicable to him if he were established within that State.*** Such a situation may be subject to judicial control under the provisions of the chapter relating to the right of establishment and not of that on the provision of services.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §22

9.1.11 Article 293 EC (formerly Article 220 EC)

The Treaty has taken account of that variety in national legislation. In defining, in Article 58, the companies which enjoy the right of establishment, the Treaty places on the same footing, as connecting factors, the registered office, central administration and principal place of business of a company. Moreover, ***Article 220 of the Treaty provides for the conclusion, so far as is necessary, of agreements between the Member States with a view to securing inter alia the retention of legal personality in the event of transfer of the registered office of companies from one country to another. No convention in this area has yet come into force.***

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §21

9.1.12 Article 294 EC (formerly Article 221 EC)

Furthermore, ***the condition relating to the control of the capital of certain legal persons owning vessels is also contrary to Article 221 of the Treaty since it restricts participation by nationals of other Member States in the capital of such legal persons.***

Case C-334/94 Commission v France [1996] ECR I-1307 §18

In the case of a company, the right of establishment is generally exercised by the setting-up of agencies, branches or subsidiaries, as is expressly provided for in the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52. Indeed, that is the form of establishment in which the applicant engaged in this case by opening an investment management office in the Netherlands. A company may also exercise its right of establishment by taking part in the incorporation of a company in another Member State, and in that regard ***Article 221 of the Treaty ensures that it will receive the same treatment as nationals of that Member State as regards participation in the capital of the new company.***

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §17

9.2 RELATION TO SECONDARY LAW

9.2.1 Absence of Harmonisation

In the absence of harmonisation of the conditions under which a person holding a postgraduate academic title may make use of it in Member States other than the one in which it was awarded, *the Member States remain, as a matter of principle, competent to lay down the detailed rules governing the use of such a title on their territory.*

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §27

Community law does not preclude a Member State from adopting, in the absence of harmonisation, measures designed to prevent the opportunities created under the Treaty from being abused in a manner contrary to the legitimate interests of the State (see the judgment in Knoors, cited above, paragraph 25).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §34

9.2.2 During the Transitional Period

In these circumstances *the 'general programme' and the directives provided for by Article 54 were of significance only during the transitional period*, since the freedom of establishment was fully attained at the end of it.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §13

It appears from the above that in the system of the chapter on the right of establishment the '*general programme*' and the directives provided for by the Treaty are intended to accomplish two functions, the first being *to eliminate obstacles in the way of attaining freedom of establishment during the transitional period*, the second being *to introduce into the law of Member States a set of provisions intended to facilitate the effective exercise of this freedom* for the purpose of assisting economic and social interpenetration within the Community in the sphere of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §21

9.2.2.1 General Programmes

In particular as is apparent from Article 54(3)(e) of the Treaty *and the General programme for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment of 18 December 1961* (Official Journal, English Special Edition, Second Series IX, p.7), *the right to acquire, use or dispose of immovable property on the territory of a Member State is the corollary of freedom of establishment.*

Case C-305/87 Commission v Greece [1989] ECR 1461 §22

The same idea is expressed by Title I of *the general programme* for the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment, *which designates as beneficiaries, in the first and third indents, the “nationals of member states” without any distinction as regards nationality or residence.*

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §16

For the purpose of achieving this objective by progressive stages during the transitional period *Article 54 provides for the drawing up by the Council of a ‘general programme’* and, for the implementation of this programme, directives intended to attain freedom of establishment in respect of the various activities in question.

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §19

9.2.2.2 Role of Directives

For the purpose of achieving this objective by progressive stages during the transitional period Article 54 provides for the drawing up by the Council of a ‘general programme’ and, for the implementation of this programme, directives intended to attain freedom of establishment in respect of the various activities in question.

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §19

9.2.3 After the Transitional Period

At the end of the transitional period, the Member States no longer have the possibility of maintaining restrictions on the freedom of establishment, since *Article 52 has*, as from this period, *the character of a provision which is complete in itself and legally perfect.*

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §12

9.2.3.1 Role of Directives

It must be observed, first, that *the Directive*, which is based on Articles 49, 57(1) and 66 of the Treaty, *aims to facilitate freedom of movement* of persons and services *by allowing nationals of the Member States to pursue a profession, on a self-employed or employed basis, in a Member State other than that in which they have obtained their professional qualification.*

Joined Cases C-225/95, C-226/95 and C-227/95 Kapasalakis [1998] ECR I-0000 §18

In that regard, it should be noted that, whilst those provisions, which have direct effect, prohibit imposing unjustified restrictions on the freedoms concerned, they are not sufficient in themselves to ensure elimination of all obstacles to free movement of persons, services and capital, and that *the directives provided for by the Treaty in this matter preserve an important scope in the field of measures intended to make easier the effective exercise of the rights arising out of those provisions* (see, as far as freedom of establishment is concerned, Case 2/74 *Reyners* [1974] ECR 631, paragraphs 29, 30 and 31).

Case C-57/95 France v Commission [1997] ECR I-1627 §20

It is not possible to invoke against the direct effect of the rule on equal treatment with nationals contained in Article 52 *the fact that the Council has failed to issue the directives* provided for by Articles 54 and 57 *or the fact that certain of the directives actually issued have not fully attained the objectives of non-discrimination* required by Article 52.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §12

After the expiry of the transitional period the directives provided for by the chapter on the right of establishment *have become superfluous* with regard to implementing the rule on nationality, since this is henceforth sanctioned by the Treaty itself with direct effect.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §13

See also: Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §30

Besides these liberalising measures, *Article 57 provides for directives intended to ensure mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications and in a general way for the co-ordination of laws with regard to establishment and the pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.*

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §20

These directives have however not lost all interest since they preserve an important scope in the field of measures intended to make easier the effective exercise of the right of freedom of establishment.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §31

It is right therefore to reply to the question raised that, since the end of the transitional period, Article 52 of the Treaty is a directly applicable provision *despite the absence in a particular sphere, of the directives* prescribed by Articles 54(2) and 57(1) of the Treaty.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §32

9.2.3.2 Sector-based Directives

The effect of the machinery established by the Directive is to prevent the Member States from invoking depositor protection in order to impede the activities of credit institutions authorized in other Member States. Accordingly, it is clear, that *the Directive abolishes obstacles to the right of establishment* and the freedom to provide services.

Case C-233/94 Germany/Parliament and Council [1997] ECR I-2405 §19

As far as *Directive 64/223* is concerned, the aim of that directive is the attainment, *in the field of wholesale trade activities*, of freedom of establishment, as guaranteed, with direct effect after the expiry of the transition period, by Article 52 of the Treaty (see the judgment in Case 198/86 *Conradi and Others* [1987] ECR 4469, paragraph 8).

Case C-418/93 Semeraro [1996] ECR I-2975 §30

There is therefore no need to examine Directive 64/223 separately from Article 52 in this instance.

Case C-418/93 Semeraro [1996] ECR I-2975 §31

The answer to the second question must therefore be that *Directive 73/148*, properly construed, *confers no right on a company to transfer its central management and control to another Member State.*

Case C-81/87 Daily Mail [1988] ECR 5483 §29

The purpose of directive **77/249** is to facilitate the *effective exercise by lawyers of the freedom to provide services*. To that end the directive requires the Member States to recognise as a lawyer for the purpose of pursuing the activities of lawyers any person established in another Member State as a lawyer under one of the designations set out in Article 2(1), which include "Rechtsanwalt" in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Case C-292/86 Gullung [1988] ECR 111 §15

Directive no 64/427 is intended to facilitate the realisation of freedom of establishment and of freedom to provide services *in a large group of trade activities relating to industry and small craft industries*, pending the harmonisation of the conditions for access to the trades in question in the various Member States, which is an indispensable precondition for complete freedom in this sphere.

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §9

It may therefore be stated that **Directive no 64/427** is based on a broad definition of the "beneficiaries" of its provisions, in the sense that the nationals of all Member States must be able to avail themselves of the liberalising measures which it lays down, provided that they come objectively within one of the situations provided for by the directive, and no differentiation of treatment on the basis of their residence or nationality is permitted.

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §17

In this case, however, it should be borne in mind that, having regard to the nature of the trades in question, *the precise conditions set out in Article 3 of Directive no 64/427*, as regards the length of periods during which the activity in question must have been pursued, *have the effect of excluding*, in the fields in question, *the risk of abuse* referred to by the Netherlands government.

Case C-115/78 Knoors [1979] ECR 399 §26

9.3 RELATION TO NATIONAL LAW

The right to take up or pursue a profession must be regarded as directly governed by legal provisions where the laws, regulations or administrative provisions of the Member State concerned create a system under which that professional activity is expressly restricted to those who fulfil certain conditions and entry to it is denied to those who do not (see *Aranitis*, cited above, paragraph 19).

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §17

Thus, *the terms of a collective agreement which, in a general way, governs the right to take up or pursue a profession may constitute 'laws, regulations or administrative provisions'* for the purposes of Article 1(d) of Directive 89/48 and Article 1(f) of Directive 92/51, *particularly where that is the result of a single administrative policy laid down at national level.*

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §20

Next, consideration must be given to the question whether a collective agreement does, in a general way, govern the right to take up or pursue a profession. *If the terms of an agreement entered into by a public body such as the Prado and its staff representatives are common to other collective agreements entered into on an individual basis by other public bodies of the same kind and, furthermore, are the result of a single administrative policy laid down at national level, then those agreements may be sufficiently general in scope for their terms to be classified as rules regulating a professional activity* for the purposes of Directives 89/48 and 92/51.

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §22

In contrast, *where the terms of a collective agreement govern relations only between the employer and the employees within a single public body, they will in most cases not be sufficiently general in scope for the relevant professional activities to be classified as a regulated profession* for the purposes of Directives 89/48 and 92/51.

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §23

Although direct taxation is a matter for the *Member States*, they *must* nevertheless *exercise their direct taxation powers consistently with Community law* (see Case C-279/93 *Schumacker* [1995] ECR I-225, paragraphs 21; Case C-80/94 *Wielockx* [1995] ECR I-2493, paragraph 16; and Case C-107/94 *Asscher* [1996] ECR I-3089, paragraph 36; and Case C-250/95 *Futura Participations and Singer* [1997] ECR I-2471, paragraph 19).

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §19

Accordingly, *when deciding an issue concerning a situation which lies outside the scope of Community law, the national court is not required, under Community law, either to interpret its legislation in a way conforming with Community law or disapply that legislation. Where a particular provision must be disapplied in a situation covered by Community law, but that same provision could remain applicable to a situation not so covered, it is for the competent body of the State concerned to remove that legal uncertainty in so far as it might affect rights deriving from Community rules.*

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §34

In assessing the compatibility of the non-profit condition with those provisions of the Treaty, it must first be borne in mind that, as the Court has already held in Case 238/82 *Duphar and Other v Netherlands State* [1984] ECR 523, paragraph 16, and Joined Cases C-159/91 and C-160/91 *Poucet and Pistre v AGF and Cancava* [1993] ECR I-637, paragraph 6, ***Community law does not detract from the powers of the Member States to organize their social security systems.***

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §27

It should be specified in this connection that, unlike in Case C-15/90 *Middleburgh* [1991] ECR I-4655, paragraphs 14 and 15, the rules which, ***as regards freedom of establishment***, are essential for the purpose, in particular of ensuring that benefits are in fact used for the upkeep of dependent children and avoiding overlapping payments, have been adopted by the Community legislators as regards the periods in question. ***In cases such as those before the national court, therefore, the national authorities must apply by analogy such of those rules as are applicable to self-employed persons coming within the scope of Regulation No 1408/71.***

Joined Cases C-4/95 and C-5/95 Stöber and Piosa Pereira [1997] ECR I-511 §40

On that point, it must however be stressed that Community law sets limits to the exercise of those powers by the Member States in so far as ***provisions of national law adopted in that connection must not constitute an obstacle to the effective exercise of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty*** (see, to that effect, the judgment in Case 222/86 *UNECTEF v Heylens and Others* [1987] ECR 4097, paragraph 11).

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §28

Although in principle ***criminal legislation and the rules of criminal procedure***, among which the national provision in issue is to be found, ***are matters for which the Member States are responsible***, the Court has consistently held (see *inter alia* the judgment of 11 November 1981 in Case 203/80 *Casati* ((1981)) ECR 2595) that ***Community law sets certain limits to their power. Such legislative provisions may not discriminate against persons*** to whom Community law gives the right to equal treatment or restrict the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Community law.

Case C-186/87 Cowan [1989] ECR 195 §19

It must be observed in that regard that ***directly applicable provisions of the Treaty are binding on all the authorities of the Member States and they must therefore comply with them without its being necessary to adopt national implementing provisions.*** However, as the Court held in its judgment of 20 March 1986 in Case 72/85 (*Commission v Netherlands* (1986) ECR 1219), the right of individuals to rely on directly applicable provisions of the Treaty before national courts is only a minimum guarantee and is not sufficient in itself to ensure the full and complete implementation of the Treaty. It is clear from previous judgments of the Court, in particular its judgment of 25 October 1979, cited above, that ***if a provision of national law that is incompatible with a provision of the Treaty, even one directly applicable in the legal order of the Member States, is retained unchanged, this creates an ambiguous state of affairs*** by keeping the persons concerned in a state of uncertainty as to the possibility of relying on Community law and that ***maintaining such a provision in force therefore amounts to a failure by the state in question to comply with its obligations under the Treaty.***

Case C-168/85 Commission v Italy [1986] ECR 2945 §11

However, it may be seen from the provisions of Articles 54 and 57 of the Treaty that ***freedom of establishment is not completely ensured by the mere application of the rule of national treatment, as such application retains all obstacles other than those resulting from the non-possession of the nationality of the host State and, in particular, those resulting from the disparity of the conditions laid down by the different national laws for the acquisition of an appropriate professional qualification.***

Case C-136/78 Auer [1979] ECR 437 §21

However, it is not possible to disregard the legitimate interest which a Member State may have in preventing certain of its nationals, by means of facilities created under the Treaty, from attempting wrongly to evade the application of their national legislation as regards training for a trade.

Case C-115/78 Knoods [1979] ECR 399 §25

In so far as Community law makes no special provision, these objectives may be attained by measures enacted by the *Member States*, which under Article 5 of the Treaty ***are bound to take ‘all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of this Treaty or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community’, and to abstain ‘from any measure which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives of this Treaty’.***

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §16

The fact that a *national legislation provides for recognition of equivalence only for university purposes does not of itself justify the refusal to recognise such equivalence* as evidence of a professional qualification.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §25

In these circumstances, the answer to the question referred to the Court should be that *when a national of one Member State desirous of exercising a professional activity such as the profession of advocate in another Member State has obtained a diploma in his country of origin which has been recognised as an equivalent qualification by the competent authority under the legislation of the country of establishment* and which has thus enabled him to sit and pass the special qualifying examination for the profession in question, *the act of demanding the national diploma prescribed by the legislation of the country of establishment constitutes*, even in the absence of the directives provided for in Article 57, *a restriction incompatible with the freedom of establishment guaranteed by Article 52 of the Treaty.*

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §27

Besides these liberalising measures, Article 57 provides for directives intended to ensure *mutual recognition* of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications and in a general way for the *co-ordination of laws with regard to establishment and the pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.*

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §20

It appears from the above that in the system of the chapter on the right of establishment the 'general programme' and the directives provided for by the Treaty are intended to accomplish two functions, the first being to eliminate obstacles in the way of attaining freedom of establishment during the transitional period, the second being *to introduce into the law of Member States a set of provisions intended to facilitate the effective exercise of this freedom* for the purpose of assisting economic and social interpenetration within the Community in the sphere of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §21

As a reference to a set of legislative provisions effectively applied by the country of establishment to its own nationals, this rule is, by its essence, capable of being directly invoked by nationals of all the other Member States.

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §25

9.4 RELATION TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

In that connection, the first point to note is that *the argument* of the Hellenic Government *based on the International Law of the sea is not supported* by the judgment in *Factortame and Others*, cited above, paragraph 17. In that judgment the Court expressly stated that, in exercising their power to determine the conditions which must be fulfilled in order for a vessel to be entered in their registers and granted the right to fly their flag, *Member States must comply with the rules of Community law*. Although this finding only related to Article 5 of the 1958 Geneva Convention, it cannot be invalidated by two United Nations Conventions of 1982 and 1986, both signed after the accession of the Hellenic Republic to the Communities.

Case C-62/96 Commission v Greece [1997] ECR I-6725 §22

As the Advocate General points out in paragraph 38 of his Opinion, *in international law a State whose liability for breach of an international commitment is in issue will be viewed as a single entity, irrespective of whether the breach which gave rise to the damage is attributable to the legislature, the judiciary or the executive. This must apply a fortiori in the Community legal order* since all State authorities, including the legislature, are bound in performing their tasks to comply with the rules laid down by Community law directly governing the situation of individuals.

Cases C-46/93 and 48/93 Factortame III [1996] ECR I-1029 §34

10 SPECIFIC AREAS

10.1 GENERAL SYSTEM OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF DIPLOMAS

10.1.1 General principles

Accordingly, the answer to be given to the national court's question must be that *Article 52 of the Treaty is to be interpreted as meaning that where, in a situation not regulated by a directive on mutual recognition of diplomas, a Community national applies for authorisation to practise a profession access to which depends, under national law, on the possession of a diploma or professional qualification, or on periods of practical experience, the competent authorities of the Member State concerned must take into consideration all the diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications of the person concerned and his relevant experience, by comparing the specialised knowledge and abilities certified by those diplomas and that experience with the knowledge and qualifications required by the national rules.*

Case C-238/98 Hocsman [2000] ECR I-0000 §40

It is clear from paragraph 16 of the judgment in *Vlassopoulou* that *the competent authorities of the host Member State must take into consideration the diplomas, certificates and other evidence of qualifications which the person concerned has acquired in order to practice that profession in another Member State by comparing the specialised knowledge and abilities certified by those diplomas with the knowledge and qualifications required by the national rules.*

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §31

*If that comparative examination of diplomas results in the finding that the knowledge and qualifications certified by the diploma awarded in another Member State correspond to those required by the national provisions, the competent authorities of the host Member State must recognise that diploma as fulfilling the requirements laid down by its national provisions. If, on the other hand, the comparison reveals that the knowledge and qualifications certified by the foreign diploma and those required by the national provisions correspond only partially, the competent authorities are entitled to require the person concerned to show that he has acquired the knowledge and qualifications which are lacking (judgment in *Vlassopoulou*, cited above, paragraph 19).*

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §32

In that regard, *the competent national authorities must assess whether the knowledge acquired by the candidate, either during a course of study or by way of practical experience, is sufficient to show possession of knowledge which is lacking* (see, to that effect, the judgment in *Vlassopoulou*, cited above, paragraph 20).

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §33

Where no general procedure for official recognition has been laid down at national level by the host Member State, or where that procedure does not comply with the requirements of Community law as set out in paragraphs 29 to 33 of this judgment, it is for the public body seeking to fill the post itself to investigate whether the diploma obtained by the candidate in another Member State, together, where appropriate, with practical experience, is to be regarded as equivalent to the qualification required.

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §34

Such an obligation is all the more necessary where, as in this case, the public body in question has made a grant to the candidate to enable him to pursue his studies in another Member State and has already employed him on a temporary basis in the post to be filled. Where that is the case, the public body is in fact ideally placed to assess the candidate's actual knowledge and abilities compared to the knowledge and abilities of holders of the national diploma, as indeed the Prado was to assess Ms Fernández de Bobadilla's suitability for the post of restorer of cultural assets.

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §35

Likewise, in applying their national provisions, *Member States may not ignore the knowledge and qualifications already acquired by the person concerned in another Member State* (see Case C-340/89 *Vlassopoulou v Ministerium fuer Justiz, Bundes- und Europaangelegenheiten Baden-Wuerttemberg* [1991] ECR I-2357, paragraph 15). Consequently, *they must take account of the equivalence of diplomas* (see the judgment in *Thieffry*, paragraphs 19 and 27) and, if necessary, *proceed to a comparison of the knowledge and qualifications required by their national rules and those of the person concerned* (see the judgment in *Vlassopoulou*, paragraph 16).

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §38

Thus, *the authorisation procedure must in the first place be intended solely to verify whether the postgraduate academic title obtained in another Member State was properly awarded*, following a course of studies which was actually completed, in an establishment of higher education which was competent to award it.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §38

10.1.2 Role of directives

The function of directives which lay down common rules and criteria for mutual recognition of diplomas is thus to introduce a system in which Member States are obliged to accept the equivalence of certain diplomas and cannot require the persons concerned to comply with requirements other than those laid down by the relevant directives.

Case C-238/98 Hocsmán [2000] ECR I-0000 §33

The effect of Article 1(d) of Directive 89/48 and Article 1(f) of Directive 92/51 is that, *where the conditions for taking up or pursuing a professional activity are directly or indirectly governed by legal provisions, whether laws, regulations or administrative provisions, that activity constitutes a regulated profession* (see Case C-164/94 *Aranitis* [1996] ECR I-135, paragraph 18).

Case C-234/97 Fernández de Bobadilla [1999] ECR I- 4773 §16

Council *Directive 89/48/EEC* of 21 December 1988, *relating to a general system of recognition of higher education diplomas* awarded on completion of professional education and training of at least three years' duration (OJ 1989 L 19, p.16) *does not cover an academic title* such as that in point before the national court, *which was awarded on completion of studies of only one year's duration*.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §25

In contrast, *Council Directive 92/51/EEC on a second general system for the recognition of professional education and training to supplement Directive 89/48/EEC* (OJ 1992 L 209, p.25) *extends the system of recognition to diplomas evidencing completion of studies of at least one year's duration*. That directive, however, was adopted after the occurrence of the circumstances giving rise to the main proceedings and the period prescribed for its transposition into national law has not yet expired.

Case C-19/92 Kraus [1993] ECR I-1663 §26

Thus a Member State *cannot*, after 1 January 1973, make the exercise of the right to free establishment by a national of a new Member State *subject to an exceptional authorisation in so far as he fulfils the conditions laid down by the legislation of the country of establishment for its own nationals*.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §15

In this connection *the legal requirement*, in the various Member States, *relating to the possession of qualifications for admission to certain professions constitutes a restriction on the effective exercise of the freedom of establishment* the abolition of which is, under Article 57(1), to be made easier by directives of the Council for the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §16

With a view to making it easier for persons to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons, Article 57 assigns to the Council the duty of *issuing directives concerning, first, the mutual recognition of diplomas*, and secondly, the co-ordination of the provisions laid down by law or administrative action in Member States concerning the taking up and pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §11

Besides these liberalising measures, *Article 57 provides for directives intended to ensure mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications* and in a general way for the co-ordination of laws with regard to establishment and the pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §20

10.2 SOCIAL WELFARE

In that regard, it should be observed that Article 52 of the Treaty confers on nationals of one Member State who wish to pursue activities as self-employed persons in another Member State the benefit of the same treatment as the host State's own nationals and prohibits any discrimination based on nationality which hinders the taking up or pursuit of such activities. As the Court held in Case C-111/91 *Commission v Luxembourg* [1993] ECR I-817, paragraph 17, that prohibition covers not only specific rules on the pursuit of occupational activities, but also, as emerges from the General Programme for the abolition of restrictions on the freedom of establishment (OJ, English Special Edition, Second Series (IX), p. 7), any measure which, pursuant to any provision laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in a Member State, or as the result of the application of such a provision, or of administrative practices, hinders nationals of other Member States in their pursuit of activities as self-employed persons by treating nationals of other Member States differently from nationals of the country concerned.

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §27

That prohibition thus applies to the imposition of a residence requirement in respect of the grant of a social advantage where it has been established that that requirement is discriminatory in nature (Commission v Luxembourg, cited above, paragraph 18).

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §28

The principle of equal treatment thus laid down is also intended to prevent discrimination to the detriment of descendants who are dependent on a self-employed worker. It precludes, therefore, the imposition of a residence requirement such as that provided for in the national legislation concerned which, as stated in paragraph 23 of this judgment, must be regarded as discriminatory.

Case C-337/97 C.P.M. Meeusen [1999] ECR I-3289 §29

In that regard, it must be stated that, as Community law stands at present, *a Member State may*, in the exercise of the powers it retains to organize its social security system, *consider that a social welfare system* of the kind at issue in this case *necessarily implies*, with a view to attaining its objectives, *that an admission of private operators to that system as providers of social welfare services is to be made subject to the condition that they are non-profit-making.*

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §32

Moreover, *the fact that it is impossible for profit-making companies automatically to participate in the running of a statutory social welfare system* of a Member State by concluding a contract which entitles them to be reimbursed by the public authorities for the costs of providing social welfare services of a health-care nature *is not liable to place profit-making companies from other Member States in a less favourable factual or legal position than profit-making companies from the Member State in which they are established.*

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §33

In view of the foregoing, *the non-profit condition cannot be regarded as contrary to Articles 52 and 58* of the Treaty.

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §34

The answer to the second and third questions must therefore be that *Articles 52 and 58* of the Treaty *do not preclude a Member State from allowing only non-profit-making private operators to participate in the running of its social welfare system* by concluding contracts which entitle them to be reimbursed by the public authorities for the costs of providing social welfare services of a health-care nature.

Case C-70/95 Sodemare [1997] ECR I-3395 §35

10.3 TAXATION

In those circumstances, *the refusal to grant the tax concessions in question to the permanent establishments in Germany of non-resident companies makes it less attractive for those companies to have intercorporate holdings through German branches, since under German law and double-taxation treaties the tax concessions in question can only be granted to German subsidiaries which, as legal persons, are subject to unlimited tax liability, which thus restricts the freedom to choose the most appropriate legal form for the pursuit of activities in another Member State*, which the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 52 of the Treaty expressly confers on economic operators.

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §42

The difference in treatment to which branches of non-resident companies are subject in comparison with resident companies as well as the restriction of the freedom to choose the form of secondary establishment must be regarded as constituting a single composite infringement of Articles 52 and 58 of the Treaty.

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §43

It must be stated in response to that argument that *a reduction of revenue due to the impossibility of partially compensating for the reduction in tax yield brought about by the grant to foreign companies having a permanent branch in Germany of the various tax concessions in question is not one of the grounds listed in Article 56 of the EC Treaty (now, after amendment, Article 46 EC) and cannot be regarded as a matter of overriding general interest which may be relied upon in order to justify unequal treatment that is in principle incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty* (see, to this effect, the judgment in *ICI*, cited above, paragraph 28).

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §50

In this regard, it must be observed that *the difference in tax treatment between resident companies and branches cannot, however, be justified by other advantages which branches enjoy in comparison with resident companies and which, according to the German Government, will compensate for the disadvantages of not being allowed the tax concessions in question. Even if such advantages exist, they cannot justify breach of the obligation laid down in Article 52 of the Treaty to accord the same domestic treatment concerning the tax concessions in question* (see, to this effect, *Commission v France*, cited above, paragraph 21).

Case C-307/97 Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v Finanzamt [1999] ECR I- 6161 §53

However, *national legislation which absolutely prevents the taxpayer from submitting evidence that expenditure relating to research carried out in other Member States has actually been incurred cannot be justified in the name of effectiveness of fiscal supervision.*

Case C-254/97 Baxter and Others [1999] ECR I-4809 §19

The taxpayer should not be excluded a priori from providing relevant documentary evidence enabling the tax authorities of the Member State imposing the levy to ascertain, clearly and precisely, the nature and genuineness of the research expenditure incurred in other Member States.

Case C-254/97 Baxter and Others [1999] ECR I-4809 §20

Consequently, *national legislation*, such as the Greek tax legislation, *which, for the purposes of taxing income, does not establish, as between companies having their seat in Greece and companies which, having their seat in another Member State, have a permanent establishment in Greece, any distinction such as to justify, in relation to the same taxation, a difference in treatment between the two categories of companies and which establishes a difference in treatment as regards the rate of income tax, introduces discrimination against companies having their seat in another Member State in so far as it imposes on them, irrespective of their legal form and the nature of the shares which they issue, a rate of taxation of 40% whereas the rate of 35% applies only to companies whose seat is in Greece.*

Case C-311/97 Royal Bank of Scotland [1999] ECR I-2651 §30

As regards the justification based on the risk of tax avoidance, suffice it to note that the legislation at issue in the main proceedings does not have the specific purpose of preventing wholly artificial arrangements, set up to circumvent United Kingdom tax legislation, from attracting tax benefits, but applies generally to all situations in which the majority of a group's subsidiaries are established, for whatever reason, outside the United Kingdom. However, the establishment of a company outside the United Kingdom does not, of itself, necessarily entail tax avoidance, *since that company will in any event be subject to the tax legislation of the State of establishment.*

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §26

In answer to the argument that revenue lost through the granting of tax relief on losses incurred by resident subsidiaries cannot be offset by taxing the profits of non-resident subsidiaries, it must be pointed out that diminution of tax revenue occurring in this way is not one of the grounds listed in Article 56 of the Treaty and cannot be regarded as a matter of overriding general interest which may be relied upon in order to justify unequal treatment that is, in principle, incompatible with Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §28

It is true that in the past the Court has accepted that the need to maintain the cohesion of tax systems could, in certain circumstances, provide sufficient justification for maintaining rules restricting fundamental freedoms (see, to this effect, Case C-204/90 *Bachmann* [1992] ECR I-249 and Case C-300/90 *Commission v Belgium* [1992] ECR I-305). Nevertheless, in the cases cited, there was a direct link between the deductibility of contributions from taxable income and the taxation of sums payable by insurers under old-age and life assurance policies, and that link had to be maintained in order to preserve the cohesion of the tax system in question. In the present case, there is no such direct link between the consortium relief granted for losses incurred by a resident subsidiary and the taxation of profits made by non-resident subsidiaries.

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §29

Consequently, the answer to be given to the first question must be that **Article 52** of the Treaty **precludes legislation** of a Member State **which**, in the case of companies established in that State belonging to a consortium through which they control a holding company, by means of which they exercise their right to freedom of establishment in order to set up subsidiaries in other Member States, **makes a particular form of tax relief subject to the requirement that the holding company's business consist wholly or mainly in the holding of shares in subsidiaries that are established in the Member State concerned.**

Case C-264/96 ICI [1998] ECR I-0000 §30

In the light of all the foregoing considerations, the reply to the question submitted to the Court must be that **Article 52 of the Treaty does not preclude a Member State from making the carrying forward of previous losses**, requested by a taxpayer which has a branch in its territory but is not resident there, **subject to the condition that the losses must be economically related to the income earned by the taxpayer in that State**, provided that resident taxpayers do not receive more favourable treatment. On the other hand, **that article does preclude the carrying forward of losses being made subject to the condition that in the year in which the losses were incurred, the taxpayer must have kept and held in that State accounts relating to his activities carried on there which comply with the relevant national rules.** The Member State concerned may, however, require the non-resident taxpayer to demonstrate clearly and precisely that the amount of the losses which he claims to have incurred corresponds, under its domestic rules governing the calculation of income and losses which were applicable in the financial year concerned, to the amount of the losses actually incurred in that State by the taxpayer.

Case C-250/95 Futura & Singer [1997] ECR I-2471 §43

10.4 SPECIFIC PROFESSIONS

10.4.1 Law

However, *the taking-up and pursuit of certain self-employed activities may be conditional on complying with certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action justified by the general good*, such as rules relating to organisation, qualifications, professional ethics, supervision and liability (see Case C-71/76 *Thieffry v Conseil de l' Ordre des Avocats à la Cour de Paris* [1977] ECR 765, paragraph 12). Such provisions may stipulate in particular that pursuit of a particular activity is restricted to *holders of a diploma, certificate or other evidence of formal qualifications, to persons belonging to a professional body or to persons subject to particular rules or supervision, as the case may be. They may also lay down the conditions for the use of professional titles, such as avvocato.*

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §35

Where the taking-up or pursuit of a specific activity is subject to such conditions in the host Member State, a national of another Member State intending to pursue that activity must in principle comply with them. It is for this reason that Article 57 provides that the Council is to issue directives, such as Directive 89/48, for the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications or, as the case may be, for the co-ordination of national provisions concerning the taking-up and pursuit of activities as self-employed persons.

Case C-55/94 Gebhard [1995] ECR I-4165 §36

It is established that *no measure has yet been adopted under Article 57(2) of the EEC Treaty concerning the harmonisation of the conditions of access to a lawyer's activities.*

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §10

In the course of that examination, a Member State may, however, take into consideration objective differences relating to both the legal framework of the profession in question in the Member State of origin and to its field of activity. *In the case of the profession of lawyer, a Member State may therefore carry out a comparative examination of diplomas, taking account of the differences identified between the national legal systems concerned.*

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §18

Consequently, the answer to the question submitted by the Bundesgerichtshof must be that **Article 52 of the EEC Treaty must be interpreted as requiring the national authorities of a Member State to which an application for admission to the profession of lawyer is made** by a Community subject who is already admitted to practise as a lawyer in his country of origin and who practises as a legal adviser in the first-mentioned Member State **to examine to what extent the knowledge and qualifications attested by the diploma obtained by the person concerned in his country of origin correspond to those required by the rules of the host State**; if those diplomas correspond only partially, the national authorities in question are entitled to require the person concerned to prove that he has acquired the knowledge and qualifications which are lacking.

Case C-340/89 Vlassopoulou [1991] ECR I-2357 §23

In view of the special nature of the legal profession, however, the second Member State must have the right, in the interests of the due administration of justice, **to require that lawyers enrolled at a bar in its territory should practise in such a way as to maintain sufficient contact with their clients and the judicial authorities and abide by the rules of the profession**. nevertheless such requirements must not prevent the nationals of other Member States from exercising properly the right of establishment guaranteed them by the Treaty.

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §20

The question must therefore be answered to the effect that even in the absence of any directive co-ordinating national provisions governing access to and the exercise of the legal profession, Article 52 *et seq.* of the EEC Treaty prevent the competent authorities of a Member State from **denying**, on the basis of the national legislation and the rules of professional conduct which are in force in that State, to a national of another Member State **the right to enter and to exercise the legal profession solely on the ground that he maintains chambers simultaneously in another Member State**.

Case C-107/83 Klopp [1984] ECR 2971 §22

In these circumstances, the answer to the question referred to the Court should be that when a national of one Member State **desirous** of exercising a professional activity such as the profession of advocate in another Member State has obtained a **diploma in his country of origin which has been recognised as an equivalent qualification by the competent authority under the legislation of the country of establishment** and which has thus enabled him to sit and pass the special qualifying examination for the profession in question, **the act of demanding the national diploma prescribed by the legislation of the country of establishment constitutes**, even in the absence of the directives provided for in Article 57, **a restriction incompatible with the freedom of establishment** guaranteed by Article 52 of the Treaty.

Case C-71/76 Thieffry [1977] ECR 765 §27

Differences exist, however, between the governments referred to *as regards the nature of the activities which are thus excepted from the principle of the freedom of establishment, taking into account the different organisation of the professions corresponding to that of avocat from one Member State to another.*

Case C-2/74 Revners [1974] ECR 631 §40

The most typical activities of the profession of avocat, in particular, such as consultation and legal assistance and also representation and the defence of parties in court, even when the intervention or assistance of the avocat is compulsory or is a legal monopoly, cannot be considered as connected with the exercise of official authority.

Case C-2/74 Reyners [1974] ECR 631 §52

10.4.2 Insurance

In that respect, it must be acknowledged *that an insurance undertaking of another Member State which maintains a permanent presence in the Member State in question comes within the scope of the provisions of the Treaty on the right of establishment, even if that presence does not take the form of a branch or agency, but consists merely of an office managed by the undertaking's own staff or by a person who is independent but authorised to act on a permanent basis for the undertaking, as would be the case with an agency.* In the light of the aforementioned definition contained in the first paragraph of Article 60, such an insurance undertaking cannot therefore avail itself of Articles 59 and 60 with regard to its activities in the Member State in question.

Case C-205/84 Commission v Germany [1986] ECR 3755 §21

10.4.3 Architects

The answer to the question referred to the Court must therefore be that, with effect from 1 January 1973, *a national of a new Member State who holds a qualification recognised by the competent authorities of the Member State of establishment as equivalent to the certificate issued and required in that State enjoys the right to be admitted to the profession of architect and to practise it under the same conditions as nationals of the Member State of establishment* without being required to satisfy any additional conditions.

Case C-11/77 Patrick [1977] ECR 1199 §18

10.4.4 Medical and Dental Professions

It must first be pointed out that nationals of a Member State who pursue their occupation in another Member State *are obliged to comply with the rules which govern the pursuit of the occupation in question in that Member State*. As the French government rightly observes, *in the case of the medical and dental professions those rules reflect in particular a concern to ensure that individuals enjoy the most effective and complete health protection possible*.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR I-1475 §10

However, in so far as those rules have the effect of restricting freedom of movement for workers, the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services within the community, they are compatible with the treaty only *if the restrictions which they entail are actually justified in view of the general obligations inherent in the proper practice of the professions in question and apply to nationals and foreigners alike*. That is not the case where the restrictions are such as to create discrimination against practitioners established in other member states or raise obstacles to access to the profession which go beyond *what is necessary in order to achieve the intended goals*.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR I-1475 §11

In that context, it must be stated first of all that the principle that a practitioner may have only one practice, put forward by the French government *as indispensable to the continuity of medical care, is applied more strictly with regard to practitioners from other member states than practitioners established in France*. Although, according to the documents before the court and the information provided by the parties, the councils of the ordre des medecins authorise doctors established in France to open a second practice only at a short distance from their main practice, doctors established in another Member State, even close to the frontier, are never permitted to open a second practice in France. *Similarly, the French legislation makes it possible in principle for dental surgeons established in France to be authorised to open one or more secondary practices, but a dental practitioner established in another Member State can never be authorised to open a second practice in France*.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR I-1475 §12

Secondly, it must be observed that *the general rule prohibiting doctors and dental practitioners established in another Member State from practising in France is unduly restrictive*. First of all, *in the case of certain medical specialities, it is not necessary that the specialist should be close to the patient on a continuous basis after the treatment has been given*. That is so where the specialist carries out a single procedure, as is often the case of a radiologist, for example, or where subsequent care is provided by other medical personnel, as is often the case of a surgeon. Furthermore, as the French government indeed recognised, recent developments in the medical profession show that even in the area of general medicine the increasing trend is for *practitioners to belong to group practices, so that a patient cannot always consult the same general practitioner*.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR I-1475 §13

Those considerations show that the prohibition on the enrolment in a register of the ordre in France of any doctor or dental surgeon who is still enrolled or registered in another Member State is too absolute and general in nature to be justified by the need to ensure continuity of medical treatment or of applying French rules of medical ethics in France.

Case C-96/85 Commission v France [1986] ECR I-1475 §14

10.4.5 Audit

At Community level, authorisation to practise as an *auditor* is dealt with in the Eighth Council Directive 84/253/EEC of 10 April 1984 based on Article 54(3)(g) of the Treaty on the approval of persons responsible for carrying out the statutory audits of accounting documents (OJ 1984 L 126, p. 20, hereinafter referred to as "the Eighth Directive").

Case C-106/91 Ramrath [1992] ECR I-3351 §6