

NACZELNY SĄD ADMINISTRACYJNY

ZESZYTY NAUKOWE  
Sądownictwa  
Administracyjnego

---

dwumiesięcznik

rok IX nr 1 (46)/2013  
Warszawa 2013

WYDAWCA  
Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny

KOMITET REDAKCYJNY

Barbara Adamiak, Stefan Babiarczy, Irena Chojnacka, Jan Filip, Bogusław Gruszczyński,  
Roman Hauser, Małgorzata Sawicka-Jezierczuk (sekretarz redakcji), Andrzej Skoczylas,  
Janusz Trzciniński (redaktor naczelny), Maria Wiśniewska, Andrzej Wróbel

Tłumaczenie na język angielski: *Michał Mróz*  
Korekta: *Justyna Woldańska*

ADRES REDAKCJI

Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny  
00–011 Warszawa, ul. G.P. Bođuena 3/5  
tel. 22 826–74–88, fax 22 826–74–54, e-mail: [msawicka@nsa.gov.pl](mailto:msawicka@nsa.gov.pl)

© Copyright by Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny  
Warszawa 2013

ISSN 1734–803X  
Nr indeksu 204358

„Zeszyty Naukowe Sądownictwa Administracyjnego” znajdują się w wykazie czasopism  
punktowanych przez Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego  
na potrzeby oceny parametrycznej jednostek naukowych.



**LexisNexis Polska Sp. z o.o.**

Ochota Office Park 1, Al. Jerozolimskie 181, 02–222 Warszawa  
tel. 22 572 95 00, faks 22 572 95 68

Infolinia: 22 572 99 99

[www.lexisnexus.pl](http://www.lexisnexus.pl); e-mail: [biuro@LexisNexis.pl](mailto:biuro@LexisNexis.pl)

Księgarnia Internetowa dostępna ze strony [www.lexisnexus.pl](http://www.lexisnexus.pl)

# SPIS TREŚCI

## STUDIA I ARTYKUŁY

|                                                                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Prof. dr hab. Bogusław Banaszak (Uniwersytet Wrocławski)</i>                                                             |    |
| <b>Uwagi w sprawie zgodności z Konstytucją RP art. 89 ust. 16 ustawy z dnia 6 grudnia 2008 r. o podatku akcyzowym</b> ..... | 9  |
| Summary .....                                                                                                               | 21 |
| <br><i>Sędzia NSA Jacek Brolik (Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny)</i>                                                           |    |
| <b>Interpretacje ogólne przepisów prawa podatkowego</b> .....                                                               | 22 |
| Summary .....                                                                                                               | 42 |
| <br><i>Mgr Krzysztof Kaszubowski (asystent, Uniwersytet Gdański)</i>                                                        |    |
| <i>Dr Mikołaj Pułło (adiunkt, Uniwersytet Gdański)</i>                                                                      |    |
| <b>Problematyka zaskarżalności aktu przekazania sprawy według właściwości w świetle nowego brzmienia k.p.a.</b> .....       | 43 |
| Summary .....                                                                                                               | 59 |
| <br><i>Dr Wojciech Kręcis (sędzia WSA w Lublinie)</i>                                                                       |    |
| <b>Terminy w postępowaniach o przyznanie płatności producentom rolnym</b> .....                                             | 60 |
| Summary .....                                                                                                               | 75 |
| <br><i>Mgr Łukasz M. Wyszomirski (doktorant, Uniwersytet Warszawski)</i>                                                    |    |
| <b>Zwrot środków europejskich przez beneficjenta</b> .....                                                                  | 77 |
| Summary .....                                                                                                               | 93 |

## VARIA

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Sprawozdanie z Międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej na temat: „Aktualne problemy postępowania egzekucyjnego w administracji” zorganizowanej w dniu 9 listopada 2012 r. w Wojewódzkim Sądzie Administracyjnym w Poznaniu (Przemysław Ostojski)</b> ..... | 95 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

## ORZECZNICTWO

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>I. Trybunał Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej (wybór i opracowanie: Andrzej Wróbel)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |     |
| 1. Obywatelstwo Unii – Prawa podstawowe – Dyrektywa 2003/109/WE – Dyrektywa 2004/38/WE – Prawo pobytu obywatela państwa trzeciego w państwie członkowskim pochodzenia obywatela przebywającego w innym państwie członkowskim<br>Wyrok TSUE z dnia 8 listopada 2012 r. w sprawie C-40/11 <i>Yoshikazu Iida przeciwko Stadt Ulm</i> ..... | 101 |
| 2. Zamówienia publiczne – Rażąco niskie oferty – Bezpośredni skutek dyrektyw w odniesieniu do organów administracyjnych<br>Wyrok ETS z dnia 22 czerwca 1989 r. w sprawie 103/88 w sprawie <i>Fratelli Costanzo SpA przeciwko Comune di Milano</i> .....                                                                                 | 111 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>II. Europejski Trybunał Praw Człowieka</b> (wybór i opracowanie: <i>Agnieszka Wilk-Ilewicz</i> )<br>Obowiązek tolerowania wykonywania praw łowieckich na własności a naruszenie<br>prawa poszanowania mienia, gwarantowanego art. 1 Protokołu nr 1 do Konwencji<br>Orzeczenia ETPC z dnia 29 kwietnia 1999 r. w sprawie <i>Chassagnou i inni<br/>przeciwko Francji</i> (skargi 25088/94, 28331/95 oraz 28443/95, ECHR 1999-III)<br>oraz z dnia 26 czerwca 2012 r. w sprawie <i>Herrmann przeciwko Niemcom</i><br>(skarga nr 9300/07) ..... | 113 |
| <b>III. Trybunał Konstytucyjny</b> (wybór: <i>Irena Chojnacka</i> , opracowanie: <i>Mieszko Nowicki</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |     |
| 1. Wyrok TK z dnia 23 października 2012 r. (sygn. akt SK 11/12)<br>[dot. niekonstytucyjności przepisu ustawy „zabużańskiej” uzależniającego<br>prawo do rekompensaty od zamieszkiwania w dniu 1 września 1939 r. na byłym<br>terytorium RP] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 116 |
| 2. Wyrok TK z dnia 30 października 2012 r. (sygn. akt SK 8/12)<br>[dot. niekonstytucyjności przepisu ustawy o zasadach prowadzenia polityki rozwoju<br>dotyczącego skutków wniesienia niekompletnej skargi] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 123 |
| <b>IV. Sąd Najwyższy</b> (wybór i opracowanie: <i>Dawid Miąsik</i> )<br>Wyrok SN z dnia 19 października 2012 r. (sygn. akt III SK 3/12) [dot. podstaw odmowy<br>zastosowania przepisu ustawy z powodu sprzeczności z dyrektywą unijną oraz zasady<br>stosowania dyrektyw unijnych w postępowaniu przed sądem krajowym] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 130 |
| <b>V. Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny i wojewódzkie sądy administracyjne</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |     |
| A. Orzecznictwo Naczelnego Sądu Administracyjnego (wybór: <i>Stefan Babiarz</i> ,<br>opracowanie: <i>Marcin Wiącek</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |     |
| 1. Uchwała składu siedmiu sędziów NSA z dnia 13 listopada 2012 r.<br>(sygn. akt II OPS 2/12) [dot. zarządu nieruchomością stanowiącą współwłasność<br>spółdzielni mieszkaniowej] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 136 |
| 2. Uchwała składu siedmiu sędziów NSA z dnia 19 listopada 2012 r.<br>(sygn. akt II FPS 4/12) [dot. zwrotu kosztów za wniesienie odpowiedzi<br>na skargę kasacyjną] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 145 |
| 3. Wyrok NSA z dnia 22 sierpnia 2012 r. (sygn. akt II GSK 1779/11) [dot. braku<br>kompetencji Ministra Sprawiedliwości do dokonania wpisu na listę radców<br>prawnych oraz prawa do wpisu na listę radców prawnych bez odbycia aplikacji<br>radcowskiej] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 149 |
| B. Orzecznictwo wojewódzkich sądów administracyjnych (wybór: <i>Bogusław<br/>Gruszczyński</i> , opracowanie: <i>Marcin Wiącek</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |     |
| 1. Wyrok WSA w Białymstoku z dnia 9 lutego 2012 r. (sygn. akt II SA/Bk 668/11)<br>[dot. kwalifikacji robót polegających na zmianie konstrukcji i kierunku spadku<br>dachu oraz postępowania legalizacyjnego w przypadku przebudowy dokonanej<br>bez pozwolenia] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 154 |
| 2. Wyrok WSA w Szczecinie z dnia 13 czerwca 2012 r. (sygn. akt II SA/Sz 230/12)<br>[dot. pozbawienia statusu osoby bezrobotnej w związku z pobytem<br>w sanatorium] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 158 |
| 3. Wyrok WSA w Szczecinie z dnia 20 czerwca 2012 r. (sygn. akt I SA/Sz 1001/11)<br>[dot. opodatkowania dochodu uzyskanego z tytułu nabycia i spłaty<br>wierzycelności] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 160 |
| 4. Wyrok WSA w Gliwicach z dnia 27 lipca 2012 r. (sygn. akt II SA/Gl 623/12)<br>[dot. braku kompetencji rady miasta do wyrażenia zgody na zrzeczenie się<br>odszkodowania za nieruchomości zajęte pod drogę publiczną] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 164 |
| 5. Postanowienie WSA w Białymstoku z dnia 28 czerwca 2012 r. (sygn. akt II SA/Bk<br>465/12) [dot. niedopuszczalności skargi do WSA na wezwanie do poddania<br>automatu do gier hazardowych badaniu sprawdzającemu] .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 166 |
| <b>VI. Wnioski Prezesa NSA i pytania prawne sądów administracyjnych skierowane<br/>do Trybunału Konstytucyjnego</b> (opracowała <i>Irena Chojnacka</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |     |

|                                                                                                                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Pytania prawne sądów administracyjnych skierowane w 2012 r. do Trybunału Konstytucyjnego .....                    | 169 |
| 2. Rozstrzygnięcia Trybunału Konstytucyjnego w 2012 r. zainicjowane pytaniami prawnymi sądów administracyjnych ..... | 170 |
| 3. Pytania prawne sądów administracyjnych oczekujące na rozstrzygnięcie przez Trybunał Konstytucyjny .....           | 171 |

## VII. Glosy

*Prof. dr hab. Krzysztof Wójtowicz (Uniwersytet Wrocławski)*

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Glosa do wyroku Sądu Najwyższego z dnia 14 czerwca 2012 r. (sygn. akt I CSK 577/11)</b> [dot. braku podstaw do twierdzenia, że ostateczny wyrok ETPC w sprawie o naruszenie przez Polskę art. 1 protokołu nr 1 do Europejskiej Konwencji jest tożsamy ze stwierdzeniem niezgodności aktu normatywnego z Konstytucją] ..... | 173 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

*Mgr Krzysztof Radzikowski (doradca podatkowy)*

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Glosa do wyroku Naczelnego Sądu Administracyjnego z dnia 1 marca 2011 r. (sygn. akt II FSK 1802/09)</b> [dot. rażącego naruszenia prawa w kontekście pojęcia czynności, które nie mogą być przedmiotem prawnie skutecznej umowy – art. 2 ust. 1 pkt 4 ustawy o podatku dochodowym od osób fizycznych] ..... | 180 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

## KRONIKA

|                                                                                                                                        |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Kalendarium sądownictwa administracyjnego (listopad–grudzień 2012 r.)</b> (opracował <i>Przemysław Florjanowicz-Błachut</i> ) ..... | 187 |
| <b>Uzupełnienie kroniki (wrzesień–październik 2012 r.)</b> .....                                                                       | 201 |

## BIBLIOGRAFIA

|                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Publikacje z zakresu postępowania administracyjnego i sądowoadministracyjnego</b> (listopad–grudzień 2012 r.) (opracowała <i>Marta Jaszczukowa</i> ) ..... | 203 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

\*

|                                                                                                                         |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Lista recenzentów opracowań opublikowanych w „Zeszytach Naukowych Sądownictwa Administracyjnego” w 2012 r.</b> ..... | 208 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                                                |  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Skorowidz „Zeszytów Naukowych Sądownictwa Administracyjnego” za 2012 r.</b> (opracował <i>Paweł Skrzeliński</i> ) (wkładka) |  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## STUDIES AND ARTICLES

*Professor Bogusław Banaszak, Ph.D. (Wrocław University)*

|                                                                                                                                                         |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Commentary on the compliance of Art. 89.16 of the Act on Excise Duty dated 6 December 2008 with the Constitution of the Republic of Poland .....</b> | <b>9</b> |
| Summary .....                                                                                                                                           | 21       |

*Jacek Brolik (judge of the SAC)*

|                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>General interpretations of the tax law provisions .....</b> | <b>22</b> |
| Summary .....                                                  | 42        |

*Krzysztof Kaszubowski, M.Sc. (assistant, Gdańsk University)*

*Mikołaj Pułto, Ph.D. (assistant professor, Gdańsk University)*

|                                                                                                                                             |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Suability of the act of transferring a case according to a court's competence in the light of the amended Civil Procedure Code .....</b> | <b>43</b> |
| Summary .....                                                                                                                               | 59        |

*Wojciech Kręcis, Ph.D. (judge of the VAC in Lublin)*

|                                                                                                |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Time limits in the proceedings to award direct payments to agricultural producers .....</b> | <b>60</b> |
| Summary .....                                                                                  | 75        |

*Łukasz Wyszomirski, M.Sc. (doctoral student at Warsaw University)*

|                                                           |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>The repayment of EU funds by the beneficiary .....</b> | <b>77</b> |
| Summary .....                                             | 93        |

## VARIA

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Report from the international scientific conference “Current problems of enforcement proceedings in administration” held on 9 November 2012 at the Voivodship Administrative Court in Poznań (Przemysław Ostojski) .....</b> | <b>95</b> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|

## JUDICIAL DECISIONS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>I. The European Court of Justice</b> (selected and prepared by <i>Andrzej Wróbel</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |     |
| 1. Citizenship of the Union – Fundamental rights – Directive 2003/109/EC Directive 2004/38/EC – Right of residence of a third-country national in the Member State of origin of a citizen residing in another Member State (Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 8 November 2012 in case C-40/11: <i>Yoshikazu Iida v Stadt Ulm (City of Ulm)</i> ) ..... | 101 |
| 2. Public works contracts – Abnormally low tenders – Direct effect of directives in relation to administrative authorities (Judgment of the Court of 22 June 1989 in case 103/88: <i>Fratelli Costanzo SpA v Comune di Milano (Municipality of Milan)</i> ) .....                                                                                             | 111 |
| <b>II. The European Court of Human Rights</b> (selected and prepared by <i>Agnieszka Wilk-Ilewicz</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |     |
| The obligation to tolerate the exercise of hunting rights on one's property and violation of one's right of peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions as guaranteed by Article 1                                                                                                                                                                                |     |

|             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |     |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
|             | of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (judgement of the ECHR of 29 April 1999, applications Nos. 25088/94, 28331/95 and 28443/95, case of <i>Chassagnou and others v. France</i> and judgement of the ECHR of 26 June 2012, application No. 9300/07, case of <i>Herrmann v. Germany</i> ) ..... | 113 |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>The Constitutional Tribunal</b> (selected by <i>Irena Chojnacka</i> , prepared by <i>Mieszko Nowicki</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
|             | 1. The unconstitutionality of the provision of the so-called „Bug River” Act making the right to compensation conditional on residing on 1 September 1939 in the former territory of the Republic of Poland (judgement of the Constitutional Tribunal dated 23 October 2012, files No. SK 11/12) .....                                                    | 116 |
|             | 2. The unconstitutionality of the provision of the Act on the Principles of Implementing the Development Policy concerning the results of filing an incomplete complaint (judgement of the Constitutional Tribunal dated 30 October 2012, files No. SK 8/12) ...                                                                                          | 123 |
| <b>IV.</b>  | <b>The Supreme Court</b> (selected and prepared by <i>Dawid Miśkiewicz</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |     |
|             | The grounds for the refusal to apply a provision of an act due to its inconsistency with an EU directive and the principles of applying EU directives in proceedings before national courts (judgement of the Supreme Court of 19 October 2012, files No. III SK 3/12) .....                                                                              | 130 |
| <b>V.</b>   | <b>The Supreme Administrative Court and the Voivodship Administrative Courts</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |     |
|             | A. The judicial decisions of the Supreme Administrative Court (selected by <i>Stefan Babiarz</i> , prepared by <i>Marcin Wiściek</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |     |
|             | 1. Managing a real property being a joint property of a housing cooperative (resolution of the Supreme Administrative Court of 13 November 2012, files No. II OPS 2/12) .....                                                                                                                                                                             | 136 |
|             | 2. Reimbursing the costs of filing a cassation complaint (resolution of the Supreme Administrative Court of 19 November 2012, files No. II FPS 4/12) .....                                                                                                                                                                                                | 145 |
|             | 3. The Minister of Justice is not competent to make an entry in the list of legal advisors and the right to be entered in the list of legal advisors without the legal training (judgement of the Supreme Administrative Court of 22 August 2012, files No. II GSK 1779/11) .....                                                                         | 149 |
|             | B. The judicial decisions of the Voivodship Administrative Courts (selected by <i>Bogusław Gruszczyński</i> , prepared by <i>Marcin Wiściek</i> )                                                                                                                                                                                                         |     |
|             | 1. The qualifications of the construction works consisting in altering the structure and direction of the roof pitch and the legalisation proceedings in the event of an alteration without a permit (judgement of the Voivodship Administrative Court in Białystok of 9 February 2012, files No. II SA/Bk 668/11) .....                                  | 154 |
|             | 2. An unemployed person being deprived of his/her status due to his/her stay at a sanatorium (judgement of the Voivodship Administrative Court in Szczecin of 13 June 2012, files No. II SA/Sz 230/12) .....                                                                                                                                              | 158 |
|             | 3. Taxation of income obtained from the acquisition and repayment of claims (judgement of the Voivodship Administrative Court in Szczecin of 20 June 2012, files No. I SA/Sz 1001/11) .....                                                                                                                                                               | 160 |
|             | 4. The city council is not competent to consent to the waiver of compensation for a real property expropriated for the construction of a public road (judgement of the Voivodship Administrative Court in Gliwice of 27 July 2012, files No. II SA/Gl 623/12) .....                                                                                       | 164 |
|             | 5. The inadmissibility to file a complaint to the VAC against the request to provide a slot machine to inspection (judgement of the Voivodship Administrative Court in Białystok of 28 June 2012, files No. II SA/Bk 465/12) .....                                                                                                                        | 166 |
| <b>VI.</b>  | <b>The applications of the President of the SAC and the preliminary questions of the administrative courts to the Constitutional Tribunal</b> (prepared by <i>Irena Chojnacka</i> )                                                                                                                                                                       |     |
|             | 1. The legal questions of the administrative courts to the Constitutional Tribunal referred in 2012 .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 169 |

|                                                                                                                                              |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2. The legal decisions of the Constitutional Tribunal made in 2012 initiated by the preliminary questions of the administrative courts ..... | 170 |
| 3. The preliminary questions pending the Constitutional Tribunal's decision .....                                                            | 171 |

## VII. Glosses

*Professor Krzysztof Wójtowicz, Ph.D. (Wrocław University)*

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Gloss to the judgement of the Supreme Court of 14 June 2012, files No. I CSK 577/11</b><br>[re. the lack of grounds to claim that a final judgement of the European Court of Human Rights in the case concerning the violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms by Poland is equal to declaring a normative act unconstitutional] ..... | 173 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

*Krzysztof Radzikowski, M.Sc. (tax advisor)*

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Gloss to the judgement of the SAC of 1 March 2011, files No. II FSK 1802/09</b> [re. gross violation of law in the context of the notion of the actions that may not be the object of a legally effective agreement – Art. 2.4 of the Act on Personal Income Tax] ..... | 180 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

## CHRONICLE

|                                                                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>The schedule of events in the administrative jurisdiction</b> (November–December 2012)<br>(prepared by <i>Przemysław Florjanowicz-Błachut</i> ) ..... | 187 |
| <b>Supplement of the chronicle</b> (September–October 2012) .....                                                                                        | 201 |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

|                                                                                                                                                                                        |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Publications in the area of the administrative procedure and the proceedings before administrative courts</b> (November–December 2012) (prepared by <i>Marta Jaszcukowa</i> ) ..... | 203 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

\*

|                                                                                                                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| List of the of the reviewers of studies and articles published in the <i>Scientific Bulletin of the Administrative Courts</i> in 2012 ..... | 208 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                                                                             |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Reference guide of the <i>Scientific Bulletin of the Administrative Courts</i></b> for the year 2012<br>(prepared by <i>Paweł Skrzeliński</i> ) (insert) |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|



## Summary

of the article: **Commentary on the compliance of Art. 89.16 of the Act on Excise Duty dated 6 December 2008 with the Constitution of the Republic of Poland**

In the part of the act referred to in the title that concerns the excise duty on heating oil the legislator introduced a lower rate for heating oil and a higher rate for oil used as vehicle fuel (i.e. for propulsion purposes). Art. 89.16 is a reaction to the possibility of replacing heating oil for fuel oil. If heating oil may be used not only for heating purposes, but also as vehicle fuel, the legislator was concerned with preventing the reduction of the state budget inflows as a result of using heating oil inconsistently with its purpose (i.e. not for heating purposes but as a substitute for fuel oil). Art. 89.5 to Art. 89.15 of the Act on Excise Duty imposed on the heating oil sellers a number of obligations. If they fail to satisfy these obligations the rate of the excise duty on the oil they sell will be the rate applicable to fuel oil, higher than the rate applicable to heating oil.

The solution outlined in this article seems to be logical and justified by the economic interest of the state. The problem is that on the one hand Art. 89.16 is imprecise and on the other hand it is far too rigorous if we look at it from the perspective of the principles set out in the Constitution of the Republic of Poland.

The discussion in the article leads to the conclusion that Art. 89.16 in connection with Art. 89.5 to Art. 89.15 do not include sufficiently specific provisions and therefore violate the principle of sufficient specification inferred from the rule of the democratic state of law included in Art. 2 of the Constitution and fail to satisfy the requirement of sufficient specification that may be inferred from Art. 217 of the Constitution. Given that the remedies (sanctions) set out in Art. 89.16 are inadequate for the purpose of the Act on Excise Duty these provisions violate the principle of proportionality inferred from, amongst others, the principle of the democratic state of law (Art. 2 of the Constitution) and Art. 31.3 of the Constitution.

Please note that customs and fiscal administration authorities may not be specific robots applying laws to the citizens and other entities whose declarations they verify for their satisfaction of formal requirements. The verification of these declarations as such may not be reduced to the mere confirmation of the presence or absence of the required signatures, PESELS (Personal Identification Numbers) or NIPs (Tax identification Numbers), observation of deadlines, etc. In this context Art. 89.16 of the act on Excise Duty must be recognised as openly violating the prohibition of excessive formalism inferred from the principle of the democratic state of law.

## Summary

of the article: **General interpretations of the tax law provisions**

The Minister of Finance issues general interpretations of tax law provisions both by virtue of law and at request. In these interpretations the Minister of Finance presents the evaluation of the ability to apply the specific provisions of law and their construction, if it is necessary for the purpose of such evaluation.

The object of interpretation may be the provision of the substantive tax law. However, an interpretation – within the meaning of the Tax Code – may not be issued with respect to the application and construction of the provisions regulating tax proceedings. Issuing the interpretations of the provisions creating the institutions of tax law regulated and performed on the basis of administrative discretion would also be legally unjustified.

General interpretations of tax law provisions formally have no binding force, but actually affect the taxpayers' conduct and the tax authorities' decisions. Following an interpretation gives rise to a particular legal protection.

## Summary

of the article: **Suability of the act of transferring a case according to a court's competence in the light of the amended Civil Procedure Code**

Under the Administrative Procedure Code an administrative authority must transfer an erroneously submitted request (application) to a competent authority or, in the event of a few matters for which a few authorities are competent, instruct the applicant that he/she must submit individual requests to the competent public administration authorities. Amendments to Art. 65 and 66 of the Administrative Procedure Code that came into force on 11 April 2011 changed the form of such actions at the same time depriving the persons submitting the application of the right to bring a complaint. However, due to the lack of transitional provisions, the extent to which and the method in which the amendments affect the pending proceedings became problematic.

Assuming that when no transitional provisions are issued the new regulations are applicable, the authors analyse the individual cases when the amendments affect the ability to verify the decisions issued under Art. 65 and 66.1 of the Administrative Procedure Code. The discussion concerned both the admissibility of initiating the course of instances or extraordinary verification with respect to such provisions in the light of the new regulations as well as their court control. In the article the authors discuss the very action of bringing a complaint and the competence of the authority (a court) to verify the decision. Particular attention was paid to the possible decisions of a second instance authority.

## Summary

of the article: **Time limits in the proceedings to award direct payments to agricultural producers**

The notion of time and its role in the administrative law is significant and complex. Time limit, understood as an additional reservation to an action limiting in time its result and lacking the element of uncertainty, is frequently a constructing element of the institutions of administrative law, both substantive and procedural. Time limits are divided into time limits of the substantive law and time limits of the procedural law on the basis of the criterion of various levels of results of failure to comply with them.

The question of “time limit” as a legal phenomenon is of material importance in context of the legal acts (both national and European) regulating the principles of awarding direct payments or assistance within the framework of EU Common Agricultural Policy. These are the Act on Payments under Direct Support Schemes dated 26 June 2007 implemented in the national law under the direct support schemes and the Act on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) dated 7 March 2007 implemented under the support for rural areas schemes. Functioning within different assistance schemes these acts have a lot in common – they are related to various acts of EU law determining their contents as well as the method and direction of their interpretation, they have mixed nature and the proceedings they regulate are particular proceedings whose important feature is a high degree of formality and speed determined by their purpose and nature (distribution of assistance funds depending on their limited amount and time when they are to be distributed), emphasised in the solutions aimed at efficiency. The solutions ensuring the efficiency of these proceedings include the time limit. As the statutory time limit it is addressed to the beneficiaries of the benefits regulated by the above mentioned acts of law.

Interpretation of the provisions pursuant to which the legislator operates a time limit the compliance with which is supposed to be a premise for evaluating the efficiency of the activities or actions undertaken by the beneficiary of the assistance may identify various doubts concerning the evaluation of the legal effects of the failure to comply with the specific time limit and, as a result, its nature. Analysis of the legal decisions made by the administrative courts shows that in most cases the views on the legal nature of a given time limit are uniform. The matters in which opinions seem to diverge are these concerning the interpretation of Art. 8.2 of the Regulation of the Council of Ministers dated 7 December 2004 on the detailed terms and conditions of granting financial assistance supporting the semi-subsistence farms covered with the rural areas development plan and Art. 2.3(b) of the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development dated 23 July 2007 on the time limits for the applicants, collectors and the first processors to perform certain actions i.e. the legal nature of the time limits set out therein.

## Summary

of the article: **The repayment of EU funds by the beneficiary**

The purpose of this article is to discuss the major legal problems related to the repayment of the funds allocated to the implementation of programs with the participation of European funds by the beneficiaries of these funds, in particular the prerequisites and the procedure of the repayment.

These matters are regulated in Art. 207 of the Public Finance Act dated 27 August 2009 (the "PFA"). The prerequisites for the repayment of funds by the beneficiary are: (1) a misuse of the funds, (2) the use of funds in violation of the procedures set forth in Art. 184 of the PFA, (3) an undue drawing of the funds or drawing them in excessive amount. The interpretation of the prerequisites for the repayment regulated in the PFA poses many difficulties. The prerequisites for the repayment are formulated in an unclear and inaccurate manner, allowing the administrative authorities to interpret and apply them arbitrarily.

In the further part of the article the procedure of the repayment by the beneficiary has been discussed. It is a two-step procedure. First, it consists of the informal, non-codified procedure, in course of which the authority determines, whether the prerequisites for repayment of funds by the beneficiary have been met. This procedure ends with the service of the request to the beneficiary to repay the funds voluntarily or to grant consent to reduce future payments within 14 days from the service of the request. The legal nature of the request is not clear – according to the author it should be considered as a public administration action a complaint against which may not be brought to an administrative court of administration concerning the obligation derived from the provisions of law. If the beneficiary does not comply with the request, the competent authority imposes on the beneficiary an obligation to repay the funds in the form of a decision. It is an administrative decision issued in the procedure regulated in the Administrative Procedure Code – it is subject to an appeal and to a complaint to an administrative court.

The regulations of the PFA pertaining to the repayment of funds by the beneficiary should be assessed negatively. The prerequisites of the repayment have been formulated in a sketchy manner, therefore their interpretation and application consist of the interpretation of the provisions of the subsidy agreement concluded with the respective beneficiary. In practice it is not the provisions of the PFA, but the provisions of the subsidy agreement that form the basis for issuing the decision on the repayment of funds, which is contradictory to Art. 7 of the Polish Constitution.