



DECISION OF THE PERMANENT CHAMBER TO DISMISS THE CASE

Article 39 of the EPPO Regulation

The Permanent Chamber 10, composed of Martin BRESMAN, Chair of the Chamber, Anne PANTAZI LAMPROU and Yves VAN DEN BERGE, permanent members, Nikolaos PASCHALIS, supervising European Prosecutor,

Considering that the Permanent Chamber adopts the present decision in the absence of Anne PANTAZI LAMPROU, permanent member, pursuant to Article 23(5) of the Internal Rules of Procedure ("IRP") as adopted by College Decision 003/2020 of 12 October 2020 as subsequently amended and supplemented,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EU) 2017/1939 of 12 October 2017 ("the EPPO Regulation"), in particular Articles 35 and 39 thereof, the Internal Rules of Procedure adopted by the College of the EPPO on 12 October 2020 ("IRP") and subsequent amendments, in particular Article 56 thereof,

Having regard to the report of the European Delegated Prosecutor, Popi PAPANDREOU and Dionysios MOUZAKIS, submitted on 10 July 2026 containing a summary of the case and a reasoned proposal to dismiss the case,

The PC, considering that:

1) The case concerning Maria FOTOPOLLOU:

The evidence shows that no unlawful action was taken in relation with the request for the transfer of the entitlements submitted by Maria FOTOPOLLOU, despite the intervention made by Nikolaos KOTSALOS to Dimitrios MELAS.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed and the case shall be dismissed regarding Dimitrios MELAS, Nikolaos KOTSALOS and Maria FOTOPOLLOU.

2) The case concerning Efthymia PAGOUDI:

The collected evidence shows that the farmer Efthymia PAGOUDI did not submit any untrue information to OPEKEPE as she had the legal right to receive the subsidy. Therefore, the non-procurement fraud offence allegedly committed by her does not exist.

Considering this, the actions taken by Dimitrios Melas, Nikolaos KOTSALOS, Konstantinos MOUSOUROULIS and Emmanouil FRAGAKIS, to allow Efthymia PAGOUDI to have the

subsidy request approved, do not fulfill the constitutive elements of the investigated offences.

The administered evidence cannot prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Panagiotis MITARAKIS was aware about the actions performed by the aforementioned suspects.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that the subjective element of the offence for which Panagiotis MITARAKIS was investigated is fulfilled.

Therefore, the case shall be dismissed in relation to the mentioned persons for lack of relevant evidence.

3. The case concerning Alkiviadis GIANNAKOS:

The administered evidence cannot prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Konstantinos TSIARAS was aware about the illegal actions performed by Athanasios VALIOTIS and Christos ZIOGAS to obtain the payment of subsidies to Alkiviadis GIANNAKOS.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that the subjective element of the offence for which Konstantinos TSIARAS was investigated is fulfilled.

The case shall be dismissed just in relation with Konstantinos TSIARAS, the rest of the involved persons being investigated in a separate case.

4. The case concerning Ioannis MINADAKIS, Adamantios GEROGIANNAKIS, Dimitrios LALOS and Christos APOSTOLAKIS:

The evidence shows no unlawful action was taken in relation with the decisions for the recovery of the sums paid to Ioannis MINADAKIS, Adamantios GEROGIANNAKIS, Dimitrios LALOS and Christos APOSTOLAKIS, despite the intervention made by Ioannis TROULINNOS to Dimitrios MELAS.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed and the case shall be dismissed regarding Dimitrios MELAS, Ioannis TROULINNOS, Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, Ioannis MINADAKIS, Adamantios GEROGIANNAKIS, Dimitrios LALOS and Christos APOSTOLAKIS.

5. The case concerning Emmanouil VAMVOUKAS:

The evidence shows no unlawful action was taken in relation with the decisions related to the subsidies paid to Emmanouil VAMVOUKAS, despite the intervention made by Ioannis TROULINNOS to Dimitrios MELAS.

The PC notes that Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, the member of the Hellenic Parliament to which Ioannis TROULINNOS was an associate, was not aware about the discussions between the later and Dimitrios Melas, according to the available evidence.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Ioannis TROULINNOS, Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

It is noted that Emmanouil VAMVOUKAS was prosecuted in a separate case

6. The case concerning Dimitrios PISLINAS:

The evidence shows no unlawful action was taken in relation with the decisions related to the subsidies paid to Dimitrios PISLINAS, despite the intervention allegedly made by Vasileios VASILEIADIS to Antonios KOROYESIS and Dimitrios MELAS. Moreover, no intervention in the on-the-spot check performed by OPEKEPE on 13/12/2021 was established.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Antonios KOROYESIS, Vasileios VASILEIADIS, and Dimitrios PISLINAS and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

7. The case concerning Nikolaos KOKONIS and Glykeria BARTZOKA:

The evidence shows that OPEKEPE's approval of the requests for the transfer of rights from Nikolaos KOKONIS to Glykeria BARTZOKA was accordance with the applicable legal framework, whereas Dimitrios VARTZOPOULOS seems only to have asked a question to the President of OPEKEPE, without any other intervention.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Dimitrios VARTZOPOULOS, Nikolaos KOKONIS and Glykeria BARTZOKA and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

8. The case concerning Ioannis KARAPAMPAS and Chrysanthi KARAPAMPA:

The evidence shows that the subsidies were paid in accordance to the law to Ioannis KARAPAMPAS and Chrysanthi KARAPAMPA, despite the interventions made by Theofilos LEONTARIDIS to Dimitrios MELAS in this regard.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Theofilos LEONTARIDIS, Ioannis KARAPAMPAS and Chrysanthi KARAPAMPA and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

9. The case concerning Georgios SAVVAS:

The evidence shows that the subsidies were paid in accordance to the law to Georgios SAVVAS, despite the interventions made by Pavsanias AGREVIS to Dimitrios MELAS in this regard.

It was further established that Konstantina KELEPOURI made a material error within the application for subsidy processed for Georgios SAVVAS.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsanias AGREVIS, Georgios SAVVAS and Konstantina KELEPOURI and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

10. The case concerning Konstantina KALLI and Spyridon KALLIS:

The evidence shows that, factually Konstantina KALLI and Spyridon KALLIS had the right to the subsidies. As well, they mentioned the land as owned within their application out of error. Therefore, they did not submit any false information to OPEKEPE and the subsidies



were paid to them in accordance with the law. Due to this, the interventions made by Pavsanias AGREVIS to Dimitrios MELAS and Antonios KOROYESIS were not instigation to an unlawful action.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsanias AGREVIS, Antonios KOROYESIS, Konstantina KALLI and Spyridon KALLIS and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

11. The case concerning Panayiotis STOUPAS and Spyridon STOUPAS:

The evidence shows that the request to rectify the errors was made by Panayiotis STOUPAS and Spyridon STOUPAS within the established deadlines and no other breaches of the rules were identified. Due to this, the interventions made by Pavsanias AGREVIS to Dimitrios MELAS and Antonios KOROYESIS did not result in the commissions of any actions against the applicable legal framework.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that a criminal offence was committed by Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsanias AGREVIS, Antonios KOROYESIS, Panayiotis STOUPAS and Spyridon STOUPAS and the case shall be dismissed regarding them.

12. The case concerning Athanasios LIOUPIS:

The administered evidence cannot prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Athanasios LIOUPIS was aware about the illegal actions performed by Christos BOUKOROS and Dimitrios MELAS to obtain the payment of subsidies to Dimosthenis TZAVELAS and Vasiliki XOULIARA.

Therefore, there is a lack of relevant evidence that the subjective element of the offence for which Athanasios LIOUPIS was investigated is fulfilled.

The case shall be dismissed just in relation with Athanasios LIOUPIS, the rest of the involved persons being investigated in a separate case.

For these reasons, the case shall be dismissed in relation with the mentioned persons and offences for lack of relevant evidence in accordance with Article 39 (1) (g) from the EPPO Regulation.

The PC,

GIVES THE FOLLOWING

I. DECIDES to dismiss case I.1186/2026 on account of the lack of relevant evidence, in relation with the following persons and offences:

- 1. Dimitrios MELAS, Nikolaos KOTSALOS and Maria FOTOPOLU** – possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Maria FOTOPOLU;
- 2. Dimitrios Melas, Nikolaos KOTSALOS, Panagiotis MITARAKIS, Konstantinos MOUSOUROULIS, Emmanouil FRAGAKIS and Efthymia PAGAUDI** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Efthymia PAGAUDI;



EUROPEAN
PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR'S
OFFICE

3. **Konstantinos TSIARAS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Alkiviadis GIANNAKOS;
4. **Dimitrios MELAS, Ioannis TROULINOS, Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, Ioannis MINADAKIS, Adamantios GEROGIANNAKIS, Dimitrios LALOS and Christos APOSTOLAKIS** - possible offences committed in relation to the recovery of the subsidies paid to Ioannis MINADAKIS, Adamantios GEROGIANNAKIS, Dimitrios LALOS and Christos APOSTOLAKIS;
5. **Dimitrios MELAS, Ioannis TROULINOS, Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidies obtained by Emmanouil VAMVOUKAS in 2019 and 2020;
6. **Dimitrios MELAS, Antonios KOROVESIS, Vasileios VASILEIADIS, and Dimitrios PISLINAS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Dimitrios PISLINAS;
7. **Dimitrios MELAS, Dimitrios VARTZOPOULOS, Nikolaos KOKONIS and Glykeria BARTZOKA** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Nikolaos KOKONIS and Glykeria BARTZOKA;
8. **Dimitrios MELAS, Theofilos LEONTARIDIS, Ioannis KARAPAMPAS and Chrysanthi KARAPAMPA** - possible offences committed in relation to the payment of subsidies to Ioannis KARAPAMPAS and Chrysanthi KARAPAMPA;
9. **Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsaniyas AGREVIS, Georgios SAVVAS and Konstantina KELEPOURI** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Georgios SAVVAS;
10. **Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsaniyas AGREVIS, Antonios KOROVESIS, Konstantina KALLI and Spyridon KALLIS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Konstantina KALLI and Spyridon KALLIS;
11. **Dimitrios MELAS, Pavsaniyas AGREVIS, Antonios KOROVESIS, Panayiotis STOUPAS and Spyridon STOUPAS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Panayiotis STOUPAS and Spyridon STOUPAS;
12. **Athanasios LIOUPIS** - possible offences committed in relation to the subsidy application submitted in 2021 by Dimosthenis TZAVELAS and Vasiliki XOULIARA;

After adoption, this decision shall be implemented by the EDP in accordance with the requirements of the national law and shall be notified in accordance with Article 39(4) of the EPPO Regulation.

Signature,	Digitally signed by:
Martin BRESMAN	PER ERIK MARTIN
	BRESMAN (EUROPEAN
	PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S
	OFFICE (EPPO))
	Date: 2026-07-14 18:
	20:05 UTC

