

Index

- Achughbabian* [2011] 233–4, 236–7
Adams [1978] 176
Advocaten voor de Wereld VZW v. Leden van de Ministerraad [2007] 194–5
Air France v. Folkerts [2013] 23
air passenger compensation
 interpretation of law 23
Aklagaren v. Fransson [2013] 33–4, 37–8
anti-discrimination law
 CJEU case trends 239
 domestic bodies, powers of 244–6
 France, in 250–51
 Germany, in 251
 indirect racial discrimination 240, 248
 litigation
 NGO role in 245–6
 outcome, influences on 248–9
 pensions rights cases 162–3
 policy implementation, influences on 243–5
 scope of protection 240
 see also Employment Equality Directive; Race Equality Directive
argumentative/ discursive coherence 151–2
Artur Weryński v. Mediatel 4B Spółka z o.o. [2011] 56–7
Association of European Competition Law Judges 114
asylum seekers
 indirect liability doctrine 208–10

Balbiino case [2007] 161–2
Banif Plus Bank v. Csipai [2013] 21
Baum, L. 64–5
behavioural economics 64–5

Bosnia-Herzegovina
 free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 182–3
Bosshard [1980] 176
Brasserie and Factortame [1993] 76–82, 84–9, 90–94, 98
British Telecommunications [1993] 90, 99
Bulgaria
 transfer of powers to EU 40

case citation networks
 damages, liability for 75–8
 study method 71–5
Cassis de Dijon case [1979] 176
Charter of Fundamental Rights
 constitutional review, and 35–8
child abduction 200–201
CILFIT v. Ministry of Health [1982] 137–9
coherence models 151–4
Commission v. Netherlands [1986] 89
Commission v. Portugal [2008] 94–5
compatibility of national law
 citizens infringement references 6–7, 17–19
 constitutional review, and 28–31, 35–9
 consumer protection 142
 Europe clauses 39–40, 43–5, 47
 European Arrest Warrant 141–2, 194–7, 199–200, 206, 208
 freedom of establishment 31–4
 gambling regulation 137–9
 obligations regarding 28–9
 part-time workers 21
 pension rights 162–3, 166
 residence permits 162–3, 166, 201–2
 Simmenthal ruling, and 29–34

- sincere cooperation principle 39, 79–80, 82–3
- unfair contract terms 21–2
- constitutional courts
 - constitutionality rulings 39–47
 - jurisdiction 38–9, 47–8
 - obligations 38–41
 - self-perception of 41–7
 - Simmenthal*, impacts of 38–41
 - sincere cooperation principle 39, 79–80, 82–3
- constitutional review
 - Charter of Fundamental Rights, and 36–8
 - compatibility of national law, and 28–31, 35–6
 - limitations on 28–31, 35–6
 - transfer of powers to international/supranational organizations 39–40
- constitutionalisation
 - influences on 1–2
- constructivism 171
- Costa v. Enel* [1964] 7, 27–8, 79, 81, 86–7
- Courage v. Crehan* [2001] 76–8
- Court of Justice of the EU
 - effectiveness 100–101
 - direct effect 79–81, 83, 86, 89–90
 - enforcement mechanism, as 68, 70–71
 - Francovich* formulation 91–100
 - justification for 88–91
 - last resort, as 91, 94, 99–100
 - new legal order argument 79–81, 86–7
 - principle of sincere cooperation 39, 79–80, 82–3
 - procedural autonomy, and 82–3
 - protection of rights of individuals 79–80, 83–4
 - serious breach, interpretation 90
 - settled case law argument 79–82
 - State liability for damage to individuals 90–100
 - Type 1, full effect of EU law 68–70, 74, 91–2, 100
 - Type 2, dual requirement 68–70, 74–5, 82–4, 99, 100–101
 - non-EU courts, relationships with
 - EU norm diffusion, role in 169–72, 184–5, 187
 - Europe Agreements and Stabilisation and Association Agreements, and 179–84
 - European Court of Human Rights 236–7
 - European Economic Area, in 174–6, 184–6
 - legal norms, judicial localization 172–84
 - perspective, differences in 168–9
 - public international law
 - obligations, and 184–6
 - Swiss-EU Bilateral Agreements, and 176–8
 - role of
 - generally 2–3, 133
 - international law, and 169
 - legal norms externalization, and 169–70
- criminal law
 - criminalization of irregular immigration 223–6, 235–6
 - EU applicability, identification of 122–4
 - mutual recognition principle 191
- Croatia
 - free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 182
- cross-border cooperation
 - preliminary rulings 57–8
- Czech Republic
 - EU law supremacy 40, 132–3
 - free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 180–81
 - fundamental rights protection
 - European Arrest Warrant conflicts 196–7
- damages
 - liability for, case law citation network 75–8
- Decision 30/1998 (VI.25) AB* [1998] 183–4
- Decision K 15/97* [1997] 179–80
- Decision No. U-68/02* [2002] 182–3
- Decision U-III 1410/07* [2007] 182
- Dillenkofer* case [1994] 94, 97

- direct effect
 - effectiveness of EU law, and 79–81, 83, 86, 89–90
 - generally 2, 19–22
 - judicial interpretation impact on 6, 15–17
 - judicial protection of rights, and 21–2
 - justification for doctrine 20
 - minimum guarantee, as 89–90
 - non-EU Courts, legal norm localization 175–8
 - preliminary question trends 21–2
 - Returns Directive 227–30, 232–3, 235
 - Van Gend en Loos* impact on 6, 15–17, 79–81
 - vs. primacy 16
- Dutch Council for the Judiciary 116–17
- e-justice portal 112
- effectiveness
 - judicial enforcement mechanism, as 68–71, 100–101
 - CJEU case study method 71–5
 - direct effect of EU law, and 79–81, 83, 86, 89–90
 - Francovich* formulation 91–100
 - justification for 88–91
 - of last resort 91, 94, 99–100
 - new legal order argument 79–81, 86–7
 - procedural autonomy, and 82–3
 - protection of rights of individuals 79–80, 83–4
 - serious breach, interpretation 90
 - settled case law argument 79–82
 - sincere cooperation principle 39, 79–80, 82–3
 - State liability for damage to individuals 90–100
- national courts, of 106
 - challenges 108–11
 - EU initiatives regarding 108–9
 - infrastructure, influences of 107, 109
 - measuring 106–7
 - Netherlands, initiatives in 116–26
 - training initiatives 111–16
- State liability for infringement of EU law 90–100
 - Type 1, full effect of EU law 68–70, 74, 91–2, 100
 - Type 2, dual requirement 68–70, 74–5, 82–4, 99, 100–101
- effet utile* 68–70, 74, 91–2, 100
- El Dridi* [2011] 222, 232–7
- Employment Equality Directive
 - CJEU case trends 239
 - scope of application 240
- equal pay
 - interpretation of law 22
- Estonia
 - Constitutional Court 44–5
 - EU law applicability
 - case trends 159–61, 164–7
 - compatibility rulings 44–5, 159–61, 164–6
 - constitutional amendments 40, 154–7
 - direct effect principle 159
 - EU law supremacy 157–9
 - European Stability Mechanism, and 156
 - study method 148–53
 - substantive coherence 159–60
 - measuring effectiveness 149–53
 - pension rights cases 162–3, 166
 - structural funds cases 162
 - surplus stock cases 161–2
- Eurinfra* Project 117–19
- Europe Agreements
 - legal norms, judicial localization 179–87
- Europe clauses 39–40, 43–5, 47
- European Arrest Warrant
 - Framework Decision 193–6
- fundamental rights protection
 - conflicts 191–2, 194, 214–16
 - asylum seekers 208–10
 - degrading or inhuman treatment 204–5
 - implementation difficulties 196–203
 - indirect liability doctrine 208–10
 - margin of discretion 200–203
 - obligations 207–9
 - preliminary references to CJEU 194–5, 200–202, 215

- procedural difficulties 203–7
- right to fair trial 200–201, 205, 210–11, 213–14
- right to liberty 205–6
- right to private and family life 202, 206
- source of rights 193–4
- surrender refusal grounds 207–14
- national court rulings 141–2, 196–9, 203–7
- principles of 191
- European Commission
 - cooperation with Member States 217
 - infringement enforcement powers 218–19
 - monitoring EU law implementation 217–18
- European Economic Area
 - legal norms, judicial localization 174–6, 184–6
- European Free Trade Agreement *see* European Economic Area
- European Judicial Training Network 114
- Europeanization
 - definitions 242–6
 - litigation
 - NGO role in 245–6
 - outcome, influences on 248–9
 - policy penetration, influences on 242–4
 - veto powers 244–5
- F-K v. Polish Judicial Authority* [2012] 206
- Fallimento Traghetti del Mediterraneo v. del Consiglio dei Ministri* [2010] 99
- Filipiak* [2009] 33
- Filipiak v. Dyrektor Izby Skarbowej w Poznaniu* [2008] 140
- formalism 151
- Fortuna sp. z o.o. v. Dyrektor Izby Celnej w Gdyni* [2011] 138
- France
 - Constitutional Court compatibility rulings 41–2
 - EU law supremacy 132–3
 - fundamental rights protection
 - margin of discretion 202
 - right to fair trial 200–201
 - immigration policy
 - compared with Italian policy 231–5
 - judicial activism 230–35
 - preliminary references 200–201, 233–4
 - race discrimination 247
 - case trends 250–51, 259–60
 - EU law implementation 251, 258, 260
 - legal definitions 250
 - Francovich and Bonifaci v. Italian Republic* [1991] 76–9, 83–5, 87, 98
 - rulings following 88–100
 - free movement of persons 56, 177, 201–2
 - free movement of services 42–4
 - free trade agreements (FTAs)
 - legal norms localization 172–4, 184–7
 - balancing needs 185–7
 - benefits and disadvantages 187
 - equivalent concepts adoption 175
 - EU Accession, impact on 187
 - EU norms externalization 170–71
 - Europe Agreements and Stabilisation and Association Agreements 179–84
 - European Economic Area 174–6, 184–6
 - public international law
 - obligations, and 185–6
 - Swiss-EU Bilateral Agreements 176–8
 - freedom of establishment
 - compatibility of national law 31–4
 - freedom of occupation
 - compatibility of national law 31–4
 - freedom to provide services 45–7
 - fundamental rights protection
 - EU Roadmap 192
 - European Arrest Warrant conflicts
 - 191–2, 194, 214–16
 - asylum seekers 208–10
 - extradition to non-contracting party state 208
 - implementation difficulties 196–203

- indirect liability 208–10
- inhuman or degrading treatment 204–5
- interpretation 193–4
- margin of discretion 200–203
- obligations 207–9
- preliminary references to CJEU 194–5, 200–202, 215–16
- procedural difficulties 203–7
- residence permits 162–3, 166, 201–2
- right to fair trial 200–201, 205, 210–11, 213–14
- right to liberty 205–6
- right to private and family life 202, 206
- surrender refusal grounds 207–14
- European Commission powers 218
- interpretation of law conflicts 200–203
- policy implementation, influences on 244–6
- Returns Directive 222, 232–8
- source of rights 193–4
- validity 193–4
- gambling regulation
 - compatibility of national law 137–9
- Gavieiro and Torres* case [2010] 94–5
- gender equality
 - policy implementation, influences on 245–6
- Germany
 - compatibility of national law 31–4, 37–8, 41
 - fundamental rights protection
 - European Arrest Warrant 198–9
 - residence permits 201–2
 - principle of openness with EU 130
 - race discrimination 247–8
 - case trends 252–4, 260
 - EU law implementation 252, 254, 258–60
 - law, limitations of 254
 - legal definitions 252–3
 - good legal policy principle 64
 - Gourmet International (2001)* 24–5
 - Granital v. Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato* [1984] 41
- Hauer* [1979] 181
- Hedley Lomas* [1994] 90, 97–8
- HH and PH v. Deputy Prosecutor of the Italian Republic, Genoa* [2012] 206
- human rights law
 - national law applicability, identification of 122–4
- Hungary
 - Constitutional Court compatibility rulings 42–5
 - free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 179, 183–4
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- immigration law
 - criminalization of irregular immigration 223–6, 235–6
 - indirect liability doctrine 208–10
 - judicial engagement 121
 - state sovereignty, and 236–7
 - see also* Returns Directive
- indirect effect
 - generally 2
 - Marleasing* principle 179, 184–5
- indirect liability 208–10
- indirect racial discrimination 240, 248
- inhuman or degrading treatment 204–5
- institutional coherence 151–2
- institutional theory of law 150–51
- interpretation of law
 - fundamental right protection conflicts 200–203
 - margin of discretion 200–203
 - preliminary questions 17, 22–3
 - serious breach 90
- Ireland
 - fundamental rights protection conflicts 204–6, 212
- Italy
 - Constitutional Court compatibility rulings 41, 45–7
 - fundamental right protection conflicts 206, 223–4
 - immigration policy
 - compared with French policy 231–5
 - criminalization of irregular immigration 223–6, 235–6
 - judicial activism 222, 225–30

- race discrimination 247–8
 - case trends 254–7, 260
 - EU law implementation 256–7, 259–60
 - legal definitions 256
- Jeremy F.* case [2013] 200–201, 213–14
- judicial cooperation 109
 - implementation challenges 110–11
 - importance of 219, 228
 - language barriers 110–12
- judicial education initiatives
 - difficulties 126
 - generally 111–16, 219, 244
 - Netherlands, in 116–20, 126
- judicial empowerment theory 63–6
- judicial review
 - limitations on 28–31, 35–6
- justice
 - judicial cooperation, and 109
- Justice Forum 112
- Kenny v. Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform* [2013] 23
- Köbler v. Republik Österreich* [2003] 76–8, 90–94, 96, 100
- Kornhauser, L. 64
- Krolik v. Regional Court in Czestochowa* [2012] 205
- Latvia
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- legal norms
 - definition 171
 - EU diffusion role 169–71
 - judicial localization 172–4
 - Europe Agreements and Stabilisation and Association Agreements, and 179–84
 - European Economic Area, in 174–6
 - Swiss-EU Bilateral Agreements, and 176–8
- legal pluralism 150–51
- legalism 52, 64
- Lithuania
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- Lopes Da Silva Jorge* [2012] 202
- Lütticke (No.2)* [1971] 41
- MacCormick, N. 150–51
- Macedonia
 - free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 182–3
- Marleasing* [1990] 179, 184–5
- Mecanarte* [1991] 29–31
- Melki and Abdeli* [2010] 30–31
- Melloni v. Ministerio Fiscal* [2013] 194–5, 199–200, 213–14
- MG Probud Gdynia sp. z o.o. (Insolvency Proceedings)* [2010] 56–7
- Michaeler* [2008] 21
- Minister for Justice and Equality v. Kelly aka Nolan* [2013] 205–6
- Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform v. Rettinger* [2010] 204–5
- MSS v. Belgium and Greece* [2011] 208–9
- national/ public security
 - interpretation 162–3
- national courts, generally
 - EU law application
 - coherence models 151–4
 - legal doctrine development 152
 - study methods 148–53
 - judicial cooperation 109
 - implementation challenges 110–11
 - importance of 219, 228
 - language barriers 110–12
 - see also* individual countries
- national law, generally
 - compartmentalization 122
 - EU applicability to
 - coherence models 151–4
 - hierarchical relationships 150–51
 - identification of 122–4
 - institutional theory of law, and 150–51
 - legal pluralism, and 150–51
 - politicization 121–2
- neo-functionalism 52
- neo-realism 52
- Nerkowska v. Zaklad Ubezpieczeń Społecznych Oddział w Koszalinie* [2008] 55–6

- Netherlands
 judiciary
 composition 116
 education initiatives 116–20, 126
 Eurinfra Project 117–19
 national court effectiveness
 Court Coordinators 117–19, 126
 developments 116–26
 EU Chambers 119–20, 126
 Eurinfra Project 117–19
 infrastructure influences 107
 Non-Government Organizations 245
Norbrook Laboratories v. MAFF [1998] 99, 101
- Océano Grupo Editorial* [2000] 21
- part-time workers
 compatibility of national law 21
- pension rights
 compatibility of national law 162–3, 166
- Petersen v. Finanzamt Ludwigshafen* [2013] 17–18
Physiogel [2012] 176
Piotr Kawala v. Gmina Miasta Jaworzna [2007] 56–7
- Poland
 Accession Treaty case 128–31
 Administrative Courts 133–6, 145
 CJEU, national court relationships with 130
 Constitutional Tribunal 127–33, 139, 179–80
 contradictory rulings 136–44
 EU law applicability, identification 134–40
 EU law supremacy, and 40, 127–40, 144–5
 EU law vs. international law conflicts 131
 European Arrest Warrant 141–2, 196–7, 206
 free trade agreements, EU legal norm localization 179–80, 183
Kompetenz-Keompetenz doctrine 129
 multicentric approach of judiciary 128–33, 145
 preliminary references
 compatibility of national law 56–7
 cross-border cooperation 57–8
 inter-court competition, and 63–4
 judicial empowerment theory 63–6
 judicial engagement 53, 59–62
 judicial understanding of procedure 58–9
 study parameters and method 53–5
 trends 55–8
 presumption of constitutionality 130–31
 Supreme Court 136–40
 Working Time Directive rulings 140–41
- political office, right to stand for 44–5
Polska Telefonia Cyfrowa sp. z o.o. v. Prezes Urzędu Komunikacji Elektronicznej [2011] 56
- Posner, R. 64–5
- post-Communist Member States
 EU law, judicial acceptance trends 146–7
see also individual countries
- preliminary references
 academic studies
 judicial engagement in Poland 52–5
 trends 50–51
 answers
 deference cases 24
 purpose 24–5
 types 24
 citizens' infringement procedure 6–7, 17–19
 constitutionality, and 28–31
 constraints and restrictions 124–6
 criticisms of 110–11
 fundamental rights conflicts 194
 European Arrest Warrant 194–5
 guidance for 195–6, 200–202, 215–16
 generally 2, 49, 220
 language barriers 110–12
 legalism 51–2, 64
 motives for 7–8, 66–7
 extra-legal influences 53, 64–7, 121

- inter-court competition theory
 - 52, 63–4
- judicial empowerment theory
 - 63–6
- judicial engagement 53, 59–62
- judicial perspectives 52–3
- judicial understanding of
 - procedure, and 58–9
- legalism 51–2, 64
- neo-functionalism 52
- neo-realism 52
- national court criticisms 110–11
- principles of 49–50
- questions
 - compatibility of national norms
 - 6–7, 17–19, 28–31
 - direct effect of EU law 6, 17, 19–22
 - interpretation of EU law 17, 22–3, 27
- Returns Directive 222, 232–5
 - CJEU rulings, implications of 235–8
- three-pillar structure 194
- trends 50–51
- Prezes Urzędu Ochrony Konkurencji i Konsumentów v. Tele2 Polska sp. z o.o.* [2011] 56
- principle of supremacy
 - establishment 27
 - good legal policy principle, and 64
 - judicial rulings 2–3, 40, 127–40, 132–3, 144–5, 157–9
 - ordinary courts, and 34–5
 - Simmenthal* ruling, and 34–5
- prison conditions 204–5
- private party disputes
 - interpretation of law 22
- procedural autonomy principle 82–3
- public international law
 - EU legal norms localization, and 184–6
- public procurement
 - effectiveness of EU policy 94
- Raad voor de Rechtspraak* (Dutch Judicial Council) 116–17
- Race Equality Directive
 - CJEU case trends 239–40, 245
 - domestic judicial interpretation
 - France, in 247, 250–51, 258, 260
 - Germany, in 247–8, 252–4, 258–9, 260
 - influences on, generally 243–5
 - Italy, in 247–8, 254–7, 259–60
 - scope of 240
 - enforcement trends 258
- racial discrimination 239–40
 - data, limitations of 247
 - indirect discrimination 240, 248
 - litigation
 - NGO role in 245–6
 - outcomes, influences on 248–9
 - multidimensional character of 249
- Radu* [2012] 210–11
- Rakvere Lihakombinaat* case [2008] 161–2
- Ramos, F. 64
- Refcomp v. Axa Corporate Solutions Assurance* [2013] 23
- residence permits
 - compatibility of national law 162–3, 166, 201–2
- resource-constrained team theory 64
- Returns Directive
 - background 220
 - criticisms 221
 - custodial measures, validity of 233–4
 - direct effect principle 227–30, 232–3, 235
 - fundamental rights protection 222, 232–8
 - judicial activism, importance of 228–9, 237–8
 - national criminal law compatibility 232–3, 235–6
 - preliminary references
 - basis for 219
 - CJEU rulings, implications of 235–8
 - French courts 230–35
 - Italian courts 222, 227–30
 - prior to implementation date 222
 - principles 220–21
- Rewe/ Comet* cases (1976) 79–80, 82–4
- right not to be subject to inhuman or degrading treatment 204–5

- right to fair trial
 - fundamental rights protection
 - conflicts 200–201, 205, 210–14
 - preliminary references 195, 199–201
 - right to liberty 205–6
 - right to private and family life 202, 206
- Romania
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- Schengen Borders Code 236
- Schul* [1982] 183
- self-presentation theory 64–5
- Simmethal v. Italian Minister for Finance* [1976] 7, 47–8, 79–81
- constitutional courts, and
 - constitutional review implications 28–31, 35–6
 - obligations 38–41
 - self-perceptions 41–7
- implications of 26–9, 34–8
 - constitutional and judicial practices 36–8
 - constitutional review limitations 35–6
 - ordinary court powers 34–5
 - rulings following 29–34, 85–7
- sincere cooperation principle 39, 79–80, 82–3
- Škoda automobilova* case [1997] 180–81
- Slovakia
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- Slovenia
 - transfer of powers to EU 40
- social psychology 64–5
- Soering v. UK* [1989] 208
- Spain
 - European Arrest Warrant,
 - compatibility conflicts 194–5, 199–200
- Stabilisation and Association Agreements
 - legal norms, judicial localization 179–84
- Stapleton v. Ireland* [2010] 212
- State liability 2
 - damage caused to individuals 90–100
- structural funds
 - compatibility of national law 162
- substantive coherence 151–4
- surplus stock
 - compatibility of national law 162
- surplus stock cases 161–2
- Sweden
 - compatibility of national law 33–4, 37–8
 - judicial review restrictions 37–8
- Switzerland
 - Swiss-EU Bilateral Agreements
 - legal norms, judicial localization 176–8
- taxation
 - constitutionality rulings 45–7
 - Tomasz Rubach (Criminal Proceedings)* [2009] 56
 - Traghetti del Mediterraneo v. Repubblica Italiana* [2003] 91, 94, 96
- unfair contract terms
 - compatibility of national law 21–2
- United Kingdom
 - European Arrest Warrant,
 - compatibility conflicts 208
- Van Gend en Loos v. Administratie der Belastingen* [1963] 6, 15–17, 79–81
- Vandoorne v. Belgische Staat* [2011] 18–19
- veto powers 244–5
- Wallis Report (role of national judges in EU judicial system) (2008) 110–11
- Winner Wetten v. Bürgermeisterin der Stadt Bergheim* [2010] 31–4
- Wolzenburg* [2009] 200–201
- Working Time Directive
 - national court rulings 140–41
- Zakład Ubezpieczeń Społecznych Oddział w Nowym S'czu v. Stanisława Tomaszewska* [2011] 56