

THE CONSTITUTIONAL
LAW OF THE EUROPEAN
UNION
Third Edition

LEXISNEXIS LAW SCHOOL ADVISORY BOARD

William Araiza

Professor of Law
Brooklyn Law School

Ruth Colker

*Distinguished University Professor &
Heck-Faust Memorial Chair in Constitutional Law*
Ohio State University Moritz College of Law

Olympia Duhart

Associate Professor of Law
Nova Southeastern University Shepard Broad Law School

Samuel Estreicher

Dwight D. Opperman Professor of Law
Director, Center for Labor and Employment Law
NYU School of Law

David Gamage

Assistant Professor of Law
UC Berkeley School of Law

Joan Heminway

College of Law Distinguished Professor of Law
University of Tennessee College of Law

Edward Imwinkelried

Edward L. Barrett, Jr. Professor of Law
UC Davis School of Law

Paul Marcus

Haynes Professor of Law
William and Mary Law School

Melissa Weresh

Director of Legal Writing and Professor of Law
Drake University Law School

THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

THIRD EDITION

James D. Dinnage

MA (Cantab.) and Licence Spéciale en Droit Européen (Brussels)

Solicitor (England)

Attorney at Law (New York)

Special Legal Consultant (District of Columbia)

Jean-Luc Laffineur

Laffineur Law Firm

Avocat au Barreau de Bruxelles (Belgium)

LL.M. in International and European Business Law, University of London (England)

Maîtrise de Droit, Université de Paris II (France)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-4600-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dinnage, James.
The constitutional law of the European Union / James D. Dinnage, Jean-Luc Laffineur. – 3rd ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-7698-4600-2 (hardbound : alk. paper)
1. Constitutional law--European Union countries. I. Laffineur, Jean-Luc. II. Title.
KJE4445.D56 2012
342.24--dc23

2012006544

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2012 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool.

Editorial Offices

121 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

DEDICATION

To Eleftheria, Orlando and Hector
Jean-Luc Laffineur, Brussels, September 2011

To Karen and Russell, and all of my family.
James Dinnage, Wilmington, DE, September 2011

FOREWORD TO THE THIRD EDITION

Casebooks are not designed for judges. They know the law — that, at any event, is the fiction embraced by most European systems, including the Court of Justice of the EU. Nevertheless, this particular judge would have benefited significantly had he had this case book on his shelves when he was appointed and when he started drafting judgments. Similarly, I have no doubt that legal advisers — be they office-bound or advocates in court — would equally benefit. A danger to which all lawyers, whether judges or advisers, are subject is that of taking quotations out of context and applying them blindly. This book should prevent this by helping them to consider what has deliberately been unsaid in the judgments, what is said elsewhere, and the possible implication of applying words literally.

It starts by distilling much of EU law into a code (which it modestly describes as a Template) and follows this by 20 chapters that take an article of the Template and then set out the relevant law more fully. Each of these chapters starts with a brief elaboration of the proposition of the Template under examination and then continues with citations from the case law, legislative or administrative instruments from which the brief summary was drawn. Each of these citations is followed by an astute questionnaire on issues raised and not necessarily answered by the judgment or instrument under review.

One occasionally comes across advocates who embody the minimum amount of thought in the maximum amount of words. This book does the opposite. Adding my congratulations to those expressed by former Judge Bellamy in the previous forewords I commend it heartily.

**Konrad Schiemann
Luxembourg
6th October, 2011**

FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

It is over 50 years since the Treaty establishing the European *Economic Community* (emphasis added) was signed in Rome on 25 March 1957, and longer still since the signature of its predecessor, the European Coal and Steel Treaty, on 18 April 1951. Since those now distant days, two trends have been particularly important. First, there has been a relatively constant process of adhesion of new Member States, from the original Six in the 1950s to 27 Member States today. The major accessions of 2004 and 2007, which brought a total of 12 Member States into what has now become the European Union, have been particularly significant. Secondly, the activities of the European Union have been progressively extended well beyond the economic aims of the original Treaties into fields never envisaged by the founding fathers — including a common foreign policy, justice and home affairs, asylum and immigration, citizenship, the protection of the environment, a single currency, at least among many Member States, and even, embryonically, defence. These changes are of course reflected in the adoption, in the 1993 Treaty of Maastricht, of the concept of the “European Union” as an umbrella term wider than, but including, the “European Community,” from the title of which the word “Economic” was also dropped. If and when the Reform Treaty of 2007 is ratified, the “European Community” will itself pass into history and the whole complex structure will be subsumed under the single description “European Union.”

These developments, among others, have created enormous pressures in the sphere with which this work is concerned, namely the Constitutional Law of the European Union. The Treaty of Rome is a cohesive and relatively simple document drafted in terms of general principles. In the clarity of its vision it is arguably one of the greatest documents produced in the second half of the twentieth century. However, the constitutional structure of the Union has become ever more complex. Among many changes we have had the Single European Act (1987), the Treaties of Maastricht (1993), Amsterdam (1997), and Nice (2003), numerous Treaties of Accession, the EEA Agreement of 1994, and a bewildering number of other Acts, Pacts, Charters, Decisions, Agreements and Conventions, accompanied by an array of pillars, opt-outs, protocols and procedures, re-enforced by an astonishing number of regulations and directives. An attempt to bring some kind of order into this diverse framework failed when the ill-fated and provocatively named Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe, signed in 2004, was rejected by the electorates of France and The Netherlands. The Reform Treaty of 2007, which revives some of the important elements of the failed 2004 Treaty, awaits ratification at the time of writing.

Against this background, a new edition of this work, first published in 1996, is warmly to be welcomed. With 27 Member States to be accommodated, three EEA States, and further candidates for accession waiting in the wings (including currently Croatia, Serbia, and Turkey), it is more important than ever to explain, as clearly as possible, the underlying principles of the constitution and governance of this unique phenomenon, the European Union. That is what this work achieves through the tried and tested case book method. Whether it is the autonomous nature of the EU legal system, including the

FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

relationship between the Union and the Member States, the legislative competence of the EU, the complex process of EU Governance, or the relationship between the EU and the individual, including fundamental rights, this work covers every aspect of the subject.

In describing, through case law and materials, the constitutional structure of the Union, this book also charts much of the remarkable, in many ways inspiring, and certainly unique, story of the dynamic, and still continuing, process of European integration over the past 50 years. The Treaties and other instruments now provide, in effect, a supra-national constitutional framework for a territory stretching from the North of Finland to the Mediterranean, and from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, unparalleled in history. We are all greatly indebted to the authors for this new edition of this comprehensive and authoritative work.

Christopher Bellamy
London
April 2008

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

The title itself reflects the innovative character of this magnificent new work. Not everyone would agree that the European Union, as such, was even a legal entity, let alone the proud possessor of “a constitution.” But, as the authors point out, the absence of a single written document does not imply the absence of “constitutional” law. On the contrary, as this book demonstrates, the law of the European Union, and of the three Communities on which it is based, is a remarkable example of the dynamic development of constitutional principles for the governance of a unique form of political organization whose founding texts are often telegraphic to the point of obscurity.

However, because there is no one “constitutional” document, and because the legal system of the Union and its constituent parts has to be developed, as it goes along, drawing when necessary on the principles common to the member states, which themselves exhibit a rich legal, cultural and political diversity, it is also true that the constitutional law of the European Union is sometimes hard to find. It is the great merit of this work that the authors have assembled within a single corner and from a vast mosaic of different sources, a structured, articulate and comprehensive collection of the cases and materials needed for studying the constitutional aspects of the European Union unencumbered, so far as possible, by the details of the substantive law.

As the reader will also divine, it is not clear how “the process of creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe” (note: not among the “States” of Europe) will develop, constitutionally speaking, in the future, or how the Union will adapt itself to new challenges, notably to the East. Many constitutional issues concerning, for example, such basic matters as the respective powers of the executive and the legislature, and the relations between the Union, its constituent member states, and the citizens, are still being worked out on an almost daily basis (see for example the judgments of March 5, 1996 in joined cases C-46/and C-48/93 *Brasserie du Pêcheur* and *Factortame*, concerning State liability for legislative breach of Community Law). The Maastricht II Intergovernmental Conference, which opened in Turin on March 29, may mark a new phase in this development.

In these circumstances the present work is extremely opportune. Even if we cannot yet emulate Walter Bagehot who, writing in *The English Constitution* (1867), was able to distinguish between the *dignified* parts of the constitution “which excite and preserve the reverence of the population” and the *efficient* parts “by which it, in fact, works and rules” it is nonetheless vitally important that the constitutional aspects of the *acquis communautaire* should be readily accessible and comprehensible.

This book addresses that need. In my view the authors are to be congratulated.

Christopher Bellamy
Luxembourg
1 April 1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We extend our thanks to the Publications Office of the European Union for its open policy in permitting reproduction of its publications, including case reports, legislation and other materials, which make up the bulk of the text in this book. Only European Union legislation printed in the paper edition of the *Official Journal of the European Union* is deemed authentic.

We wish also to thank the Incorporated Council of Law Reporting for kind permission to reproduce extracts from a number of English cases, specifically *Factortame v. Secretary of State for Transport*, *Thoburn et al. v. Sunderland City Council et al.* and *Maclaine Watson & Co. Ltd v. Department of Trade and Industry and Related Appeals*. Similarly, we thank Sweet & Maxwell for permission to reproduce extracts from the Common Market Law Reports translations of the following national court cases: *Administration des Douanes v. Société Cafés Jacques Vabre & J. Weigel et Cie Sàrl*, *Internationale Handelsgesellschaft mbH v. Einfuhr- und Vorratsstelle für Getreide und Futtermittel (Solange I)*; *Brunner v. European Union Treaty*; *Blackburn v. Attorney General*; *Boisdet*; *Mccarthy's Ltd v. Smith*; and *Acciaierie San Michele SpA (in liquidation) v. High Authority of the ECSC*.

Our acknowledgment of the efforts of others with respect to the prior edition of this work should be repeated here, particularly as much of their work has supported this edition also. We are extremely grateful to Karen Dinnage, Arlene Steigler, and Suzanna Pierrepont for their invaluable assistance and patience, to Julian Joshua of the Steptoe and Johnson law firm in Brussels for his most helpful comments and to Maud Grunchar, Clémentine Leroy, Aurélie Perrichet, and Claire Martin of Cabinet d'avocats Laffineur. Our heartfelt thanks go to the library staff of Villanova University Law School, particularly Amy Spare, Matthew McGovern, and Robert Hegadorn for responding so promptly to our research requests, and to Maureen Carver, Assistant Dean for Student Records and Registrar, for assisting us in determining the extent of interest in U.S. law schools in EU Law. We would be remiss not to mention also the Villanova EU Law classes of 2007 through 2010 for bearing with us as we worked our way through the materials and navigated the various iterations of what became the Treaty of Lisbon. Their contributions were invaluable in helping us figure out what worked and what didn't, and the book is again much improved as a result.

Shortly after his retirement as President of the European Court of Justice in 1988, Lord Mackenzie Stuart (now sadly departed this life) visited the United States as a Woodrow Wilson Fellow. John Murphy and I were honored to have the opportunity to host him on a visit to the various historic sites in Philadelphia, followed by a dinner and seminar at Villanova University Law School. He had become extremely interested in the parallels between the judicial decisions from the early days of the United States and those of the European Communities and was clearly intrigued by what he saw and heard in Philadelphia. At the seminar in the evening he was full of fascinating insights and also provided highly entertaining and colorful accounts of some of his judgments. He was a leading inspiration for our original project.

Two other European Court judges have honored us by contributing Forewords to the various editions of this work. Sir Christopher Bellamy, who served on the General Court from 1992 to 1999, contributed the Foreword to the first and second editions. Sir Konrad

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Schiemann, currently serving as a Judge at the Court of Justice, graciously agreed to provide the Foreword for this edition. We are indeed most grateful for their kind expressions of support and enthusiasm for our project.

PREFACE

At the date of the first edition of this book, the European Union was “settling down”, centered around a three-pillar structure: the European Community; the Common & Foreign Security policy and Justice Affairs and Home Affairs. The first pillar was based on the integration process among the Member States; the other two on cooperation between them. Integration and cooperation reflect the two ways the EU has always moved forward: the former being the area in which the Member States have abandoned most of their sovereignty, the latter being the area where they are the most reluctant to abandon it. There was general despondency that the new European Union had chosen the path of intergovernmental cooperation rather than integration.

How far we have come since then!

The Treaty of Amsterdam started the process of shifting TEU subject matter into the Community structure. After the subsequent rather disappointing Nice Treaty, the Member States took the more dramatic step of convening a process to rewrite the Treaties as a formalized Constitution, combining the Union and the Communities into one integrated structure, and indeed, a Constitution Treaty was signed. Although 18 Member States ratified it, the peoples of two of the six founding Member States rejected it in referenda. Was this, then, a rejection of the ideals of the Communities and the Union? Or was the Treaty a victim of other forces and worries that found a focal point for discontent? Would this turn of events set back the process of ever closer union for many years?

Whatever the reasons for rejection, the response of the Member States was relatively unequivocal. The process had to go to the next step if the Union were to be an effective force in dealing with the challenges of the twenty-first century and a membership that now stood at 27 states. Thus, in 2007, under the dedicated leadership of Germany as Chairman of the European Council, the practical and reforming elements of the Constitution Treaty were revived, shorn of the latter’s more formal and controversial constitutional themes.

This effort resulted in the Treaty of Lisbon, which was eventually ratified by all Member States and came into effect on December 1, 2009. The creation of a single European Union based on the integrationist structure of the Community Treaties was achieved. With that came a remarkable degree of constitutional clarity, and this enabled us to create the constitutional template found in Chapter 1. The revisions to the organization of the book in this third edition reflect the structure of that template and at last enable an orderly, logical, and Treaty-based approach to the study of the Union’s constitutional law.

Ironically, ever since the three-pillar structure was abandoned with the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU’s edifice has been shaking; threatened by the European sovereign debt crisis and the danger it is currently posing to the very existence of the Euro.

On September 28, 2011, the President of the European Commission, Mr. Barroso, said that the European governments could not be relied upon to lead deeper economic integration among Eurozone members and that “*For all this to work, we need more than ever the independent authority of the Commission.*” By this statement, Mr. Barroso not only attempted to reestablish his authority and that of the European Commission; he also

PREFACE

expressed the wish of many Europeans for more integration in order to solve the economic and financial problems currently faced by the EU. There is no doubt that the development of the EU will continue to revolve around these two concepts of integration and cooperation. The question remains whether the balance will lean towards one more than to the other in the coming years. The likelihood seems to be that a “permanent” and enlarged European Financial Stability Facility will continue to be constituted outside the Union’s structure, thus preserving the Member States’ sovereignty over economic and fiscal policy. Were it to be otherwise, Europeans would finally have to confront the possibility of a fiscal union. Politically this is probably not feasible today. Yet, with the TEU history as a model, is it not likely that this instrument will eventually move into the Union structure and become a Union competence? This would be such a radical step that the citizens of Europe ought surely to be given their say: they would be asked, finally, whether they wish to be part of a “United States of Europe”, and an entirely new chapter in European history would begin.

This is a fascinating, though tense, moment of history to live through. There is always the possibility that events will overpower the unity of the Euro, that it will unravel and along with it the Union as a whole. Yet the Communities and the Union have survived crises in the past only to emerge stronger. It is our belief that the internal momentum for unification and the external pressures compelling it will once again prevail.

THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED STATES: A MESSAGE TO AMERICAN READERS

Dear Readers,

Now more than ever the importance of a deep understanding of EU Constitutional Law to American legal students and practitioners is critical. Having experienced over many years firsthand the vibrant business and economic relationship between the U.S. and Europe, I can resoundingly attest to the EU's predominant role as America's premier trade and investment partner.

Unparalleled in its depth and breadth, this bilateral partnership easily is described by superlatives: the largest, the most complex, the most profitable, the wealthiest, and the longest in duration. In fact, the transatlantic economic partnership is the key driver of global prosperity and does indeed represent the biggest, most integrated, and most enduring relationship in the world.

America and the European Union account for a solid 50 percent of the world's economy, generating \$5 trillion in total commercial sales each year and employing nearly 15 million workers on both sides of the Atlantic. With 54 percent of the world's GDP in terms of value and 40 percent in terms of purchasing power, it is no exaggeration to reaffirm that the transatlantic business bonds are second to none.

Equally impressive, the U.S. and Europe are each other's primary source and destination for foreign direct investment and notwithstanding fiscal and financial challenges, rates of growth are showing solid increases: in the last 10 years, American companies placed about \$1.3 trillion into European FDI locations, a figure that represents more than 60 percent of total U.S. FDI for that same period. In tandem, Europe's share of total U.S. FDI in 2010 was roughly 52 percent and that proportion is expected to continue with more than half of the top foreign investors by country into the U.S. coming from Europe. By contrast, value of EU investment assets in the U.S. is three times the amount of the combined value in the so-called BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China).

In terms of trade, the U.S. takes the number one position for EU exports of goods (well over 20 percent) and also is in the number one position of imports of EU services with about double that value, i.e., about 40 percent. Overall, America and the EU are each other's most important commercial partners when it comes to services trade and investment. The U.S. and European services economies have never been as interwoven as now in financial services, telecoms, utilities, insurance, advertising, computer services, and other related activities.

Moreover, even with recent past and current financial tribulations, American and EU financial markets continue to account for well over two-thirds of global banking assets, three-quarters of global financial services, 77 percent of all private and public debt securities, and almost 80 percent of all interest-rate derivatives.

These preeminent commercial, investment, financial, and trade connections require preeminent legal counsel and support to maintain their vibrancy. Europe is now and is expected for the next few years to remain the most profitable region to do business in the world for American firms. U.S. foreign affiliate income earned in Europe rose to an estimated \$196 billion for the latest reporting period available — a record high.

Using this casebook as a reference, study of EU constitutional and other legal provisions, case

A MESSAGE TO AMERICAN READERS

law, precedents, and relevant regulations will add immeasurably to your effectiveness as an attorney. With globalization's ever-strengthening reach, there is high probability that your clients will overwhelmingly want to do business with European companies. They, therefore, need American attorneys with knowledge of the European legal framework to ensure their success.

The Continent is frequently viewed as emblematic of centuries-old established borders, traditions, and precepts. However, the U.S. as a nation is much older than many of the modern nation-states we think of as iconic European: Italy, Ireland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Belgium, just to name a few. The European Union in its present form has only been in existence for about 20 years (as of the time of this writing) and the euro as the single monetary unit was introduced as a functioning currency in daily use just a scant decade ago. Scanning today's headlines, we can safely say the "Union" is sometimes still more observed in its exception. Member states continue to exert tremendous autonomy and the resulting influence and effect, not only within Europe, but including in the U.S. and even worldwide, is unprecedented.

However, it is the shared affirmation and belief in common and deeply held values that will continue to infuse the transatlantic relationship with longevity and prosperity. These intersections of values complement the deeply interdependent transatlantic economy and the trust and confidence that have been created through the many collaborative years of trade and investment. Both partners are committed to the rule of law, the democratic process, and a free and fair market economy — all of which require attorneys with relevant competencies and expertise.

There is no doubt that the business and economic ties between the U.S. and Europe are second to none, and we share a common historical context, social traditions, and philosophical orientation that are reflected in some similar legal concepts as framework. However, despite these many commonalities, expectations and manner of doing business in each location are surprisingly different. Unlike their American counterparts, European business people are for the most part risk-averse, extremely loyal to local preference and are not as mobile as the average American worker. From a legal perspective, an interesting anomaly, one among many, is the American priority of security versus the European preference to favor privacy relating to sharing of, for example airline passenger and financial data and the tensions that are created when combating terrorism.

Thus, there is ample legal work to be accomplished in the transatlantic arena. Attorney services to protect and expand research and development, intellectual property rights, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and strategic commercial alignments, and standardization in all manner of manufacturing and regulatory frameworks are just a few of the practice areas where clients will seek your counsel as they pursue access to lucrative European markets.

In conclusion, I cannot overemphasize the value of this text to those seeking to best advise clients seeking to engage in the competitive world of international business. I commend James Dinnage and Jean-Luc Laffineur for this impressive work. Today's world is truly a seamless universe. Therefore, even for those who believe they will focus their careers on areas only related to more local matters, familiarity with the issues presented here will serve them well.

Camille E. Sailer, Esq.

President

Board of Trustees

European American Chamber of Commerce — New Jersey/

Former Regional Commercial Counselor

Embassy of the United States of America in Brussels

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I	THE EUROPEAN UNION AS AN INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION	1
Chapter 1	THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK	3
§ 1.01	INTRODUCTION	3
§ 1.02	THE CONSTITUTIONAL TEMPLATE	5
§ 1.03	FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	42
Chapter 2	ORIENTATION	63
§ 2.01	FOUNDATIONS OF THE UNION	63
[A]	Purpose	63
[B]	Founding Principles	73
[C]	Membership (and Related Matters)	73
[D]	The Institutions of the Union	75
[E]	Objectives of the Treaties	76
[F]	Autonomy	82
§ 2.02	THE COMPONENTS OF EUROPEAN LAW	82
[A]	Constitutional Documents	82
[B]	Legal Acts of the Union	86
§ 2.03	THE LEGISLATURE	88
[A]	Evolution of the Legislative Process	88
[B]	The Legislative Bodies	88
§ 2.04	EXECUTIVE POWERS	90
[A]	General Observations	90
[B]	The European Council	90
[C]	The Council	91
[D]	The Commission	91
[E]	Specialized Functions	92
[F]	The Role of the Member States	92
§ 2.05	JUDICIAL POWERS	93
[A]	The Court of Justice of the European Union	93
[B]	The Courts of the Member States	95
§ 2.06	THE UNION'S COMPETENCES	95
[A]	General Principles and Observations	95
[B]	Fundamental Rights	96
[C]	Foreign Policy	97
[D]	Finances	97
[E]	Currency	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[F]	Categories of Competences	98
§ 2.07	LIMITS ON THE EXERCISE OF MEMBER STATE COMPETENCES	98
[A]	Measures That Interfere With Free Movement of Goods, Services, Capital, or Impede Establishment in Another Member State	98
[B]	Other Measures	99
§ 2.08	THE UNION AND THE INDIVIDUAL	100
[A]	Citizenship	100
[B]	Effect of Union Law on Individuals	101
§ 2.09	RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBER STATES	102
§ 2.10	FURTHER READING	102
 Chapter 3 THE AUTONOMY OF UNION LAW		105
§ 3.01	OVERVIEW	105
§ 3.02	THE AUTONOMY OF UNION LAW AS DEVELOPED BY THE ECJ	106
[A]	The Transfer of Sovereign Rights to the Union	106
	<i>Van Gend en Loos v. Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen</i>	106
	<i>Costa v. Enel</i>	107
	Notes and Questions	108
[B]	The Primacy, or Supremacy, of Union Law	108
	<i>Costa v. Enel</i>	108
	Notes and Questions	109
[C]	Effect on National Constitutions and Constitutional Principles	110
	<i>Internationale Handelsgesellschaft mbH v. Einfuhr- und Vorratsstelle für Getreide und Futtermittel</i>	110
	Notes and Questions	112
	<i>The Queen v. Secretary of State for Transport Ex Parte Factortame Limited and Others</i>	112
	Notes and Questions	115
	<i>Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v. Simmenthal SpA</i>	116
	Notes and Questions	118
[D]	Consequences of Applying the Supremacy Doctrine in National Law	119
	<i>Ministero delle Finanze v. In.co.ge.'90 Srl, and Others</i>	119
	Notes and Questions	121
[E]	The Effects of the Primacy Doctrine on the Position of the Member States in International Law	122
	<i>Yassin Abdullah Kadi and Al Barakaat International Foundation v. Council</i>	122
	Notes and Questions	124
§ 3.03	THE DOCTRINE OF SUPREMACY IN NATIONAL COURTS	127
[A]	Acceptance of the ECJ's View of Supremacy?	127
	<i>Administration des Douanes v. Societe Cafés Jacques Vabre & J. Weigel</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>et Cie SARL</i>	127
	Notes and Questions	129
[B]	Conflicts With Fundamental Rights	135
	<i>Internationale Handelsgesellschaft mbH v. Einfuhr- und Vorratsstelle für Getreide und Futtermittel (Solange I)</i>	135
	Notes and Questions	138
[C]	Restrictions on the Transfer of Sovereignty	141
	<i>Brunner v. European Union Treaty</i>	141
	Notes and Questions	143
	<i>Blackburn v. Attorney General</i>	144
	Notes and Questions	147
[D]	Last in Time Rule	148
	<i>McCarthy’s Ltd v. Smith</i>	148
	<i>Thoburn v. Sunderland City Council; Hunt v. Hackney London Borough Council; Harman and Another v. Cornwall County Council; Collins v. Sutton London Borough Council</i>	149
	Notes and Questions	152
[E]	Other Constitutional and Procedural Obstacles	154
	<i>Factortame Ltd. and Others, Appellants and Secretary of State for Transport, Respondent</i>	154
	Notes and Questions	154
[F]	Unilateral Determinations on the Scope and Meaning of EU Law	157
	<i>Ministre de l’interieur v. Cohn-Bendit</i>	157
	Notes and Questions	157
§ 3.04	THE UNION’S INSTITUTIONS IN THE NATIONAL COURTS	158
	<i>High Authority Of The European Coal And Steel Community v. Concordato Officine Elettromeccaniche Merlini</i>	158
	Notes and Questions	160
	<i>Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd v. Department of Trade and Industry and Related Appeals</i>	161
	Notes and Questions	165
<hr/>		
Part II	THE COMPONENTS OF EU LAW	167
<hr/>		
Chapter 4	CONSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS AND PRINCIPLES	169
<hr/>		
§ 4.01	OVERVIEW	169
§ 4.02	THE TREATIES	172
[A]	The Concept of Direct Effect	172
	<i>Van Gend en Loos v. Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen</i> . .	172
	Notes and Questions	174

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Johannes Henricus Maria van Binsbergen v. Bestuur van de</i>	
	<i>Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Metaalnijverheid</i>	180
	Notes and Questions	181
[B]	Can Directly Effective Provisions Create Obligations for Individuals? .	183
	<i>Union Royale Belge des Sociétés de Football Association ASBL and</i>	
	<i>Others v. Jean-Marc Bosman</i>	183
	Notes and Questions	184
[C]	Direct Applicability (?)	184
	<i>Roman Angonese v. Cassa di Risparmio di Bolzano SpA</i>	184
	Notes and Questions	186
	<i>Defrenne v. Société Anonyme Belge de Navigation Aérienne Sabena</i>	
	186
	Notes and Questions	190
§ 4.03	FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	191
[A]	General Principles of Law Common to the Member States	191
	<i>Liselotte Hauer v. Land Rheinland - Pfalz</i>	191
	Notes and Questions	195
[B]	The Impact of the Charter of Fundamental Rights	196
	Commission Report on Monitoring of Compliance with Fundamental	
	Rights	196
[C]	The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and	
	Fundamental Freedoms	199
	March 2010 Speech by Mr Serhiy Holovaty, Vice-Chairperson of the	
	Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, Council of Europe .	199
	Notes and Questions	200
[D]	The Reach and Limits of EU Fundamental Rights	202
	<i>Elliniki Radiofonia Tileorassi Anonimi Etairia (ERT AE) and Another v.</i>	
	<i>Dimotiki Etairia Pliroforissis and Sotirios Kouvelas and Another</i> . .	202
	<i>Friedrich Kremzow v. Austria</i>	203
	Notes and Questions	204
	<i>Seda Küçükdeveci v. Swedex GmbH & Co. KG</i>	204
	Notes and Questions	205
§ 4.04	THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE EU LEGAL	
	SYSTEM	206
[A]	The Interaction of International Law with EU Laws at the National	
	Level	206
	<i>Anklagemyndigheden v. Peter Michael Poulsen and Diva Navigation</i>	
	<i>Corp.</i>	206
	Notes and Questions	210
[B]	Interaction of International Law with Union Law at the Union Level . .	210
	<i>Racke GmbH & Co. v. Hauptzollamt Mainz</i>	210
	Notes and Questions	212

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 5	LEGAL ACTS OF THE UNION	215
§ 5.01	OVERVIEW	215
§ 5.02	DIRECTIVES	216
[A]	Direct Effect	216
	<i>Van Duyn v. Home Office</i>	216
	Notes and Questions	218
[B]	Can Directives Create Obligations for Individuals (Non-Governmental Persons)?	219
	<i>Marshall v. Southampton & South West Hampshire</i>	219
	Notes and Questions	220
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Silvio Berlusconi and Others</i>	
	Notes and Questions	222
	<i>Paola Faccini Dori v. Recreb Srl.</i>	222
	<i>Unilever Italia SpA v. Central Food SpA</i>	223
	Notes and Questions	226
[C]	Effects of Directives Before Their Implementation Deadline	227
	<i>Inter-environnement Wallonie ASBL v. Région Wallonne</i>	227
	Notes and Questions	228
[D]	Can Directives Be Disguised Decisions?	228
	<i>Government of Gibraltar v. Council</i>	228
	Notes and Questions	230
§ 5.03	REGULATIONS	231
[A]	The Nature of Direct Applicability	231
	<i>Amsterdam Bulb BV v. Produktschap voor Siergewassen</i>	231
	Notes and Questions	231
[B]	Regulations as Normative Acts (i.e., Distinguished From Decision)	231
	<i>Confédération Nationale des Producteurs de Fruits et Légumes v. Council</i>	231
	<i>Comafrica SpA and Dole Fresh Fruit Europe Ltd & Co. v. Commission</i>	233
	Notes and Questions	234
§ 5.04	DECISIONS	235
[A]	Direct Effect of Decisions Addressed to Member States	235
	<i>Grad v. Finanzamt Traunstein</i>	235
	Notes and Questions	237
[B]	Other Executive Acts Having Legal Effects	237
	<i>Air France v. Commission</i>	237
	Notes and Questions	241
[C]	“Non-existent” Acts	244
	<i>Consorzio Cooperative d’Abruzzo v. Commission</i>	244
	Notes and Questions	245

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[D]	Procedural Acts Preceding a Decision	246
	<i>International Business Machines Corporation v. Commission</i>	246
	Notes and Questions	249
	<i>Reynolds Tobacco and Others v. Commission</i>	250
	Notes and Questions	251
[E]	Acts Relating to the Internal Organization of an Institution	251
	<i>Jean-Claude Martinez, Charles de Gaulle, Front National and Emma</i>	
	<i>Bonino and Others v. Parliament</i>	251
	Notes and Questions	253
[F]	Acts Not Adopted by Institutions	254
	<i>DIR International Film Srl and Others v. Commission</i>	254
	Notes and Questions	255
§ 5.05	TREATIES	255
	<i>A. Racke GmbH & Co. v. Hauptzollamt Mainz</i>	255
	Notes and Questions	256
§ 5.06	JUDICIAL DECISIONS	258
	<i>Da Costa en Schaake NV, Jacob Meijer NV, Hoechst-Holland NV v.</i>	
	<i>Netherlands Inland Revenue Administration</i>	258
	Notes and Questions	258

Part III THE UNION’S LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS 261

Chapter 6 LEGISLATIVE AND RULEMAKING PROCESSES 263

§ 6.01	OVERVIEW	263
§ 6.02	SEPARATION OF POWERS?	267
	<i>France, Italy and United Kingdom v. Commission</i>	267
	Notes and Questions	268
§ 6.03	LEGISLATIVE BODIES AND PROCEDURES	269
[A]	The European Parliament	269
	<i>Matthews v. United Kingdom</i>	269
	Notes and Questions	272
[B]	The Council	274
	<i>Parliament v. Council and Commission</i>	274
	Notes and Questions	276
[C]	Interaction between Institutions	279
	<i>Parliament v. Council</i>	279
	Notes and Questions	281
§ 6.04	LEGAL STANDARDS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTS AND RULEMAKING	284
[A]	The Requirement to State Reasons and the Legal Basis for Legislation	284

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>The Queen v. Secretary of State for Health, Ex Parte British American Tobacco (Investments) Ltd and Imperial Tobacco Ltd.</i>	284
	Notes and Questions	288
[B]	Retroactivity, Legitimate Expectations and Legal Certainty	289
	<i>Openbaar Ministerie (Public Prosecutor) v. Daniel Bout and BVI Bout en Zonen</i>	289
	Notes and Questions	289
§ 6.05	ADVICE AND CONSENT	290
	<i>Parliament v. Council (Mauritania)</i>	290
	Notes and Questions	293
§ 6.06	IMPLEMENTING AND DELEGATED RULEMAKING PROCEDURES	295
	Regulation 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 Laying Down the Rules and General Principles Concerning Mechanisms for Control by Member States of the Commission’s Exercise of Implementing Powers	295
	Notes and Questions	302
Chapter 7	EXECUTIVE POWERS	305
§ 7.01	OVERVIEW	305
§ 7.02	ENFORCEMENT OF COMPETITION LAW	314
[A]	Enforcement Authorities	314
	TFEU PROVISIONS	314
	REGULATION 1/2003	316
	Notes and Questions	320
[B]	Complaints	321
	<i>Automec Srl v. Commission</i>	321
	<i>Union Française de L’Express (Ufex), Formerly Syndicat Français de L’Express International (SFEI), DHL International and Service CRIE v. Commission and May Courier</i>	324
	Notes and Questions	325
[C]	Investigations	326
	Regulation 1/2003	326
	Regulation 773/2004	330
	Notes and Questions	331
	<i>AM&S Europe Limited v. Commission</i>	331
	Notes and Questions	334
[D]	Initiation of Proceedings and Process Leading to a Decision	336
	<i>Tokai Carbon Co. Ltd (t-71/03), Intech EDM BV (t-74/03), Intech EDM AG (t-87/03) and SGL Carbon AG (t-91/03) v. Commission</i>	336
	Notes and Questions	337

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[E]	Clearance and Exemptions	339
	Regulation 1/2003	339
	Notes and Questions	339
[F]	Fines	340
	Regulation 1/2003	340
	The Fining Guidelines and the Leniency Notice	344
	Notes and Questions	346
	<i>Sumitomo Chemical Co. Ltd, and Sumika Fine Chemicals Co. Ltd v. Commission</i>	347
	Notes and Questions	349
[G]	Other Forms of Remedy	349
	Regulation 1/2003	349
	<i>Commission v. Alrosa Company Ltd</i>	350
	Notes and Questions	354
[H]	Settlement Procedure	354
	Commission Notice on the Conduct of Settlement Procedures	354
	Notes and Questions	361
[I]	International Cooperation Among Antitrust Enforcement Bodies	361
	<i>France v. Commission</i>	361
	Notes and Questions	363
§ 7.03	SUPERVISING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UNION LAW BY THE MEMBER STATES	364
[A]	The Scope of the Duty	364
	<i>Commission v. France</i>	364
	Notes and Questions	365
[B]	The Commission’s Discretion to Take Action Under EC 226/TFEU 258	367
	<i>Star Fruit Company SA v. Commission</i>	367
	Notes and Questions	368
	<i>Commission v. Italy</i>	368
	Notes and Questions	369
[C]	Do the Member States Have “Rights of the Defense”?	369
	<i>Commission v. Belgium</i>	369
	Notes and Questions	371
[D]	Remedies	371
	<i>Commission v. France</i>	371
	Notes and Questions	376
Chapter 8	JUDICIAL PROTECTION	379
§ 8.01	OVERVIEW	379

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8.02	ACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS FOR ANNULMENT OF UNION ACTS	382
[A]	Challenges to Decisions Addressed to Another Person — Direct Concern	382
	<i>Toepfer et al. v. Commission</i>	382
	Notes and Questions	383
	<i>Comité Central d'Entreprise de la Société Générale des Grandes Sources and Others v. Commission</i>	383
	Notes and Questions	386
[B]	Challenges to Decisions Addressed to Another Person — Individual Concern	387
	<i>Toepfer et al. v. Commission</i>	387
	<i>Plaumann & Co. v. Commission</i>	387
	Notes and Questions	388
	<i>Metro SB-Großmärkte GmbH & C. KG v. Commission</i>	388
	Notes and Questions	390
	<i>Kwekerij Gebroeders van der Kooy BV et al. v. Commission</i>	390
	Notes and Questions	391
[C]	Challenges to Legislative and Regulatory Acts	392
	<i>Allied Corporation v. Commission</i>	392
	<i>Codorniu SA v. Council</i>	395
	Notes and Questions	396
	<i>Commission v. Jego-Quere & Cie SA</i>	397
	Notes and Questions	399
§ 8.03	THE SCOPE OF REVIEW	401
	<i>United Kingdom v. Council</i>	401
	Notes and Questions	402
	<i>Commission v. Alrosa Company Ltd</i>	402
	Notes and Questions	404
§ 8.04	SCOPE AND EFFECTS OF ANNULMENT	404
	<i>NTN Toyo Bearing Company Limited and Others v. Council</i>	404
	Notes and Questions	405
	<i>Roger Tremblay, Harry Kestenberg and Syndicat des Exploitants de Lieux de Loisirs (Sell) v. Commission</i>	406
	Notes and Questions	407
§ 8.05	ACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS TO REQUIRE THE ADOPTION OF AN ACT	408
	<i>Lord Bethell v. Commission</i>	408
	Notes and Questions	409
	<i>Commission v. T-Mobile Austria GmbH</i>	409
	Notes and Questions	412
§ 8.06	THE PLEA OF ILLEGALITY	414

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Simmenthal S.P.A. v. Commission</i>	414
	Notes and Questions	415
§ 8.07	CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES AGAINST EU INSTITUTIONS	416
[A]	An Autonomous Cause of Action	416
	<i>Merkur-Außenhandels-GmbH v. Commission</i>	416
	Notes and Questions	417
	<i>SA Biovilac NV v. European Economic Community</i>	418
	Notes and Questions	418
[B]	Tort Liability?	419
	<i>Claude Sayag and S.A. Zurich v. Jean-Pierre Leduc, Denise Thonnon and S.A. La Concorde</i>	419
	Notes and Questions	420
	<i>Ismeri Europa Srl v. Court of Auditors</i>	420
	Notes and Questions	421
[C]	Claims Arising From Legislative or Regulatory Acts	422
	<i>Holtz & Willemsen GmbH v. Council and Commission</i>	422
	Notes and Questions	424
	<i>Dorsch Consult Ingenieurgesellschaft mbH v. Council and Commission</i>	424
	Notes and Questions	426
[D]	Claims Arising From Executive Decisions	426
	<i>Commission v. Camar Srl and Tico Srl</i>	426
	Notes and Questions	429
[E]	Claims Based on Maladministration	429
	<i>Hans-Martin Tillack v. Commission</i>	429
	Notes and Questions	432
Chapter 9	EU LAW IN THE NATIONAL COURTS	435
§ 9.01	OVERVIEW	435
§ 9.02	THE EC 234/TFEU 267 REFERRAL	439
[A]	Is a Ruling “Necessary to Enable [the National Court] to Give Judgment”?	439
	<i>Foglia v. Novello</i>	439
	Notes and Questions	441
	<i>Salonia v. Poidomani</i>	444
	Notes and Questions	446
	<i>Srl Cilfit and Lanificio Di Gavardo SpA v. Ministry of Health</i>	447
	Notes and Questions	449
	<i>Foglia v. Novello (No. 2)</i>	450
	Notes and Questions	452
[B]	“Before Any Court or Tribunal of a Member State”	454

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Pretore di Salo v. Persons Unknown</i>	454
	Notes and Questions	456
	<i>Nordsee Deutsche Hochseefischerei GmbH v. Reederei Mond Hochseefischerei Nordstern AG & Co. KG and Reederei Friedrich Busse Hochseefischerei Nordstern AG & Co. KG</i>	458
	Notes and Questions	460
[C]	Rulings on the Validity of EU Acts	460
	<i>Firma Foto-Frost v. Hauptzollamt Luebeck-Ost</i>	460
	Notes and Questions	462
	<i>TWD Textilwerke Deggendorf GmbH v. Germany</i>	463
	Notes and Questions	465
§ 9.03	THE DUTY OF SINCERE COOPERATION (EC 10/TEU 4)	466
	<i>Von Colson & Kamann v. Land Nordrhein-Westfalen</i>	466
	Notes and Questions	468
§ 9.04	TEU 19: “EFFECTIVE LEGAL PROTECTION”	469
[A]	The General Principle of Equivalence to National Protection	469
	<i>Unibet (london) Ltd and Unibet (International) Ltd v. Justitiekanslern</i>	469
	Notes and Questions	475
[B]	The Obligation of the National Court to Raise EU Law Issues of its Own Motion	475
	<i>Jeroen van Schijndel and Johannes Nicolaas Cornelis van Veen v. Stichting Pensioenfonds voor Fysiotherapeuten</i>	475
	Notes and Questions	478
	<i>Oceano Grupo Editorial SA v. Rocio Murciano Quintero, and Salvat Editores SA v. Jose M. Sanchez Alcon Prades Jose Luis Copano Badillo and Others</i>	478
	Notes and Questions	480
[C]	Interplay with National Evidentiary and Procedural Rules	482
	<i>Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v. SpA San Giorgio</i>	482
	<i>Marks & Spencer PLC v. Commissioners of Customs & Excise</i>	484
	Notes and Questions	485
[D]	The Principle of Effectiveness in the Context of Civil Actions Between Private Parties	486
	<i>Courage Ltd v. Bernard Crehan and Bernard Crehan v. Courage Ltd and Others</i>	486
	Notes and Questions	488
	<i>Vincenzo Manfredi v. Lloyd Adriatico Assicurazioni SpA, Antonio Cannito v. Fondiaria Sai SpA And Nicolo Tricarico and Pasqualina Murgolo v. Assitalia SpA</i>	488
	Notes and Questions	490
§ 9.05	EFFECTIVE LEGAL PROTECTION — ACTIONS FOR DAMAGES	491

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[A]	The Basic Principles	491
	<i>Francovich v. Italy</i>	491
	Notes and Questions	494
	<i>Brasserie du Pecheur SA v. Bundesrepublik Deutschland and The Queen</i> <i>v. Secretary of State for Transport, Ex Parte: Factortame Ltd and Others</i>	495
	Notes and Questions	502
[B]	Culpability — Margin of Choice for the Member State	503
	<i>Walter Rechberger, Renate Greindl, Hermann Hofmeister and Others v.</i> <i>Austria</i>	503
	Notes and Questions	506
[C]	Fault and Damages Criteria	506
	<i>Brasserie du Pêcheur SA v. Bundesrepublik Deutschland and The Queen</i> <i>v. Secretary of State for Transport, Ex Parte: Factortame Ltd and Others</i>	506
	Notes and Questions	508
[H]	Who Is Responsible?	509
	<i>Salomone Haim v. Kassenzahnärztliche Vereinigung Nordrhein</i>	509
	Notes and Questions	510
	<i>Gerhard Köbler v. Austria</i>	510
	Notes and Questions	513
§ 9.06	THE CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION OF THE NATIONAL COURTS IN THE EU	514
	Opinion 1/09	514
	Notes and Questions	518
<hr/>		
Part IV	EUROPEAN UNION COMPETENCES	519
Chapter 10	UNION COMPETENCES — GENERAL THEMES	521
§ 10.01	OVERVIEW	521
§ 10.02	SUBSIDIARITY AND PROPORTIONALITY	527
[A]	Texts	527
	Protocol on the Application of the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality	528
	Notes and Questions	531
[B]	Judicial Consideration of Subsidiarity	531
	<i>The Queen v. Secretary of State For Health, Ex Parte British American</i> <i>Tobacco (investments) Ltd and Imperial Tobacco Ltd</i>	531
	Notes and Questions	534
[C]	Judicial Consideration of Proportionality	534
	<i>United Kingdom v. Council</i>	534
	Notes and Questions	537

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Germany v. Parliament and Council</i>	537
	Notes and Questions	543
§ 10.03	IMPLIED POWERS AND THE ROLE OF EC 308/TFEU 352	543
	<i>Spain v. Council</i>	543
	Notes and Questions	545
	<i>Commission v. Council</i>	545
	Notes and Questions	550
Chapter 11	INTERNAL COMPETENCES	551
§ 11.01	OVERVIEW	551
§ 11.02	EXCLUSIVE POWERS — EU COMPETITION LAW	559
[A]	Internal Jurisdiction — The Effect on Trade	559
	<i>Etablissements Consten SARL and Grundig-Verkaufs-GmbH v. Commission</i>	559
	Notes and Questions	563
	<i>Vincenzo Manfredi v. Lloyd Adriatico Assicurazioni SpA, Antonio Cannito v. Fondiaria SAI SpA And Nicolo Tricarico and Pasqualina Murgolo v. Assitalia Spa</i>	565
	Notes and Questions	567
[B]	Appreciable Effect on Trade Between Member States and Appreciable Effect on Competition	567
	<i>Franz Völk v. Etablissements J. Vervaecke</i>	567
	Commission Notice on Areements of Minor Importance Which Do Not Appreciably Restrict Competition Under EC 81/TFEU 101(1) of the Treaty Establishing the European Community (De Minimis)	568
	Notes and Questions	571
	<i>Stergios Delimitis v. Henninger Brau AG</i>	573
	Notes and Questions	576
[C]	Extraterritorial Reach	576
	<i>A Ahlstrom Oy and Others v. Commission</i>	576
	Notes and Questions	579
[D]	EU Competition Law Interaction with National Competition Laws . . .	582
	REGULATION 1/2003	582
	Notes and Questions	583
§ 11.03	EXCLUSIVE POWERS — CONSERVATION OF MARINE RESOURCES	585
	<i>Lieutenant Commander A. G. Rogers v. H. B. L. Darthenay</i>	585
	Notes and Questions	588
§ 11.04	SHARED POWERS — AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	588
[A]	Preemption?	588
	<i>Pigs Marketing Board v. Raymond Redmond</i>	588

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Notes and Questions	590
[B]	Interaction with National Policies in Other Areas	593
	<i>R (On the Application of Milk Marque Ltd and Another) (Dairy Industry Federation, Third Party) v. Competition Commission and Others</i>	593
	Notes and Questions	599
	<i>De Samvirkende Danske Landboforeninger v. Ministry of Fiscal Affairs</i>	599
	Notes and Questions	602
§ 11.05	SHARED POWERS — THE INTERNAL MARKET	603
[A]	The Scope of Harmonization Powers	603
	TFEU Provisions	603
	<i>Germany v. Parliament and Council</i>	605
	Notes and Questions	611
[B]	Preemptive Effects of Harmonization	611
	<i>Commission v. United Kingdom</i>	611
	<i>Pubblico Ministero v. Ratti</i>	614
	Notes and Questions	617
[C]	Conferral of Responsibilities on the EU in the Context of Harmonized Laws	618
	<i>Germany v. Council</i>	618
	Notes and Questions	622
[D]	EU Involvement and Special Agencies — An Example: Trademarks	622
	Council Regulation (EC) No 40/94	622
	Notes and Questions	625
§ 11.06	SHARED POWERS — CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LAW	625
	TFEU Provisions	625
	Notes and Questions	629
Chapter 12 EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMPETENCES		631
§ 12.01	OVERVIEW	631
§ 12.02	EXCLUSIVE COMPETENCE — EC 133/TFEU 207	636
[A]	Scope	636
	Opinion 1/75	636
	Notes and Questions	638
	Opinion 1/94	639
	Notes and Questions	643
[B]	Interaction with Member State Competences	644
	Opinion 1/78	644
	Notes and Questions	648
[C]	Relationship with Other EC/TFEU Internal Competences	648
	Opinion 1/94	648

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Notes and Questions	649
§ 12.03	EXCLUSIVE COMPETENCES UNDER TFEU 3 AND 216	650
[A]	Effect on Common Rules or Alteration of their Scope	650
	<i>Commission v. Council</i>	650
	Notes and Questions	653
	Opinion 1/94	653
	Notes and Questions	656
	<i>Commission v. Belgium</i>	656
	Notes and Questions	661
[B]	“Necessary to Enable the Union to Exercise Internal Competences”	663
	Opinion 1/76	663
	Notes and Questions	665
	Opinion 1/94	665
	Notes and Questions	665
§ 12.04	“MIXED AGREEMENTS”	666
	Opinion 1/94	666
	Notes and Questions	667
	<i>Commission v. Ireland</i>	667
	Notes and Questions	668
§ 12.05	SURRENDER OF UNION POWERS TO THE MEMBER STATES	669
	<i>Bulk Oil (zug) Ag v. Sun International Ltd And Sun Oil Trading Co.</i>	669
	Notes and Questions	672

Part V	TREATY LIMITATIONS ON THE EXERCISE OF MEMBER STATE COMPETENCES	673
---------------	---	------------

Chapter 13	MEASURES AFFECTING THE FREE MOVEMENT OF GOODS	675
-------------------	--	------------

§ 13.01	OVERVIEW	675
§ 13.02	CUSTOMS DUTIES	677
	<i>Interzuccheri v. Ditta Rezzano</i>	677
	<i>Commission v. Denmark</i>	679
	Notes and Questions	681
§ 13.03	INDIRECT TAXATION	683
[A]	Discrimination Against Imported Products	683
	<i>Humblot v. Directeur des Services Fiscaux</i>	683
	Notes and Questions	685
[B]	Indirect Protection Between Products	691
	<i>John Walker and Sons Ltd v. Ministerium for Skatter og Afgifter</i>	691
	Notes and Questions	694
§ 13.04	OVERALL SCOPE OF EC 28/TFEU 34	698

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Procureur du Roi v. Benoit and Gustave Dassonville</i>	698
	Notes and Questions	698
§ 13.05	DISCRIMINATION AGAINST IMPORTS	699
[A]	Must There Be an Intent to Protect Domestic Products?	699
	<i>Procureur du Roi v. Benoit and Gustave Dassonville</i>	699
	Notes and Questions	699
	<i>Openbaar Ministerie v. Van Tiggele</i>	701
	Notes and Questions	702
[B]	Legal Consequences for Measures that Infringe EC 28/TFEU 34	702
	<i>Criminal Proceedings against Jacques Pistre, Michele Barthes, Yves Milhau and Didier Oberti</i>	702
	Notes and Questions	704
[C]	The EC 30/TFEU 36 Exceptions	705
	<i>Adriaan de Peijper, Managing Director of Centrafarm BV</i>	705
	Notes and Questions	708
	<i>R v. Maurice Donald Henn and John Frederick Ernest Darby</i>	708
	Notes and Questions	710
	<i>Commission v. France</i>	711
	Notes and Questions	715
[D]	The Effect of EC 30/TFEU 36 on Intellectual Property Rules	715
	<i>Centrafarm BV and Adriaan de Peijper v. Winthrop BV</i>	715
	Notes and Questions	717
	<i>Centrafarm B.V. v. Sterling Drug, Inc.</i>	717
	Notes and Questions	719
	<i>Warner Brothers Inc. v. Christiansen</i>	720
	Notes and Questions	722
§ 13.06	NON-DISCRIMINATORY TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	723
[A]	General Principle	723
	<i>Rewe — Zentral AG v. Bundesmonopolverwaltung Für Branntwein</i>	723
	Notes and Questions	724
[B]	Evaluation — Rules that Failed the General Interest Test	726
	<i>Ministère Public v. Gérard Deserbais</i>	726
	Notes and Questions	728
	<i>Commission v. Germany</i>	728
	Notes and Questions	730
[C]	<i>Cassis</i> and the Doctrine of Mutual Recognition	730
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Jacqueline Brandsma</i>	730
	Notes and Questions	732
	Regulation 764/2008 Laying Down Procedures Relating to the Application of Certain National Technical Rules to Products Lawfully Marketed in Another Member State and Repealing Decision	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	N°3052/95/EC	734
	Notes and Questions	739
§ 13.07	THE BOUNDARIES OF EC 28/TFEU 34	740
[A]	Measures that Merely Affect the Overall Volume of Trade	740
	<i>Torfaen Borough Council v. B & Q PLC</i>	740
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against: B. Keck and D. Mithouard</i>	742
	Notes and Questions	744
[B]	Non-Technical Requirements that Have a Discriminatory Effect Against Imports	745
	<i>Commission v. Germany</i>	745
	Notes and Questions	747
[C]	Non-Discriminatory Measures Affecting Consumer Behavior	748
	<i>Commission v. Italy</i>	748
	<i>Åklagaren v. Percy Mickelsson and Joakim Roos</i>	750
	Notes and Questions	752
[D]	Rules not Related to Goods at All	752
	<i>Eugen Schmidberger, Internationale Transporte und Planzuge v. Austria</i>	752
	Notes and Questions	757
[E]	Abuse of the <i>Cassis</i> Doctrine	758
	<i>Association des Centres Distributeurs Edouard Leclerc v. “Au Blé Vert”</i> <i>SARL</i>	758
	Notes and Questions	759
Chapter 14	MEASURES AFFECTING THE FREE MOVEMENT OF SERVICES	761
§ 14.01	OVERVIEW	761
§ 14.02	RESIDENCE AND NATIONALITY	764
	<i>Johannes Henricus Maria van Binsbergen v. Bestuur van de</i> <i>Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Metaalnijverheid</i>	764
	Notes and Questions	765
§ 14.03	BUSINESS LICENSES AND QUALIFICATIONS	765
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Alfred John Webb</i>	765
	Notes and Questions	768
	<i>Commission v. Germany</i>	768
	Notes and Questions	770
	<i>Josep Peñarroja Fa v. Bureau of the Cour de Cassation</i>	771
	Notes and Questions	773
§ 14.04	MEASURES AFFECTING THE SERVICES THEMSELVES	774
	<i>Wolff & Muller GmbH & Co. KG v. Jose Filipe Pereira Felix.</i>	774
	Notes and Questions	776

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Alpine Investments BV v. Minister van Financiën</i>	777
	Notes and Questions	782
	<i>Coditel v. Ciné Vog Films</i>	782
	Notes and Questions	785
§ 14.05	INDIRECT RESTRICTIONS	785
[A]	Police Powers	785
	<i>Marc Michel Josemans v. Burgemeester van Maastricht</i>	785
	Notes and Questions	789
[B]	Taxation	790
	<i>FKP Scorpio Konzertproduktionen GmbH v. Finanzamt Hamburg-Eimsbuttel</i>	790
	Notes and Questions	794
	<i>Francois de Coster v. College des Bourgmestres et Echevins de Watermael-Boitsfort</i>	794
	Notes and Questions	797
[C]	Budgetary Matters	797
	<i>V.G. Müller-Fauré v. Onderlinge Waarborgmaatschappij OZ Zorgverzekeringen UA and E.E.M. van Riet v. Onderlinge Waarborgmaatschappij Zao Zorgverzekeringen</i>	797
	Notes and Questions	807
§ 14.06	THE SCOPE AND BOUNDARIES OF EC 49/TFEU 56	807
[A]	Application to the Receipt of Services	807
	<i>Luisi and Carbone v. Ministero del Tesoro</i>	807
	Notes and Questions	809
[B]	Remoteness	810
	<i>The Society for the Protection of Unborn Children Ireland Ltd v. Stephen Grogan and Others</i>	810
	Notes and Questions	813
[C]	The Need for an Economic Activity	813
	<i>Christelle Delière v. Ligue Francophone de Judo et Disciplines Associées ASBL, Ligue Belge de Judo ASBL, Union Européenne de Judo and François Pacquée</i>	813
	Notes and Questions	816
[D]	Relationship to Other Freedoms	817
	<i>State v. Sacchi</i>	817
	Notes and Questions	819
[E]	Exercise of Official Authority	819
	<i>Josep Peñarroja Fa v. Bureau of the Cour de Cassation</i>	819
	Notes and Questions	820

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 15	MEASURES AFFECTING MOVEMENT OF BUSINESSES AND CAPITAL	821
§ 15.01	OVERVIEW	821
§ 15.02	THE RIGHT OF ESTABLISHMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS	822
[A]	The Meaning of “Establishment”	822
	<i>Reinhard Gebhard v. Consiglio dell’Ordine degli Avvocati e Procuratori di Milano</i>	822
	<i>Commission v. Germany</i>	824
	Notes and Questions	825
	<i>The Queen v. Secretary of State for Transport, Ex Parte Factortame Ltd and Others</i>	826
	Notes and Questions	828
[B]	The Meaning of “Nationals of a Member State” in EC 43/TFEU 49	829
	<i>J. Knors v. Secretary of State for Economic Affairs</i>	829
	Notes and Questions	830
[C]	Requirement for Compliance with Host State Regulation, and the Scope of Mutual Recognition	831
	<i>Reinhard Gebhard v. Consiglio dell’Ordine degli Avvocati e Procuratori di Milano</i>	831
	Notes and Questions	832
	<i>Thieffry v. Conseil de l’Ordre des Avocats de Paris</i>	832
	Notes and Questions	835
	<i>Robert Koller v. Oberste Berufungs- und Disziplinarkommission (OBDK)</i>	842
	Notes and Questions	843
[D]	Justification of Restrictions Based on the General Interest	844
	<i>Ordre des Avocats au Barreau de Paris v. Klopp</i>	844
	Notes and Questions	846
[E]	The Public Service Exception	850
	<i>Jean Reyners v. Belgian State</i>	850
	Notes and Questions	852
	<i>Commission v. Belgium</i>	852
	Notes and Questions	857
§ 15.03	ESTABLISHMENT AND THE REGULATION OF BUSINESS ENTITIES	857
[A]	The Effect of EC 43/TFEU 49 on State Corporation Laws	857
	<i>Überseering BV v. Nordic Construction Company Baumanagement GmbH (NCC)</i>	857
	Notes and Questions	860
[B]	Abuse?	864
	<i>Centros Ltd and Erhvervs-og Selskabsstyrelsen</i>	864
	Notes and Questions	868

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[C]	The Interplay of EC 43/TFEU 49 and States' Taxation Competences . . .	870
	<i>The Queen v. H. M. Treasury and Commissioners of Inland Revenue, Ex Parte Daily Mail and General Trust PLC</i>	870
	Notes and Questions	873
§ 15.04	FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL	876
[A]	The Scope of EC 56/TFEU 63	876
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Lucas Emilio Sanz de Lera, Raimundo Díaz Jiménez and Figen Kapanoglu</i>	876
	Notes and Questions	877
[B]	The Interrelation of EC 56/TFEU 63 and the Taxation Competences of the Member States	877
	<i>Petri Manninen</i>	877
	Notes and Questions	884
	Notes and Questions	887
[C]	Capital Movements and State Security	887
	<i>Alfredo Albore</i>	887
	Notes and Questions	888
[D]	The Boundaries of Application of EC 56/TFEU 63	889
	<i>Commission v. Germany</i>	889
	Notes and Questions	895
Chapter 16	STATE AIDS AND STATE ENTERPRISES	899
§ 16.01	OVERVIEW	899
§ 16.02	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY MEMBER STATES ("STATE AIDS")	902
[A]	What Is an Aid?	902
	<i>Commission v. France</i>	902
	Notes and Questions	904
	<i>Altmark Trans GmbH and Another v. Nahverkehrsgesellschaft Altmark GmbH</i>	904
	Notes and Questions	906
	<i>Portuguese Republic v. Commission</i>	908
	Notes and Questions	912
[B]	Effect on Trade Between Member States	912
	<i>Philip Morris Holland BV v. Commission</i>	912
	Notes and Questions	913
	<i>Altmark Trans GmbH and Another v. Nahverkehrsgesellschaft Altmark GmbH</i>	914
	Notes and Questions	915
[C]	Relationship with Other Treaty Provisions	915
	<i>Iannelli & Volpi SpA v. Ditta Paolo Meroni</i>	915

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Du Pont de Nemours Italiana SpA v. Unità Sanitaria Locale No 2 di Carrara</i>	918
	Notes and Questions	919
§ 16.03	PARTICIPATION BY THE STATE IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	919
[A]	State Monopolies	919
	<i>Pubblico Ministero v. Manghera</i>	919
	Notes and Questions	921
	<i>Hansen GmbH & Co. v. Hauptzollamt Flensburg</i>	922
	Notes and Questions	924
[B]	Grants of Exclusive Rights to Public Undertakings or Concessionaires	924
	<i>Höfner and Elser v. Macrotron GmbH</i>	924
	Notes and Questions	925
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Silvano Raso and Others</i>	926
	Notes and Questions	927
[C]	Services of General Economic Interest	927
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Paul Corbeau</i>	927
	Notes and Questions	929
[D]	Use of the Private Sector to Carry Out a State Policy	932
	<i>Pascal Van Eycke v. Aspa NV</i>	932
	Notes and Questions	934
	<i>Consorzio Industrie Fiammiferi (CIF) v. Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato</i>	935
	Notes and Questions	937
<hr/>		
Part VI	CITIZENSHIP AND FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	939
<hr/>		
Chapter 17	FREE MOVEMENT AND NON-DISCRIMINATION	941
<hr/>		
§ 17.01	OVERVIEW	941
§ 17.02	RIGHT OF FREE MOVEMENT FOR WORKERS	945
[A]	Who Is a “Worker”?	945
	<i>Levin v. Staatssecretaris van Justitie</i>	945
	Notes and Questions	947
[B]	Direct Restrictions on Free Movement of Workers	947
	<i>Lynne Watson And Alessandro Belmann</i>	947
	Notes and Questions	949
	<i>Van Duyn v. Home Office</i>	949
	Notes and Questions	951
	<i>The Queen v. Immigration Appeal Tribunal, Ex Parte Gustaff Desiderius Antonissen</i>	952
	Notes and Questions	954
[C]	Indirect Restrictions on Free Movement of Workers	955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Criminal Proceedings v. Choquet</i>	955
	Notes and Questions	958
	<i>Union Royale Belge des Sociétés de Football Association ASBL and Others v. Jean-Marc Bosman</i>	958
	Notes and Questions	961
	<i>Clean Car Autoservice GesmbH v. Landeshauptmann von Wien</i> . . .	962
	Notes and Questions	964
[D]	The Boundaries of the Prohibition on Free Movement Restrictions . . .	965
	<i>Moser v. Land Baden-Württemberg</i>	965
	<i>Volker Graf v. Filzmoser Maschinenbau GmbH</i>	966
	Notes and Questions	968
[E]	The Public Service Exemption	968
	<i>Commission v. Belgium</i>	968
	Notes and Questions	972
§ 17.03	FREE MOVEMENT AND RESIDENCE AS A CITIZENSHIP RIGHT .	973
[A]	Need for a Connection with Union Law	973
	<i>Kunqian Catherine Zhu and Man Lavette Chen v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i>	973
	Notes and Questions	977
[B]	Effect on State Competences in Other Areas — Legitimate Purpose and Proportionality	977
	<i>K. Tas-hagen and R. A. Tas v. Raadskamer Wubo van de Pensioen- en Uitkeringsraad</i>	977
	Notes and Questions	979
[C]	Conditions and Limitations in the Treaties and Union Legislation — the “Public Burden” Condition	980
	<i>Baumbast v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i>	980
	Notes and Questions	982
§ 17.04	EU LEGISLATION ON FREE MOVEMENT	983
	Directive 2004/38	983
	Notes and Questions	986
§ 17.05	FREE MOVEMENT WITHIN A MEMBER STATE	987
	<i>Roland Rutili v. Ministre de l’Interieur</i>	987
	Notes and Questions	988
§ 17.06	DISCRIMINATION ON GROUNDS OF NATIONALITY	991
[A]	Direct Discrimination	991
	<i>Maria Martinez Sala v. Freistaat Bayern</i>	991
	Notes and Questions	993
[B]	Indirect Discrimination	993
	<i>Finanzamt Köln — Altstadt v. Roland Schumacker</i>	993
	Notes and Questions	996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Roman Angonese v. Cassa di Risparmio di Bolzano SpA</i>	996
	Notes and Questions	997
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Horst Otto Bickel and Ulrich Franz</i>	997
	Notes and Questions	999
[C]	“Within the Scope of Application of the Treaties”	1000
	<i>Ian William Cowan v. Tresor Public</i>	1000
	Notes and Questions	1002
	<i>Francoise Gravier v. City of Liège</i>	1003
	Notes and Questions	1004
	<i>The Queen (on The Application of Dany Bidar) v. London Borough of Ealing and Secretary of State for Education and Skills</i>	1004
	Notes and Questions	1007
	<i>David Charles Hayes and Jeannette Karen Hayes v. Kronenberger GmbH</i>	1008
	Notes and Questions	1010
	<i>Egon Schempp v. Finanzamt München</i>	1010
	Notes and Questions	1014
Chapter 18	EQUALITY	1015
§ 18.01	OVERVIEW	1015
§ 18.02	GENDER DISCRIMINATION — EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK	1017
[A]	Indirect Discrimination	1017
	<i>J. P. Jenkins v. Kingsgate (clothing Productions) Ltd</i>	1017
	Notes and Questions	1019
[B]	The Meaning of “Pay”	1020
	<i>Barber v. Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance Group</i>	1020
	Notes and Questions	1023
§ 18.03	EQUAL TREATMENT FOR MEN AND WOMEN IN EMPLOYMENT	1024
[A]	Affirmative Action	1024
	<i>Katarina Abrahamsson And Leif Anderson v. Elisabet Fogelqvist</i>	1024
	Notes and Questions	1027
[B]	Occupational Requirements	1027
	<i>Johnston v. Chief Constable, Royal Ulster Constabulary</i>	1027
	Notes and Questions	1029
	<i>Gabriele Habermann-Beltermann v. Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Bezirksverband Ndb./Opf. e.V.</i>	1029
	Notes and Questions	1031
[C]	Remedies	1031
	<i>M. Helen Marshall v. Southampton and South-West Hampshire Area</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Health Authority</i>	1031
	Notes and Questions	1032
§ 18.04	SUPPLY OF AND ACCESS TO GOODS AND SERVICES	1033
	Directive 2004/113	1033
	Notes and Questions	1037
§ 18.05	OTHER FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION	1038
[A]	The Effect of Directive 2000/78 on the Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights	1038
	Directive 2000/78	1038
	<i>Werner Mangold v. Rudiger Helm</i>	1040
	Notes and Questions	1041
	<i>Lisa Jacqueline Grant v. South-West Trains Ltd</i>	1042
	<i>Tadao Maruko v. Versorgungsanstalt der Deutschen Bühnen</i>	1044
	Notes and Questions	1046
[B]	The Justifications Under Article 6 of Directive 2000/78	1046
	Directive 2000/78	1046
	<i>Félix Palacios de la Villa v. Cortefiel Servicios SA</i>	1047
	Notes and Questions	1051
[C]	Racial and Ethnic Discrimination	1051
	Council Directive 2000/43/EC	1051
	Notes and Questions	1053
§ 18.06	ECONOMIC EQUALITY	1053
	<i>Royal Scholten-Honig (Holdings) Ltd v. Intervention Board for Agricultural Produce; Tunnel Refineries Ltd v. Intervention Board for Agricultural Produce</i>	1053
	Notes and Questions	1054
§ 18.07	EQUALITY AND DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS	1055
	<i>Mathews v. United Kingdom</i>	1055
	Notes and Questions	1056
	<i>M. G. Eman and O. B. Sevinger v. College van Burgemeester en Wethouders van den Haag</i>	1056
	Notes and Questions	1059
Chapter 19	CITIZENS' RIGHTS	1061
§ 19.01	OVERVIEW	1061
§ 19.02	THE RIGHT TO GOOD ADMINISTRATION	1063
[A]	Timely Action	1063
	<i>JCB Service v. Commission</i>	1063
	Notes and Questions	1065
[B]	Presumption of Innocence?	1065
	<i>JCB Service v. Commission</i>	1065

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Notes and Questions	1067
[C]	Right to a Fair Hearing and the Right to Effective Judicial Protection	1067
	<i>Organisation des Modjahedines du Peuple d'Iran v. Council</i>	1067
	Notes and Questions	1074
[D]	Access to Files	1074
	<i>BPB Industries PLC and British Gypsum Ltd v. Commission</i>	1074
	Notes and Questions	1078
[E]	The Right Against Self Incrimination/Right to Silence	1080
	<i>Orkem SA (CdFChimie SA) v. Commission, Solvay & Cie v. Commission</i>	1080
	Notes and Questions	1084
§ 19.03	RIGHT OF ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS	1085
[A]	EU Legislation	1085
	Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 Regarding Public Access to European Parliament, Council and Commission Documents [2001] OJ L 145	1085
	Notes and Questions	1092
[B]	Disclosure of Legal Advice	1093
	<i>Sweden and Maurizio Turco v. Council</i>	1093
	Notes and Questions	1096
[C]	Documents of the Member States	1099
	<i>Sweden v. Commission ad Others</i>	1099
	Notes and Questions	1102
Chapter 20	HUMAN RIGHTS	1105
§ 20.01	OVERVIEW	1105
§ 20.02	FREEDOMS	1106
[A]	Expression	1106
	<i>Laserdisken ApS v. Kulturministeriet</i>	1106
	Notes and Questions	1107
	<i>Vereinigte Familienpress Zeitungsverlags- und Vertriebs GmbH v.</i> <i>Heinrich Bauer Verlag</i>	1108
	Notes and Questions	1111
[B]	The Right to Property	1111
	<i>R. v. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Ex Parte Bostock</i>	1111
	Notes and Questions	1112
	<i>The Queen And Secretary of State for Health v. British American</i> <i>Tobacco (Investments) Ltd and Imperial Tobacco Ltd, Supported by</i> <i>Japan Tobacco Inc. and JT International SA</i>	1113
	Notes and Questions	1116
	<i>Bosphorus Hava Yollari Turizm Ve Ticaret AS v. Minister For Transport,</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Energy and Communications and Others</i>	1116
	Notes and Questions	1118
[C]	Respect for Family Life	1120
	<i>Mary Carpenter v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> . .	1120
	Notes and Questions	1122
[D]	Privacy and Protection of Personal Data	1124
	Directive 95/46	1124
	<i>Tietosuojavaltuutettu v. Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy, Satamedia Oy</i>	1126
	Notes and Questions	1129
	<i>Productores de Música de España (Promusicae) v. Telefónica de España</i> <i>SAU</i>	1129
	Notes and Questions	1131
§ 20.03	DIGNITY	1133
	<i>Omega Spielhallen- und Automatenaufstellungs-GmbH v.</i> <i>Oberbürgermeisterin der Bundesstadt Bonn</i>	1133
	Notes and Questions	1135
§ 20.04	SOLIDARITY	1136
	<i>Laval Un Partneri Ltd v. Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundet, Svenska</i> <i>Byggnadsarbetareförbundets Avd. 1, Byggettan, Svenska</i> <i>Elektrikerförbundet</i>	1136
	Notes and Questions	1141
§ 20.05	JUSTICE	1143
[A]	Right to a Fair Trial and Effective Remedy	1143
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Maria Pupino</i>	1143
	Notes and Questions	1147
[B]	Double Jeopardy	1147
	<i>Criminal Proceedings Against Leopold Henri van Esbroeck.</i>	1147
	Notes and Questions	1150
Part VII	RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBER STATES . . .	1151
Chapter 21	DUTIES OF COOPERATION AMONG THE MEMBER STATES	1153
§ 21.01	OVERVIEW	1153
§ 21.02	APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW TO INTER-STATE RELATIONS	1157
	<i>Commission v. Luxembourg and Belgium</i>	1157
	<i>Commission v. France</i>	1158
	Notes and Questions	1159
§ 21.03	DUTY OF COOPERATION IN ADJUSTING EXISTING TREATY RELATIONS WITH THIRD COUNTRIES	1160

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Budejovicky Budvar, Narodni Podnik v. Rudolf Ammersin GmbH . . .</i>	1160
	Notes and Questions	1164
§ 21.04	RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES BETWEEN MEMBER STATES	1166
	<i>Commission v. Ireland</i>	1166
	Notes and Questions	1171
§ 21.05	EXTRADITION AND FULL FAITH AND CREDIT	1172
	<i>Advocaten voor de Wereld Vzw v. Leden van de Ministerraad</i>	1172
	Notes and Questions	1176

