Index

Page numbers: **bold** = table, *italics* = figure.

AA, 193, 194, 197, 201, 204
  Accession Agreement of EU to ECHR ('AA' agreed at Reykjavik, March 2023), 177, 191, 201
  Article 01(1) (in footnote), 186
  Article 03(1), 194
  Article 03(2), 195, 197
  Article 03(3), 195
  Article 03(3) in footnote, 180
  Article 03(5), 195
  Article 03(7), 197, 198
  Article 03(8), 196
  Article 04a, 202
  Article 36(4), in footnote, 198
  EU accesstion to ECHR, 179
  protocols not ratified by all EU Member States (in footnote), 186
AA (2013 version), 195, 196, 201
Aarhus Compliance Committee, 190, 217
Aarhus Convention (2005), 191, 217
abilities doctrine, 66, 67, 74
ability to give evidence, 68, 70, 86
  interrelationship with effective judicial protection, 70, 71–77
abuse of power, 15, 277
access to court, 212, 213, 283
  DG COMP, 293–94
  ESMA, 286–88
  OLAF, 301–2
  'severely limited' (EU), 212
access to justice, 9, 151, 153, 212, 346
  applicable fundamental rights, 274, 276–80
  beyond judge, 280–84
  beyond nation-state, 280–84
  chapter structure, 274–75
  co-existence of judicial and non-judicial remedies, 309, 310
  definition, 272
  division of competences, 309
  elements, 272
  enforcement by EU authorities, 274, 275–84
  enforcement stages, 274, 275, 276–80, 285, 307
    investigation, 278–79, 282, 287, 291, 292
    monitoring, 276–78, 287
    sanctioning, 279–80, 291, 292
  evolution of concept, 274, 280–84
  functional role, 272
  identification of gaps, 306–10
  implementation, 274, 275, 284–305
    DG COMP, 289–97
    ESMA, 285–89
    OLAF, 297–305
  judicial versus non-judical remedies, 284–305
  legislative design of enforcement, 309
  legislative practice, 275
  lessons, 309–10
  'must be more than access to court', 283
  procedural limb, 272
  recommendations, 275, 310
  socio-legal literature, 274, 275
  testing of remedies systems, 271–310
accessibility, 100, 145, 248, 256, 331, 338, 371
Accession Agreement. *See* AA

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

accountability, 127, 129, 130, 252, 253, 265, 429
diffusion, 171
'effective orchestration through public messaging', 153
political, 284
public appearance versus substantive, 131
accountability forums, 146, 151, 153
actio popularis, 214, 215, 225, 226
action for annulment, 8, 17–21, 93, 94, 152, 168, 192, 198, 200, 216, 301, 307, 425, 428, 429. *See also* Article 263 TFEU
admissibility, 60, 70, 86, 319, 322, 341
in footnote, 340
applicants (non-privileged), 18
applicants (privileged), 18
applicants (semi-privileged), 18
'centrepiece of remedies system', 422
Court of Justice (jurisprudence), 28–35
crucial instrument to review lawfulness of EU action, 20
directives not yet transposed into national law (systematic inadmissibility), 85
EU factual conduct, 319–22
fundamental rights, 13–35
General Court (jurisprudence), 21–28
looking beyond, 426
pleas, 17, 20
possible outcomes, 13
procedural fundamental rights dominate case law, 35
procedural rules (constraint), 20
procedure over substance (thus far), 35
rules, 17
standing, 18–21
standing (heavy burden of proof), 77–82
standing (pleas to lighten burden of proof), 82–87
standing for bringing (broad view), 100
strengths and weaknesses, 35
unavailability (soft law), 381
action for damages, 8, 36–63, 216, 301, 363, 424, 426. *See also* TFEU Article 268 *juncto* Article 340
admissibility, 60
in footnote, 340
charter rights (successful damages cases), 45
conclusion (better utilisation of for fundamental rights protection in EU), 60–63
damages liability as remedy for fundamental rights violations, 38–43
EU factual conduct, 324–27
against Frontex (pending), 218
fundamental rights remedy, 36–63
harm and compensation (types), *41*
joint liability between EU and Member States, 55–60
establishing joint liability (attribution and causation), 56–59
implementing joint liability (court competence and parallel proceedings), 59–60
lack of clear admissibility/substance stages, 70
liability law (main functions), 38–43
compensating harm caused by fundamental rights, 38–40
condemning undesired behaviour, 41–42
vindicating rights, 42–43
literature (in footnote), 37
'might be admissible, but will always fail on merits' (soft law cases), 382
'not very effective for fundamental rights remedy' (two factors), 61
quantitative glance (CJEU damages case law in proceedings), 43–47
soft law, 381–82
'unlawfulness' as condition for EU fundamental rights liability, 47–55
CJEU's approach to 'sufficiently serious breach' test in fundamental rights cases, 53–55
no conferral of rights by charter principles, 48–49
three arguments against applying 'sufficiently serious breach' test to fundamental rights, 49–53
action for damages (requirements on evidence)
ability to seek judicial redress, 87–93
effective participation (restriction), 87–93
action for failure to act, 189, 192, 216, 319, 362. *See also* TFEU: Article 265
EU factual conduct, 322–23
against Frontex (pending), 218
actori incumbit probatio: initial burden to give evidence falls on claimant, 69
adjudication, 125, 136, 140, 146, 150
right to within reasonable time, 54
usage (in footnote), 125

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

administrative action, 50, 130, 313, 317, 326, 329, 347, 348, 357, 364
in footnote, 318
administrative review: soft law, 384–88, 390
administrative tribunals (Australia/UK): in footnote, 126
admissibility of evidence, 65, 69, 86
in footnote, 65
Advocates General, 70
AG Bobek, 85, 86, 374, 381, 382
AG Bot, 376
AG Campos Sánchez-Bordona: in footnote, 389
AG Cruz Villalón, 48
in footnote, 186
AG Hogan, 77
AG Jacobs, 99, 189
in footnote, 4
UPA Opinion (2002), 82
AG Mengozzi, 42
AG Rantos, 32, 59
AG Roemer
'ontological grounds' of Article 173, 78
Plaumann case (1963), 78, 79
AG Saugmandsgaard Øe
Associação Sindical dos Juízes Portugueses case (2017), 375
AG Sharpston, 32
AG Wathelet, 376
Association de médiation sociale (*AMS*) case (2013), 48
Opinions (full list), xxvii–xxviii
aerial surveillance, 391, 402, 405, 406, 421
Frontex, AI-powered, 393–99
'Agency'. *See* Frontex
AI, 9, 250, 253, 423, 428
EU border surveillance, 392–406
Frontex, 393–99
AI-powered aerial surveillance, 397–99
risks to fundamental rights
diverse nature, 399–406
risk of discrimination, 403–5
risks to 'other substantive rights', 405–6
risks to privacy and data protection, 400–3
'human-centric approach', 410, 420
manual-review requirement, 404, 408, 409, 414
AI Act Proposal, 391, 409, 410–17, 421
application to border surveillance (scope), 411–12
double-hatting EDPS, 417–21
interplay with data protection rules, 412–17
AI Act Proposal (Articles)
Annex III, 411
Article 01, 410
Article 02, 412
Article 05(a), 411
Article 05(b), 411
Article 05(c), 411
Article 10(3), in footnote, 412
Article 10(5), in footnote, 416
Article 53, 418
Article 53(1b), 419
Article 53(1f), 420
Article 53(a), 419
Article 57(a), 418
Article 59(8), 417
Article 63(6), 418
Article 68(a), 415, 418
recital 41, 416
AI and fundamental rights, 391–421
conclusion, 421
double-hatting EDPS, 417–21
protection gaps, 421
remedial possibilities, 406–17
access, 407–10
AI Act Proposal, 410–17
AI Act Proposal (application to border surveillance), 411–12
AI Act Proposal (interplay with data protection, 412–17
reviewability, 409, 410
risks (EU border surveillance), 392–406
AI Liability Directive (proposed, 2022), 63
AI Office, 418
AI systems, 393, 410, 411, 412, 415, 419
definition, 392
in footnote, 416
AI tools, 392, 393, 394, 397, 398, 404
AIRE Centre, 220
Albania, 143
algorithmic risk assessments, 397, 404, 408
algorithms, 250, 393, 394, 396, 398, 402, 403, 406, 408. *See also* ETIAS
alliance and conflict systems in courtroom (Andersen), 212
Alonso de León, Sergio, 354
alternative dispute resolution (ADR), 8, 228, 234
EU directive (2013), 256
in footnote, 234, 256

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

alternative dispute resolution (ADR) (cont.)
passim, 245–57
amicus curiae (friend of court), 219, 220
Amsterdam, 225
Andersen, Ellen, 212
Anderson, Terence: in footnote, 77
annulment. *See* action for annulment
antitrust proceedings, 290, 291, 295, 296
appeals procedures, 329
ARAs. *See* automated risk assessments
arbitral tribunals, 230, 231, 235, 237, 238, 240, 243
area of freedom, security and justice (AFSJ), 392, 394
soft law, 377–79
Arnull, Anthony, 381, 383
Article I tribunals (USA): in footnote, 129
artificial intelligence. *See* AI
Asylum Procedures Directive (2013)
Article 14, 377
Article 15, 377
Article 15(3)(c), 377
asylum seekers, 111, 220, 374. *See also* EUAA
in footnote, 136, 216
attributability problem, 358–59
attribution
and causation (sequential questions), 56
clear rules required, 63
definition (action for damages), 56
threshold, 59
austerity, 163, 170, 375, 376, 377
EU-induced, 167–70
Austria, 80, 160
automated risk assessments, 393–97, 401, 402, 404, 410
definition, 393
Azoulai, L.: in footnote, 106

Belgium, xxix, 111, 173
Bentham, Jeremy, 96
Treatise on Judicial Evidence (1825), 95
binding legal effects, 20, 50, 320, 321, 348, 381
in footnote, 322
Bitcoin blockchain, 251
Blomgren Amsler, Lisa, 252, 253
in footnote, 253
Boards of Appeal. *See* BoAs
BoAs, 123, 124, 125, 129, 140, 150, 151, 152, 341, 388, 389, 426
access to justice perspective, 150
administrative review bodies, 334
authority and measures, 139–40, 146
decisions 'legally binding', 134
one exception (in footnote), 134
definition (broad), 133
expertise and funding, 146, 147–48, 149
increasingly 'judicialized', 129, 130
'individual interest orientation', 137
judicative function, 134
offer accountability 'in quintessentially adjudicative fashion', 129
'often conceptualised as quasi-judicial', 139
portrait, 133–34
'share many characteristics with judicial institutions', 139
Bogucki, Artur: in footnote, 416
Bosphorus doctrine. *See* ECtHR (cases)
Bourdieu, Pierre (in footnote), 126
Bovend'Eerdt, Koen, xi, 9, 271–310, 423, 425, 426
Briggs LJ, 254, 255
Brito Bastos, Felipe, 355
Broberg, M.: in footnote, 108
Brussels Convention, 235
Brussels I bis Regulation (2012), 235
Bundesverfassungsgericht, 159, 174, 175
CJEU ruling rejected (ECB PSPP case, 2020), 173, 175
non-publication of complaints not accepted for decision (in footnote), 175
Bundesverfassungsgericht (cases)
Atlanta case (2000), 167
full list, xxix–xxx
Maastricht case (2000), 172
Solange I case (1974), 163, 164, 165, 166, 167
Wünsche Handelsgesellschaft (*Solange II*) case (1986), 166
Bündnis 90/Grünen, 172
Bündnis Bürgerwille, 173
burden of proof, 65, 93, *See also onus probandi*
in footnote, 65

Campact, 173
Canada: British Columbia, 248
Canada-EU Trade Agreement (CETA), 174
capabilities (Nussbaum), 66
Cappelletti, M., 2
case law, 107, 139, 155, 183, *See also (for example)* CJEU (cases)
CJEU versus ECtHR, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 193

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

causal link, 58, 59, 91, 92, 325, 326, 381, 382
in footnote, 88, 325
causation, 59, 88
clear rules required, 63
definition (action for damages), 56
threshold, 58
ceremony (neo-institutional organisation theory), 131
CFR, 1, 3, 19, 109, 110, 171, 428
actions for damages, 43, 44
'can guide interpretation of Treaties', 426
determination of whether provision contans 'right' or 'principle', 49
entry into force (2009), 158
EU soft law, 374
incorporation into EU law, 2, 423
'rights' versus 'principles', 48
only violations of former risk damages, 48
'should extend to soft law', 380
social and economic rights, 168
CFR (Articles)
Article 01, 316, 399
Article 02, 316, 405
Article 03, 316
in footnote, 188
Article 04, 316
in footnote, 188
Article 06, 315, 405
Article 07, 45, 114, 214, 215, 278, 298, 306, 315, 316, 349, 400
in footnote, 45, 188
Article 08, 45, 114, 214, 215, 315, 400, 414
in footnote, 45
Article 11, 380
Article 15, 374
Article 16, 45, 85, 316, 374
Article 17, 45, 85, 316, 374
Article 18, 144, 316, 400
Article 19, 316
Article 20, 114, 378
Article 21, 45, 114, 352, 378, 400, 404
right to non-discrimination (*qv*), 403
Article 22, 114
Article 23, 114
Article 24, 351, 380
Article 25, 49
Article 26, 49
Article 31, 44
Article 34(1), 49
Article 34(3), 49
Article 35, 49
Article 35(3), 380
Article 36, 49
Article 37, 49
Article 38, 49, 380
Article 41, 27, 31, 44, 46, 52, 134, 291, 306, 343, 407
right to sound administration (*qv*), 330
Article 41(1), 330, 342
Article 41(2), 330
Article 41(3), 43, 331
Article 43
in footnote, 330
right to lodge complaints with Ombudsman (*qv*), 331
Article 47, 2, 5, 32, 36, 42, 44, 46, 47, 50, 62, 64, 76, 77, 85, 86, 94, 97, 129, 134, 231, 240, 306, 308, 318–19, 320, 325, 343, 385, 418, 424, 426. *See also* effective judicial protection
Article 47(2), 74
Article 48, 44, 306
Article 49, 306
Article 51, 17, 375
Article 51(1), 103
Article 51(2), 188
Article 52, 32
Article 52(1), 47, 368, 382, 400, 415
Article 52(3), 33, 52
Article 52(4), 52
Article 52(5), 48
CFSP, 46, 47, 178, 181, 424
EU accession to ECHR, 199–204
benefits, 196–204
current gap in effective protection, 199–201
key to abbreviation (Common Foreign and Security Policy), 24
Chamon, Merijn, xi, 9, 366–90, 422, 423, 425, 427
'Charter'. *See* CFR
Charter of Fundamental Rights, *See* CFR
Civil Courts Structure Review (UK), 254
civil law, 248
in footnote, 38
civil liberties, 156, 174, 190
challenges to EU intrusion on personal liberties, 170–71
civil service (of EU), 45, 192
Civil Service Tribunal, xxvi
in footnote, 44
civil society, 155, 156, 160, 161, 162, 169, 170, 174, 175, 414

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

CJEU, 1, 9, 14, 192
acte clair and *acte éclairé*, 158
action for annulment, 36
action for damages (appeals on points of law only), 43
annuls EU regulations (rather than acts), 114
approach to action for damages, 47
association between evidence and effective judicial protection, 67
attribution tests, 57
'axiological assumptions', 95, 96
'broad interpretation of own jurisdiction', 199
competence limited to pleas of law, 20, 21
'complements jurisprudence of General Court', 35
composite procedures (case law), 346
composite procedures ('failure to clarify essential aspects of judicial review'), 365
conditions for liability, 43
deference to national courts 'almost absent', 115, 118
direct access 'limited', 219
economic sanctions case law, 87
EU accession to ECHR (*Opinion 2/94* and *Opinion 2/13*), 178
fundamental rights reasoning, 424
'has not developed coherent approach to attribution', 57
'has seldom qualified an act as both regulatory and self-executing', 84
'incoherent approach to attribution', 58
'inconsistent terminology', 57
internal market, 70, 262, 371, 373, 390
joint liability between EU and Member States, 55–60
legality of Frontex's activities (2021–2023), 4
looking beyond, 426–27
'may not annul or declare primary EU law invalid', 180
preliminary reference procedure, 16, 114
procedures of decisional nature, 357
purpose, 371
reliance in decisions on ECB's Administrative Board of Review, 139
restriction of fundamental rights (notion 'not properly clarified'), 371
sole authority claimed to review validity of EU acts, 156
sufficiently serious breach test, 49–55, 61
refusal to lighten burden of proof, 93
third-party interventions ('not easily allowed access'), 211
treatment of fundamental rights complaints, 114–15
'two-speed effective judicial protection', 94
two-step test (criminal cooperation), 184
understanding of hierarchy of European legal norms, 158
'very reticent to annul EU acts', 118
view of Article 47 CFR, 424
will be subject to jurisdiction of ECtHR (upon EU accession to ECHR), 183
CJEU (cases)
Abdulrahim case (2013), 40
Achbita case (2017), 187
Achmea case (2018), 236, 237
Addis case (2020), 378
Akzo and Akcros joined case (2007), 320, 328
Al-Aqsa case (2012), 33
Aranyosi case (2016), 185
Association Greenpeace France ruling (1999), 362
Asturcom case (2009), 239
Atlanta case (1995), 166
Bank Refah Kargaran case (2020), 200
Baustahlgewebe case (1998), 183
Belgium v Commission (2018), 381, 382, 384
Bergaderm case (2000), 88, 89, 93
Berlusconi ruling (2018), 359, 360–63, 365
Bevándorlási és Állgmpolgársági Hivatal case (2018), 374
Bollman case (1973), in footnote, 105
Borelli case (1992), 359–63, 365
Brasserie du Pêcheur case (1996), 88, 93
Case *Opinion 1/17* (2019), xxi, 16
Centraal Israëlitisch Consistorie van België case (2020), 111
Codorníu case (1994), 82
Digital Rights Ireland case (2014), 183, 214, 215
Eco Swiss case, 239
Elitaliana v Eulex Kosovo case (2015), xix, 200, 201
ERTA case (1971), in footnote, 312
Factortame case (1990), 73
Fédération bancaire française (*FBF*) case (2021), 288, 382, 384, 390

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

FIAMM case (2008), 93
Foto-Frost case (1987), 158, 171, 282, 307, 358, 359
French Republic v People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (2011), 30–32
full list, xiii–xxii
Funke ruling (2023), 364
Gascogne Sack Deutschland case (2013), 54
Grimaldi ruling (1989), 358
Groupe Gascogne v Commission (2013), 54
Hauer case (1979), 165
Homoki v Commission (2021), 300
Hungary v European Parliament and Council of EU (2022), 34–35
IBM v Commission (1981), 301
Internationale Handelsgesellschaft case (1970), 164
Inuit case (2013), 318, 327
in footnote, 83
Jeanningros ruling (2020), 361
Jégo-Quéré case (2004), 81, 99, 383, 384
Johnston case (1986), 73, 95
in footnote, 73
Kadi judgment (2008), 30, 87
established two principles, 24
Kampffmeyer case (1967), 59, 60, 89
Kempter case (2008), in footnote, 105
Kendrion case (2013), 54
Kočner v EUROPOL (currently under appeal), 58
Komstroy case (2021), 236, 237
KS and KD case (pending), 200, 203
La Quadrature du Net case (2020), 188
Laval case (2007), 187
Ledra Advertising joined case (2016), 376, 381
Les Verts case (1986), 4, 17, 95, 327, 365
Liga van Moskeeën case (2018), 114
Ligue des droits humains judgment (2022), 404
Lisrestal case (1996), 353
Mallis joined case (2016), 376
Mediocurso case (2000), 354
Mellifera case (2020), 217
Mostaza Claro case (2006), 238, 239
Mulder (milk quotas) case (1992), 103
N.S. and M.E joined case (2011), 220
Nölle case (1991), 407
Nord Stream 2 appeal, 84–87
Opinion 2/13 (2014), xviii, 178, 195, 196, 197, 201, 236, 237
Otero Ramos case (2017), 74, 81
Plaumann case (1963), 78, 79, 82, 83, 87, 93, 94, 133, 155, 164, 168, 170, 189, 211, 216, 217, 218, 226, 383, 387
Poland v European Parliament and Council of EU (2022), 34–35
Pringle case (2012), 375
Randstad [variously spelled] *Italia* case (2021), 77
Rewe case (1976), 73, 95
in footnote, 73
Rosneft case (2017), 200
San Giorgio case (1983), 74, 81
Schecke case (2010), 103
Schindler Holding Ltd v European Commission (2013), 33–34
Schrems I case (2015), 183, 215
Sharpston case (2021), 32
Steffensen case (2003), 75
Stichting Greenpeace Council case (1998), 217
Sturgeon case (2009), 102
Sweden v Commission (2007), 355
T.Port case (2003), 91
Tillack case, xvi, 316, 324, 326, 330, 332, 339
in footnote, 323
TUM case (1991), 407
TWD rule (1994), 100
Unibet case (2007), 384
UPA case (2002), 82, 88, 383, 384
Van Gend en Loos case (1963), 72, 78, 95, 273
Vendrame v Commission (pending), 300
Viking case (2007), 187
Wünsche Handelsgesellschaft case (1982), 166
CJEU (procedural fundamental rights reviews)
circumscribed, yet not inconsequential, 30–35
lawfulness of limitations to fundamental rights (fourfold requirement), 32
legally-structured tests, 32
CJEU (Rules of Procedure), 104, 106, 107
Article 023(2), in footnote, 106
Article 060, in footnote, 115
Article 094 (in footnote), 104
Article 096, 106, 220
Article 097, 219
Article 097, in footnote, 106
Article 130(2), 85

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

CJEU case law
action for damages proceedings (quantitative glance), 43–47
effective judicial protection 'central fundamental right', 22
principles of evidence (ability to give evidence), 68
principles of evidence (distribution of evidentiary duties), 68
principles of evidence (two families), 68
procedural entitlements recognised by, 68
CJEU Statute
Article 23, 106
Article 25, 152
Article 42, 152
Article 58a(3), in footnote, 125
recent reforms, 134
CJEU's jurisprudence
action for annulment (*qv*), 28–35
action for annulment involving fundamental rights (numerical evidence), 29–30
appeals against General Court decisions, 29
'virtually impossible to win an appeal', 29
ClientEarth, 217
Coman-Kund, Florin, xi, 9, 311–44, 423, 426, 427
commercial arbitration, 237, 243
Commission. *See* European Commission
Commission Delegated Regulation (2012), 285
Common Agricultural Policy, 103, 112, 350
Common Foreign and Security Policy. *See* CFSP
common law, 220
in footnote, 38, 129, 371
communications, 101, 250, 278, 292, 298, 349
in footnote, 188, 314
Community Plant Variety Office, 386
BoA attached to, 134
companies, 37, 109, 111, 156, 158, 161, 163, 167, 170, 174, 277, 296
competition law, 183, 300, 307, 314, 316, 349, 350
Commission's guidelines, 369
in footnote, 66, 186
parallel behaviour 'strong evidence' of concerted practice, 70
competition policies, 26, 294
complaints mechanism, 50, 143, 259, 262, 265, 338, 342
complete system of remedies, 4, 8, 16, 227, 244, 327, 424, 430
EU accession to ECHR, 177–205
completeness principle, 95
composite procedures
access to justice, 365
access to justice (difficulties), 357
access to justice (factual action), 357, 358–59
access to justice (problem of attributability), 357, 358–59
'administrative action criterion', 348
admissibility, 359
available remedies (to violations of fundamental rights), 347
case law, 346, 349, 353–56, 359–64, 365
categorisation, 346
chapter structure, 346–47
chapter thesis, 347
conclusions, 364–65
of decisional nature, 350
definition, 9, 345
discretion, 360, 361
factual conduct, 348–50, 364
finding competent court, 356–64
separation of jurisdiction, 356–57
fundamental procedural rights, 352–56
fundamental rights violations, 345–65
fundamental rights which might be violated, 346, 348–50
further research, 364, 365
'horizontal' versus 'vertical', 346
identification of appropriate judicial forum, 348
judicial protection (gaps), 347, 357, 365
lack official definition and clear conceptualisation, 345
literature review available, 345
structural shortcomings, 365
'substantive' fundamental rights, 350–52
sufficient remedies (availability), 345–65
term coined by Herwig C. Hofmann (in footnote), 345
conferral, 172, 234, 243, 423
confidentiality, 96, 140, 230, 292
in footnote, 140, 252, 299
configuration of elites (Andersen), 212
constitutional courts, 159, 160, 161, 162, 175
constitutional identity, 159, 175
constitutional review, 161, 162
Constitutional Treaty, 423
constitutions, 168
rights (first-generation versus second-generation), 159

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

consumer law, 245, 256
consumer protection, 238, 242, 256, 380
Consumidor.gov.br, 251
contradictory debate, 68, 69, 87
Convention. *See* ECHR
corporate procedures: admissibility, 359
Council of Europe. *See also* ECtHR
  guidelines on ODR mechanisms (2021), 256, 264, 266
  Reykjavik Summit (May 2023), 177
  Steering Committee for Human Rights, 202
Council of European Union, 18, 24, 26
Court of First Instance, 183, 217, 354
  in footnote, 183
  later 'General Court' (*qv*), 189
Court of Justice of EU. *See* CJEU
COVID-19 pandemic, 173, 249
credit rating agencies (CRAs), 285, 286, 287
Credit Rating Agency Regulation (CRAR, 2011), 286, 287, 288
  Annex III, 287
  Article 23(b), 287
  Article 23(e), 287
  Article 36(a), 287
  Article 36(e), 287
cultural and legal frames (Andersen), 212
culture, 252, 264, 284
Curia database, 109
Curtin, Deirdre: in footnote, 127, 153
cybersecurity, 253, 256
Cybersettle, 248, 250
Cyprus: pension system, 377

Data Governance Act (DGA, 2022), 379
data protection, 23, 183, 214, 220, 262, 315, 396. *See also* CFR Article 8
  AI risks, 400–3
data protection authorities (DPAs), 415
  Ireland, 223
data protection rules. *See also* right to data protection
  'far from homogeneous', 413
  interplay with AI Act Proposal, 412–17
Data Retention Directive, 214
data sharing, 350, 365
De Coninck, Joyce, xi, 8, 36–63, 424, 425, 426, 429
de facto, 280, 284
De Fazio, Gianluca: legal opportunity structures (three dimensions), 212
de Gregorio, Giovanni: in footnote, 258
de jure, 280, 284, 287, 289, 307, 309
Demková, Simona, xi, 9, 391–421, 423, 427, 428
Denmark: constitutional identity, 175
DG COMP, 275, 284, 289–97, 300
  access to court, 293–94
  access to justice, 294–97
  acts in parallel with national authorities, 275
  Hearing Officers, 295–96, 297, 308
  independence, 296–97
  investigative and sanctioning powers, 291
  legal framework (safeguards and defence rights), 291–93
  manual of procedures, 292
  political accountability, 294–95
  powers mostly 'of coercive nature', 291
  Regulation (2003), 290, 291
    Article 11(6), 290
  Regulation (2004), 291
  remedies (judicial), 293–94
  remedies (non-judicial), 294–97
Digital Rights Ireland, 214, 215
Digital Services Act (DSA), 246, 254, 258, 259, 262
  adoption (2022), 379
  Article 02(h), in footnote, 258
  Article 21, 265
  Article 34, 380
  out-of-court dispute settlement bodies (prospective), 266
digital sphere: soft law interferences with fundamental rights (practice), 379–80
direct actions, 8, 61, 64, 95, 97, 100, 104, 117, 211, 318, 328
  evidentiary requirements (limitation to private parties' seeking of judicial redress, 70
  evidentiary requirements (obstruction of access to legal remedy), 70
  possibility for third-party interventions, 221
  strategic litigation, 216–19
direct concern, 78, 83, 84, 98, 155, 168, 189, 410, 424
  applied *talis qualis* in failure to act proceedings, 79
  possibility to establish in name of 'effective judicial protection', 85
  probandum, 86
direct effect doctrine, 78, 95
Directorate General for Competition. *See* DG COMP

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

discretion, 51, 53, 92, 369, 370, 409
absence of, 79
can relate to policy choices and assessment of fact, 361
definition, 361
form a decision might take, 361
whether to exercise a power, 361
dispute resolution mechanisms, 227, 229, 230, 234, 236, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245
addition of fourth party (technology), 249
eBay, 247
in footnote, 253
traditional (three-party), 249
distributed ledger technologies (DLTs), 251
domestic law, 189, 243, 370
in footnote, 194
double jeopardy. *See ne bis in idem*
drones, 391, 398, 402, 405
Dublin system, 220
due process, 17, 252, 256, 310
Dutch Council for Refugees (DCR), 224
duty of care, 407, 408
duty to give reasons, 355, 356
Article 41 CFR, 353
Dworkin's Herculean judge, 149

eBay, 246, 247
eBay: Resolution Centre, 245
EBCG Agency. *See* Frontex
EBCG Regulation (2019), xxxviii, 336, 337
Article 097(3), in footnote, 337
Article 098, 338
Article 098(1), in footnote, 338
Article 111, 335
Article 111(2) (in footnote), 335
Article 111(3) (in footnote), 336
in footnote, 135
recital 24 (in footnote), 135
recital 42 (in footnote), 135
ECHR, 17, 33, 50, 158, 236, 370, 428
EU accession, 177–205, 424
'just satisfaction' for violations, 40
ECHR (Articles)
Article 03, 182
in footnote, 188
Article 06, 33, 188, 190, 256, 296, 308. *See also* right to fair trial
Article 06(1), 188, 189, 190
Article 08, 349
in footnote, 188
Article 09, 372
Article 13, 190, 256. *See also* right to remedy
in footnote, 272
Article 35, 192
Article 36, 194
Article 36(4), 197
Article 46, 40, 184
ECN+ Directive (2019), 292, 295, 297
e-commerce, 245, 247, 250, 252
economic operators, 19, 37, 90, 289
economic rights, 156
challenges to EU trade regimes, 163–67
ECtHR, 8, 178, 226, 371, 372, 428
admissibility requirements, 191–93
case law, 52, 278
case law (quantitative analysis), 40
diagnostic test (five main stages) (Letsas), 371
exhaustion rule, 192
'Greek hot spots for asylum seekers', 2023 (in footnote), 136
judgments ('binding nature'), 185
third-party interventions, 211
ECtHR (cases)
A, B and C v Ireland (Grand Chamber, 2010), 372
Al-Jedda v United Kingdom (2011): in footnote, 203
Behrami and Saramati case (2007), 203
in footnote, 203
Bivolaru and Moldovan case (2021), 182
Bosphorus case (2005), 181, 182, 187, 190, 204
Cha'are Shalom Ve Tsedek v France (2000), 372
Connolly case (2008), 181
Dangeville v France (2002), 189
Dhahbi case (2014), 188
full list, xxviii–xxix
Menarini Diagnostics Srl v Italy (2011), 34
Posti and Rahko v Finland (2002), 190
Sanofi Pasteur v France (2020), 188
Spasov case, 189
ECtHR (intensity of review: four aspects), 187–91, 204
doctrine of positive obligations, 187, 204
locus standi requirements, 189
margin of appreciation, 187
'rather procedural *Dhahbi* case law', 188
ECtHR: Practical Guide on Admissibility Criteria (2022), in footnote, 372

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

EDPS, 342, 343, 392, 412, 413, 415, 421, 426
clear obligation when dealing with complaints, 339
conformity assessments, 418
double-hatting, 417–21
key to abbreviation (European Data Protection Supervisor), 338
offers 'quite effective legal protection', 340
participate in organisation of regulatory sandboxes, 419
role (protecting fundamental rights), 420
role in AI Office, 418
supervisory role, 420
Edwards, Lilian: in footnote, 412
effective judicial protection, 8, 16, 22, 23, 25, 64, 67, 93, 97, 205, 231, 240, 319, 366, 383, 425, 429. *See also* Article 47 CFR
access to remedy '*the* procedural guarantee', 73
by third country, 25
choice of procedures, 95
competition policies, 26
EU and national institutions (various fields of law), 26
holistic reading (some scholarly endorsement), 75
holistic reading (some support in case law), 75
holistic reading of 'procedure', 76, 94
interrelationship with effective ability to give evidence, 70, 71–77
lato sensu understanding (Wildemeersch), 75
limit, 32
restricted by evidence requirements, 77–87
standard of 'effectiveness', 73, 75
standard of 'effectiveness' (uniformity between EU and Member states), 76, 77, 94
'two-speed', 94
effective participation, 68, 70, 94
definition, 67
definition (in footnote), 67
effective participation (restriction in action for damages), 87–93
effectiveness
Article 47 CFR, 76, 87, 94
'clear definition lacking', 71
national systems of procedures and remedies, 76
'outcome-oriented notion', 71, 72
preliminary observations, 71
scope, 71
uniformity, 71
effectiveness test (rules on evidence), 74
effectiveness-rights correlation, 72
effet utile, 72
electronic communications, 188, 245
Electronic Frontier Foundation, 214
Eliantonio, Mariolina, xi, 9, 345–65, 368, 370, 423, 425, 427
English High Court, 171, 203
entrepreneurs, 163, 167
Entry/Exit System (EES), 394, 395, 396, 412
environmental law, 216, 217, 219
e-Privacy Directive (2002): in footnote, 413
equal opportunities: in footnote, 66, 226
equal treatment, 23, 28
in footnote, 66, 226
equivalence, 75, 238, 239, 384
in footnote, 281
error in law, 31, 238
ESM, 167, 173
MoUs, 375, 377, 381
ESM Treaty (2012), 375
ESMA, 274, 307, 308, 309
access to court, 286–88
access to justice, 285–89
availability of judicial review, 287
founding regulation (2010, amended 2019), 288
Article 03, 289
Article 05, 289
Article 10-16, 287
Article 42, 46, 49, 52, and 59, 289
Article 60(a), 289
Article 62, 289
independence, 289
'independent agency lacking fully-fledged input legitimacy', 287
'intentional' or 'negligent' violations by private actors, 288
on-site inspections, 307
positioned above national authorities, 275
procedural safeguards ('clarity' question), 287
remedies (judicial), 286–88
remedies (non-judicial), 288–89
ESMA: Board of Appeal, 287, 308
ESMA: Independent Investigation Officer (IIO), 287

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

ESMA: Recommendations (2013) on scope of CRAR, 286
ETIAS, xxxvii, 394–97, 399, 401–4, 405, 408, 412, 421
  risk algorithm, 397, 409, 410, 413, 414
ETIAS Central System, 395
ETIAS Central Unit, 395, 410, 414
  identical to 'Frontex' (*qv*), 395
ETIAS National Units, 397, 409
ETIAS Regulation (2018), 409, 410
  Article 14, 403
  Article 33(1), 396
  in footnote, 395
EU
  asylum *acquis*, 377
  border surveillance (risks to fundamental rights), 392–406
  burgeoning transnational executive (cloak of legitimacy), 130
  closed legal opportunity structures, 211–12
  common asylum policy, 262
  executive actors' 'lack of electoral accountability', 153
  'expanding competence', 227, 242
  foreign missions, 171
  'functionally-tailored non-state actor', 53
  fundamental rights violations (ODR as redress mechanism), 261–66
  fundamental rights violations (role of national courts in redressing), 155–76
  general system of evidence, 64–71
  as lawmaker, 6, 7
  as lawmaker (outdated vision), 422–23
  level of democratic accountability 'lags behind' (in footnote), 128
  multiple legal orders (challenge of ensuring protection of rights in same fashion), 307
  positive obligations (sometimes lacks means or competence), 53
  power, 3, 5
  range of action 'ever growing', 99
  response to Russian invasion of Ukraine (soft law), 378–79
  rule intended to confer rights on individuals (mode of determination), 48
  specific interest in upholding fundamental rights, 13
  'vast executive expansion since 1990s', 123
EU accession to ECHR, 177–205, 424
  benefits of accession, 179–91
    external remedies filling two protection gaps, 179, 180–83
    greater coherency between EU and ECHR, 179, 183–86
    substantive effects of accession on practices, 179, 186–91
  CFSP, 199–204
  conclusion, 204–5
  procedural practicalities after accession, 191–98
    co-respondent mechanism, 194–97, 204
    ECtHR admissibility requirements, 191–93
    prior involvement procedure, 197–98, 204
    shared or concurrent responsibility, 194–97
  would silence 'charges of double standards', 180
EU administrative authorities
  acountability, 351
  infringement of EU fundamental rights, 347
EU agencies, 127, 385
  list of, with own BoA (in footnote), 133
  soft law, 369
EU Agency for Asylum. *See* EUAA
EU Agency for Large-Scale IT Systems. *See* eu-LISA
EU authorities, 6–7
  definition (broad versus narrow), 6
EU Aviation Safety Agency, 134
EU citizen, 99, 137, 331
EU consumer ODR platform, 256–58
  design shortcoming, 264
EU DPR. *See* GDPR (2018/1725)
EU enforcement authorities (EEAs), 200, 308, 309, 310
EU factual conduct, 9, 311–44, 359, 364
  act with 'binding legal effects', 320–21
    in footnote, 322
  act without 'binding legal effects' (way to review legality), 321–22
  acts of 'physical' conduct, 315
  and fundamental rights, 311, 312–16
  closing legal protection gap, 344
  composite procedures, 358–59
  conceptual reflections, 311, 312–15
  conclusion, 344
  judicial remedies, 311, 318–29, 340
    action for damages, 324–27
    action of annulment, 319–22
    failure to act, 322–23

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

gaps and shortcomings, 327–29
plea of illegality, 327
preliminary reference procedure, 323–24
right to effective judicial remedy, 318–19
legal protection against fundamental rights violations, 317–18
non-judicial remedies, 311, 329–40, 341
BoAs, 334–35
Frontex fundamental rights complaint mechanism, 335–38
legal review of EU executive agencies acts, 333–34
Ombudsman, 331–33
right to good administration, 329–31
overall assessment, 311, 340–42
'prescribed and confined by law', 317
reflections and recommendations, 311, 342–44
risk for fundamental rights, 315–16
underpinning implicit legal act, 322
underpinning implicit physical act, 321
way forward (effective administrative remedies plus judicial review), 344
EU Human Rights Review Panel, 200
EU institutions, *116*, 151
failures, 322
'failures' (examples), in footnote, 322
invocation of fundamental rights protection, 18
non-judicial, 222–24
procedural obligations, 14
EU Integrated Border Management (EIBM), 405
EU integration
centrality of CJEU, 227
challenges (political rights), 172–74
EU Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)
BoA attached to, 134
in footnote, 133
EU Intellectual Property Office Regulation (2017), 385
EU judicial architecture, 427
composite procedures, 345–65
international arbitration (constitutional limits), 235–40
separation of jurisdiction, 364
separation of jurisdiction 'cornerstone', 356–57
EU law, 99, 103, 111
challenge to legality of before CJEU, 16
declarations of invalidity, 183
full list, xxxiii–xxxix
looking beyond, 427–28
principle of autonomy, 236
uniform application (argument to limit international arbitration), 238–39
uniformity, 107, 118, 120
uniformity of interpretation, 237
EU law enforcement
direct, 281
indirect, 280
'necessitates other forms of control' (functional perspective), 283
EU law enforcement authorities, 9
legal frameworks, 284–305
testing of remedies systems, 271–310
EU law enforcement authorities (examples)
DG COMP (*qv*), 289–97
ESMA (*qv*), 285–89
OLAF (*qv*), 297–305
EU legal order, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 24, 35, 36, 107, 185, 238, 239, 301, 317, 346, 356, 406
arbitration (role), 233, 243
backbone, 34
court-centricity (literature survey, in footnote), 124
effectiveness, 239
maturity, 35
preliminary reference procedure, 99
principle of freedom of proof, 85
'shaped like few others by single judicial institution', 124
soft law, 367
uniformity, 120
EU legislator, 118, 246, 256, 280, 302, 310, 365, 379, 385, 386, 390, 410, 418, 428, 430
'can do no wrong', 96, 422
EU Review Bodies. *See* Review Bodies
EU sanctions, 19, 24, 30, 54, 199, 282, 349
absence of duty to notify before adoption, 31
factual basis for imposition, 25
illegality (whether breach of fundamental rights), 54
judicial review (approach), 24
Kadi judgment (principles), 24
maintaining individual on list, 31
procedure followed to adopt these measures, 24
statement of reasons (appropriateness), 25
third-country compliance with fundamental rights, 25

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

EU Travel Information and Authorisation System. *See* ETIAS
EUAA, 135, 144, 148, 262, 265, 266, 350, 351
  Article 13 of establishing Regulation (2021 version), 377
  focus, 143
  FROs (authority and measures), 140, 142, 143–44
  guidance (2019), 377
  soft law interferences with fundamental rights (practice), 377–78
EUAA: Management Board, 377
eu-LISA, 351, 392, 395, 413
EURODAC, 339, 394, 395
Euro-expertise, 213, 225, 429
European Anti-Fraud Office. *See* OLAF
European arrest warrant, 185
  in footnote, 109
European Artificial Intelligence Office. *See* AI Office
European Asylum Policy Regulation (2021), 262
European Asylum Support Office, 135
European Banking Authority (EBA): in footnote, 313, 316
European Board for Digital Services (EBDS), 379
European Border and Coast Guard Agency. *See* Frontex
European Border and Coast Guard Regulation. *See* EBCG Regulation (2019)
European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR), 339, 398, 399
  fusion services, 398
European Central Bank, 18, 125, 173, 314, 375
  Administrative Board of Review, 139
    arrangements (procedural and institutional), 140
    opinions 'not legally binding', 139
    whether may be referred to as a 'BoA' (in footnote), 139
European Central Bank: Joint Inspection Teams, 358
European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) Regulation (2022 revision), 385
European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)
  BoA attached to, 134
  in footnote, 134, 334
European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour: in footnote, 331
European Commission, 18, 26, 194, 292, 314, 349, 351, 362, 369, 378, 382, 385, 396
  annual reports, 295
  confidentiality of documents (General Court), 96
  ESM MoUs, 375–77
  Guidelines to DG COMP on method of setting fines, 292
  'independence questioned', 297
  rules of political accountability to European Parliament, 294
European Commission: Framework Agreement with EP, 294
European Competition Network (ECN), 290, 307
  'lacks legal personality', 293
  passim, 293–97
  rules for case allocation (in footnote), 290
European Consumer Centre, 257
European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. *See* ECHR
European Council, 233, 262
European Court of Auditors (ECA), 18, 221–22, 223, 295, 302
European Court of Human Rights. *See* ECtHR
European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS-TCN), 394
European Data Innovation Board (EDIB), 379
European Data Protection Board (EDPB), 223, 379, 412, 419
European Data Protection Supervisor. *See* EDPS
European Economic Community, 1
European exceptionalism, 178
European Food Safety Authority, 386
  in footnote, 355
European Investment Bank, 224
European Ombudsman. *See* Ombudsman
European Parliament, 18, 27, 145, 262, 289, 294, 295, 388, 415
  AI legislation (2023 amendments), in footnote, 391
  Committee on Petitions, 223
European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO), 315
  in footnote, 299, 315, 317, 339

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA), 333
European Research Executive Agency (REA), 333
European Securities and Markets Authority. *See* ESMA
European Social Charter, 158
European Stability Mechanism. *See* ESM
European Supervisory Authorities (ESAs): in footnote, 313
European Supervisory Authorities: Joint Board of Appeal, 147
European Supervisory Authority Regulations (2010, amended 2019), 386–89
Europol, 63, 395, 396, 409, 420
  in footnote, 317
Europolis, 173
Eurozone crisis, 172, 173, 375
Eurozone Member States, 375
evidence
  associative view, 67
  'can hinder judicial protection provided by Treaty provisions', 70
  concept and system in EU law, 65
  definition (in footnote), 64
  EU law or general system 'cannot exist', 66
  general system (EU), 64–71
  harm suffered (abnormality), 90
  national rules, 66
  probative value, 69
  procedural perspective, 65
  processual perspective, 66
  secondary law instruments, 66
  sectoral systems, 66
evidence as enabler or filter (action brought by private parties), 64–97
  action for damages, 87–93
  conclusion, 93–97
  effective ability to give evidence, 71–77
  effective judicial protection, 71–77
  evidence requirements restricting effective access to remedy, 77–87
  general system of evidence (EU), 64–70
evidence requirements (restriction on effective access to remedy), 77–87
  burden of proof (pleas to lighten), 82–87
  direct concern criterion, 78
  individual concern, 78
  legality review, 77–87
  standing (heavy burden of proof), 77–82
evidence rules, 8, 229
evidentiary duties: distribution (definition), 69
evidentiary entitlements: main purpose (fairness), 68
ex ante authorisation, 292, 308
ex ante consultation, 278, 287
ex hypothesi argument, 80
ex post, 58, 123, 178, 302, 303, 306, 309
Excessive Deficit Procedure, 168
executive agencies
  legal review (EU factual conduct), 333–34
  Regulation (2003), xxiv, 333
    in footnote, 329

Facebook, 215, 254, 260
facti probandi
  admissibility, 78, 81
  'relevant facts', 65
facti probans (facts that prove *probandum*), 80
factual action
  composite procedures, 348–50
factual conduct, 50, 348, 423
  examples, 313
  two different senses, 313
failure to act proceedings
  admissibility, 70
  standing (heavy burden of proof), 77–82
  standing (pleas to lighten burden of proof), 82–87
'fake validity' question (Krajewski), 102
Fenger, N.: in footnote, 108
Fink, Melanie, xi, 1–9, 36–63, 142, 422–30
  in footnote, 101
Foodstuff Directive (1989), 75
Foodwatch, 173
foreign policy, 17, 30
  'largely exempt from judicial review', 171
formal legally-binding acts. *See* legal acts (binding)
forum shopping, 225, 288
fourth branch: in footnote, 128
France, 82, 130, 160
Frankfurt administrative court, 164, 165, 166
  Atlanta case, 166
free movement, 235, 372, 373, 374
free proof system, 69
  in footnote, 69
freedom from harm, 157, 163
freedom of assembly, 159, 170
freedom of expression, 13, 159, 170, 181, 259
  Article 11 CFR, 380
freedom of religion, 114, 187

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

freedom of speech, 150, 258, 261
Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs (FPÖ): in footnote, 81
Freiwillige Selbstkontrolle Multimedia-Diensteanbieter (FSM), 260
Frontex, 4, 7, 56, 125, 133, 135, 140, 216, 265, 266, 315, 316, 332, 339, 349, 351, 393, 402, 405, 406, 413, 420, 421, 429
  ability to file complaints against, 138
  AI systems, 391
  AI-powered aerial surveillance, 393–99
  automated risk assessments, 393–97
  complaint mechanism (EU factual conduct), 335–38
  complaints mechanism, 342, 427
    revision (2022), in footnote, 335, 338
  complaints mechanism (alleged shortcomings), 336–38
  forefront of border surveillance, 393–99
  FROs (authority and measures), 140–43
  FROs (complaint mechanism), in footnote, 126
  FROs (expertise and funding), 148, 149
  fundamental rights violations, 4
  fundamental rights-sensitivity (criticism and praise), 142
  'lack of individualised accountability mechanisms', 145
  maritime operations in Mediterranean, 171
  Ombudsman's 'special report' to European Parliament (from 2013), 152
  Ombudsman's 'strategic inquiries', 145
  structural problems (identification), 143
  'team members' (in footnote), 144
Frontex Executive Director (ED), 336–38
Frontex Management Board: in footnote, 336
Frontex Regulation (2019), 263
front-LEX, 216, 218
FROs, 123, 131, 150, 264, 265, 266, 426
  access to justice perspective, 150
  authority and measures, 140–44, 146
  EUAA, 140, 142, 143–44
  expertise and funding, 147, 148–49
  Frontex, 140–43, 148, 149, 336–37, 339
  'handle serious incident reporting' (internal complaint mechanism), 141
  'hardly silver bullet against structural flaws', 142
  lack of enforcement powers, 265
  main task, 137
  no authority to remedy complaints, 141
  'not yet subject to intense academic scrutiny', 124
  'only review admissibility of complaints', 141
  recommendations, 124
  'relatively novel institutions', 140
  responsibilities, 136
  roles, 140
    situational embeddedness, 140
  short portrait, 135–36
  'various tools', 138
'fundamental principle of EU law', 42, 231. *See also* 'general principle of EU law'
fundamental rights, 1, 7–8
  AI, 391–421
  compliance (procedural), 13
  compliance (substantive), 13
  conceptualised as individual entitlements, 19
  concretisation process, 52
  courts '*the* guardians', 138
  essential values of society, 15
  EU factual conduct and, 312–16
  joint responsibility (EU and Member States), 425
  protection through action for annulment (constraint), 20
  regulate relationship between EU/Member States versus individuals, 48
  reluctance to engage in reasoning, 423–24
  risks (EU border surveillance), 392–406
  risks (EU factual conduct), 315–16
Fundamental Rights Agency, 138, 140, 152, 398
fundamental rights complaints, 8
  framing, 118
  further research required, 118
  preliminary reference procedure (*qv*), 98–120
  'secondary part' of claims, 117
fundamental rights liability
  'clarity' requirement, 52, 53, 61
  'unlawfulness' as condition, 47–55
Fundamental Rights Monitors, 141, 143
Fundamental Rights Officers. *See* FROs
fundamental rights protection
  action for damages, 36–63
  better utilisation of action for damages, 60–63
  EU-specific regime, 1
  Review Bodies, 123–54
  three levels, 9

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

fundamental rights violations
committed by EU itself, 6
composite procedures, 345–65
EU factual conduct, 311–44
EU liability to damages (three conditions), 47
international aribitation (as supplementary tool), 227–44
legal protection against EU factual conduct, 317–18
ODR mechanisms, 258–61
online dispute resolution (ODR), 245–66
role of national courts in redressing), 155–76
'simple' versus 'reprehensible', 55
structural root causes, 427

Galanter, Marc, 225
Garthy, B., 2
Gas Directive (2009, amended 2019), 84
GC. *See* General Court
GDPR (2016/679 version), xxxvi, 379, 413
Article 09(2), 415
Article 22, 414
Article 22(3) as revised in 2017 and 2018, 402, 408
in footnote, 396
GDPR (2016/680). *See* Law Enforcement Directive (2016/680)
GDPR (2018/1725), xxxvii, 338–40, 413, 417, 418, 420, 421
Article 52(2), 417
Article 63, 417, 418
Article 64, 417, 418
Article 64(1), in footnote, 341
General Court, 14, 20, 134, 192
annulment of EU law in 312 cases, 22
cases alleging breaches of substantive rights, 28
cases relating to procedural issues, 23
in charge of most cases against EU institutions, 20
competence to hear actions for damages at first instance, 43
confidentiality of Commission documents, 96
fundamental rights (types) receiving special attention, 22
inadmissibility rulings, 168
previously 'Court of First Instance', 189
quantitative influence of EU fundamental rights 'relatively limited', 22
'recent expansion', 382
'remarkable contribution', 'significant role', 28
standing rules, 24
'sufficiently serious breach' test, 50
General Court (cases)
ADDE v Parliament (2019), 27
Aisha Muammer case (2021), 24
Belgium v Commission (2015), 381
Bowland (2009), 363
Branco I ruling (1995), 356
Dole Fresh Fruit International case (2003), 91
Edinger case (2001), 80
FIAMM case (2005), 92, 93
France-Aviation case (1995), 354
full list, xxii–xxvi
Hautala case (1999), xxiii, 200, 201
Italy v Commission (2020), 28
Klymenko v Council (2019), 25
Kočner v EUROPOL (2021), 59
Malagutti (2004), 363
Minister for Justice and Equality (2018), 26
Nord Stream 2 case (2020), 84, 85
Pharma Mar v Commission (2020), 27
Prodifarma e.a. v Commission (1990), 71
Sison v Council (2011), 54
Sped-Pro S.A. v Commission (2022), 26
T.Port case (2001), 91
ThyssenKrupp (2018)
also General Court case (2011) and CJEU case (2021), xxi, xxiv–xxv, 369, 379
Tillack case, xxiv
in footnote, 316, 323, 324, 326, 330, 339
Wilson-Holland case (2001): in footnote, 354
WS and Others v Frontex (2023), 429
General Court's jurisprudence (action for annulment in EU law), 21–28
influence of procedural rights, 23–28
numerical evidence, 21–23
General Data Protection Regulation. *See* GDPR
general interest, 18, 32, 33, 51, 400
'general principle of EU law', 17, 22, 33, 186, 317, 342, 399, 407
General Product Safety Directive (2002), 351
Geneva Convention (1951) and Protocol (1967), 144

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

Gentile, Giulia, xii, 8, 13–35, 422, 424, 426, 429
Gerards, Janneke, 372
German constitutional court. *See* Bundesverfassungsgericht
Germany, 59, 78, 79, 91, 160, 161, 162
  constitution, 174
  federal administrative court, 166
  ODR process, 259
  rules on evidence, 75
Gkliati, Mariana, 144
good administration, 14, 137, 317, 408, 428, *See also* right to good administration
Gragl, Paul, 186
Grand Chamber, 108, 115, *115*, 119
Greece, xxx, 144, 168, 169, 218
  asylum-seekers (in footnote), 136
  constitution, 169
  highest administrative court, 169
    in footnote, 376
Greenpeace, 217
Grimheden, Jonas, 141, 148
Grimmenstein, Marianne, 174
Grozdanovski, Ljupcho, xii, 8, 64–97, 422, 424, 425, 426
Gündel, Jörg, 383

Halberstam, Daniel, 152
Hanf, Dominik: in footnote, 134
hard law, 367, 388
harm, 93, 160
Hauer, Liselotte, 165
Hearing Officers (DG COMP), 295–96, 297, 308
Hertog, Leonhard den (in footnote), 337
hierarchy of legal norms, 158
higher law: sources, 15
Hillion, Christophe, 203
Hofmann, Andreas, xii, 8, 155–76, 425
Hofmann, Herwig: in footnote, 345, 367
home, 278, 316. *See also* CFR Article 7
human dignity, 399, 400. *See also* right to human dignity
Hungarian constitutional court, 175

impartiality, 27, 69, 74, 280, 284, 296, 330, 342, 407
  in footnote, 252
'in law we trust' presumption, 72
indicia, 70
individual concern, 79, 80, 82, 83, 98, 155, 173, 189, 190, 216, 410, 424
individual concern *probandum*, 86
  redefinition suggested by Jacobs (2002), 83
individuals, 8, 9, 18, 111, 116, 156, 161, 174, 179
  access to justice, 273
  'central role within EU legal system', 36
  important actors, 273
individuation: desired level (two criteria), 80
informalisation, 142, 144, 366, 368, 389
instant implicit decision (concept), 321, 322, 325
  in footnote, 323
institutions. *See* EU institutions
inter partes stage, 291
Inter-American Court of Human Rights: in footnote, 40
international arbitration, 428
  benefits, 229–30
  CJEU approach, 235–39
    argument of uniform application of EU law, 238–39, 240
    interim conclusion, 239–40
    principle of autonomy, 236–37, 239, 243, 244
  conclusion, 243–44
  constitutional limits within EU judicial system, 228, 235–40
  constitutional potential within EU judicial system, 228, 240–43
    practical implications, 242–43
    way forward, 241–42
  defining, 228–29
  EU law, 228, 232–35
    EU's competence and arbitration, 232–34
    regulation of arbitration (legal instruments), 234–35
  limitations, 230–31
  model, 228–31
  new way forward (EU fundamental rights violations), 227–44
  no provision in 'the Treaties', 232
  'should in no way replace EU judicial system', 242
  supplementary tool for EU fundamental rights violations, 227–44
international commercial arbitration
  definition, 228
International Council for Online Dispute Resolution (ICODR): in footnote, 252
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: compensation for violations, 40
international human rights, 39, 42, 158, 406

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

international law, 36, 92, 428
  list, xxxix
  private, 228, 232–34, 241
  public, 38, 39, 57, 233
international trade, 90, 243
Internationale Handelsgesellschaft case (1969–1974), 163–65
internet, 246, 254, 258
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), 245, 247
  in footnote, 253
interoperability, 401
  definition (in footnote), 401
Interpol, 395
investor-state arbitration, 237
Ireland, 160, 169, 182, 214, 215, 220
Isiksel, T. (in footnote), 185
Italy, 74, 77, 175, 213
IUROPA dataset, 109

Jääskinen, Niilo, 384
Johansen, Stian Øby, 171, 205
joint liability
  EU and Member States (action for damages), 55–60, 62
  literature (in footnote), 55
judicial protection
  essence of EU system of, 425
  'two-speed', 424
judicial remedies
  DG COMP, 293–94
  ESMA, 286–88
  EU factual conduct, 318–29, 344
  ex ante, 306
  limits, 422–23
  OLAF, 301–2
  versus non-judicial remedies, 284–305
judicial review
  definition, 15
  EU executive agencies acts, 333–34
  evidence requirements restricting effective access to remedy, 77–87
  hallmark of rule of law, 16
  modalities according to which litigants give evidence, 82
  overview of EU model, 15–17
  plea for lightening admissibility burden (two types), 82
justice (concept): 'humanist approach', 67
justiciable rights, 212
  EU remedies system, 212

Karagianni, Argyro, xii, 9, 271–310, 423, 425, 426
Kelsenian model of hierarchy of norms, 17
Kelsenian pyramid of legal sources, 15
Kenner, Jeff, 374
Kerber, Markus C., 173
Kosovo, 171, 200
  in footnote, 203
Krajewski, Michał, 6, 19, 145, 148
Krommendijk, Jasper, xii, 8, 177–205, 424, 428

Latvia, xxx, 168
law enforcement, 241, 423
  definition, 271
Law Enforcement Directive (2016/680), xxxvi, 413
  Article 11, 414
  in footnote, 413
law of evidence: ideal principles, 65
Łazowski, Adam, 201
LED. *See* Law Enforcement Directive
legal action, 209, 218, 277
legal acts, 2, 314, 321, 327, 334, 407, 423, 424, 427
  EU factual conduct underpinning implicit, 322
  in footnote, 84, 314, 317, 327, 340
legal acts (binding), 9, 311, 313, 317, 318, 320, 322, 323, 325, 333, 339, 343
  definition, 312
  in footnote, 312, 313, 328, 376
legal acts (non-binding), 313
  in footnote, 313
  soft law (*qv*), 311
legal aid, 170, 255
legal certainty, 34, 55, 230, 306, 307, 428
legal culture, 161, 210, 425
legal expertise, 157, 213, 219, 224, 225, 229, 429
  in footnote, 147
legal mobilisation
  definition, 210
  literature, 210
legal opportunities, 210, 213, 226
  dimensions (Andersen), 212
legal opportunity structures, 157–60, 211, 212, 217, 219, 226
  access to courts, 160
  availability of rights to challenge EU acts, 158–59

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

legal opportunity structures (cont.)
closed, 211–12
legal orders, 103, 156, 186, 273, 281, 307
coherence, 15
legal persons, 38, 116, 192, 222, 263, 276, 289, 298, 315, 329, 331, 383, 386, 416
legal profession, 162, 174
legal professional privilege, 279, 291, 292, 296, 299, 306
legislation: full list, xxxiii–xxxix
legislative acts: versus 'regulatory acts' (in footnote), 84
legislative clarity, 34, 310
legislative courts (USA): in footnote, 129
legitimacy assets, 128, 140, 152
legitimate expectations, 55, 103
Lenaert, Koen, 129
Leskinen, Charlotte (in footnote), 186
Letsas, George, 371
lex arbitri, 229
liability law, 38–43, 62
compensating harm, 38–40
compensation can be of pecuniary or non-pecuniary nature, 40
preventing undesired behaviour, 41–42
use of term, 38
in footnote, 38
vindicating rights, 42–43
Libya, 222, 223, 405
litigant characteristics, 160–62
locus standi, 98, 217
in footnote, 83
lack of argument, 218
national rules, 100
strict requirements, 178, 183, 189, 192, 198, 204, 217, 221
López Zurita, Lucía, xii, 8, 98–120, 425, 428
Lucke, Bernd, 173
Lustig, D., 15, 16
Luxembourg, 82
shorthand for 'CJEU', 106, 224, 307

Maas, Herman: in footnote, 369
maladministration, 132, 133, 137, 145, 149, 224, 289, 305, 331, 332, 385
examples (in footnote), 332
Massachusetts Amherst Center, 247
Mehr Demokratie, 173
Member States, 18, 425, 427
action for damages (joint liability with EU), 55–60
enforcement autonomy, 281
invocation of fundamental rights protection, 18
Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), 167, 168, 170
Meta, 223
Meta Oversight Board, 254, 258
annual report, 265
charter (2019), 260
first annual report (2022), 261
passim, 260–66
procedures for appeals, 260
statistics, 261
Meyer, John W.: in footnote, 126, 130, 131, 142
migration and asylum: further reading (in footnote), 135
migration law, 7, 213, 222, 225
Migration Law Clinic (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), 225
Moldova, 237
Möllers, Christoph: in footnote, 128
Montaldo, Stefano, 280
Montesquieu, *Spirit of Laws* (1748): in footnote, 128, 130
multi-level administration, 55, 61

naming and shaming, 143, 151
in footnote, 313, 316
national apex courts, 156, 159, 160, 161
national authorities, 26, 63, 155, 181, 189, 265, 275, 279, 285, 300, 309, 394
passim, 345–63
soft law, 369, 370, 377, 379
national competent authority: definition, 417
national competition authorities (NCAs)
'independence questioned', 297
passim, 289–97
powers laid down in national law, 292
national courts, 9, 59, 68, 98, 102, 105, 113, 114, 185, 238, 247, 324
central role (bringing preliminary reference procedures to CJEU), 104–5
central role within model established by Article 267 TFEU, 117
composite procedure cases, 345, 356–63
EU remedies system (over-reliance on), 424–26
inclusion of pre-emptive opinion, 114
judicial protection of private parties, 78
lack competence to rule on OLAF's investigative acts, 307
obligation to review preparatory measures, 362

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

role, 8
stripped of jurisdiction by CJEU ('certain composite procedures'), 360
national courts (lists of cases), xxix–xxxi
Belgium, xxix
England and Wales, xxxi
Germany, xxix–xxx
Greece, xxx
Latvia, xxx
Netherlands, xxx
national courts (role in redressing fundamental rights violations by EU), 155–76
access to courts, 157, 160
availability of rights to challenge EU acts, 157, 158–59
chapter offering (limitations), 175
conclusions, 174–76
legal opportunity structures, 156, 157–60
litigant characteristics, 156, 157, 160–62
rights-based litigation against EU Acts (empirical overview), 156, 162–74
civil liberties, 163, 170–71
economic rights, 163–67
political rights, 172–74
social rights, 163, 167–70
national judges, 5, 157, 383
national law, 73, 84, 104, 158, 303, 308, 383
national litigation culture, 425
national procedural rules, 117, 214, 241, 281, 360
effectiveness (CJEU case law), 81
national rules, 74, 81, 100, 163, 220, 221, 425
in footnote, 281
national sources of rights: legal mobilisation against EU acts, 155–76
national sovereignty, 307
in footnote, 66
natural language processing (NLP), 250
ne bis in idem, 23, 290, 291
Netherlands, xxx, 213, 224, 248
district court (in footnote), 185
system of constitutional adjudication 'missing', 162
welfare allocation scandal, 404
Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz (NetzDG), 260
Neustadt an der Weinstraße administrative court, 165
New Public Management, 127
New York City, 248
New York Convention, 230, 234, *See also* international arbitration
signed (1958), in footnote, 234
NextGenerationEU, 173
NGOs, 19, 109, 111, 116, 171, 210, 217, 218, 222, 263
non-binding measures, 131, 150, 373
non-contractual liability, 50, 55, 63, 87, 88, 92, 326, 344, 381
Article 340 TFEU (*qv*), 87, 341
may not differ between EU and Member States, 88
system of evidence (overall design), 88
non-discrimination, 23, 34, 114, 213, 352, 404, 414, *See also* right to non-discrimination
in footnote, 66
three EU directives, 226
non-judicial mechanisms, 6, 274, 302, 312, 318, 426, 430
non-judicial remedies, 306, 308
DG COMP, 294–97
ESMA, 288–89
EU factual conduct, 329–40, 344
versus judicial remedies, 284–305
limits, 308
non-pecuniary compensation, 40, 52, 62
in footnote, 328
non-pecuniary harm, 38, 40, 326
'broad notion' in EU liability law, 39
remedies, 39
non-privileged applicants, 2, 333
in footnote, 189
non-refoulement, 143, 316, 349, 351, 406, *See also* CFR Articles 18 and 19
norms: types (Terpan), 367
noyb, 215, 223
Nussbaum, Martha C., 66

obiter dictum, 203
OCMC. *See* Online Civil Money Claims
ODR [online dispute resolution (*qv*)] Regulation (2013), xxxv, 256, 262
OLAF, 284, 297–305, 307, 316
access to court, 301–2
access to justice, 302–5
acts in support of national authorities, 275
complaints mechanism, 304–5
digital forensics operations, 299
external investigations, 298, 301
in footnote, 339
internal investigations, 298
investigatory body, 298
judicial remedies, 301–2
key to abbreviation, 275
legal framework, 299

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

OLAF (cont.)
legal framework (revised, 2020), 302
legal framework (safeguards and defence rights), 299–301
mission, 297
non-judicial remedies, 302–5
review (external), 303–5
review (internal), 303
role of Ombudsman, 305, 308
OLAF: Controller of Procedural Guarantees, 303–5, 308
OLAF: Review Team, 303
Ombudsman, 123, 140, 150, 223, 264, 265, 266, 289, 339, 426, 428
access to justice perspective, 150
authority and measures, 145–46
criticism of Frontex, 152
duties, 132
EU factual conduct, 331–33, 342
expertise and funding, 148, 149
lack of enforcement powers, 265
legal basis (Article 228 TFEU), 263
'major limitation', 332
mandate, 145
'non-binding and structure-focused approach', 145
orientation 'towards improving administrative procedures', 137
own initiative inquiries, 132, 145
'quasi-legal route', 284
recommended (twice)establishment of individual review mechanisms to Frontex (in footnote), 135
reports, 124, 145
right to lodge complaints with (Article 43 CFR), 331
role *vis-à-vis* OLAF, 305, 308
short portrait, 132–33
soft law, 385
strategic inquiries, 133, 145
'various tools', 138
Online Civil Money Claims, 249, 250, 251, 254–56, 258, 263
online dispute resolution, 8, 428
definition, 245
elements, 246–53
from private actors to public sector, 246–53
redress mechanism for EU fundamental rights violations, 261–66
design options, 263–66
legal basis, 261–63
redressing fundamental rights violations, 245–66
technological component, 249–51
online dispute resolution mechanisms
Blomgren Amsler framework, 252–53
design, 251–53
examples, 246, 254–61
EU consumer ODR platform, 254, 256–58
ODR mechanisms set up by judiciary, 254–56
redress of fundamental rights violations, 254, 258–61
stages, 251, 253
online dispute resolution redress mechanism for EU fundamental rights violations (design options), 246, 263–66
1. establishment of goals, 263
2. engagement with stakeholders, 263
3. consideration of context and culture, 264
4. decisions regarding structure and procedure, 264–65
5. funding, 265
6. periodic evaluations, 266
online platforms, 258
DSA definition (in footnote), 258
internal complaint handling system (right to appeal), 259
onus probandi, 93, See also burden of proof
organisational expertise, 137, 147, 148, 149, 152
Owusu-Bempah, Abenaa: procedural abilities, 67

pacta sunt servanda principle, 92
para-law function, 368
Passalacqua, Virginia, 213
passenger name record (PNR), xxxvi, 394, 404
in footnote, 394
Peake, Katrina, 374
Pergantis, Vassilis Pergantis, 205
personal data processing operations, 315
personal interview, 377, 378
personal liberties, 170–71
Pescatore, Pierre, 99
physical acts, 313, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 332, 333, 344
in footnote, 327
Pijnenburg, Annick, 171
Plaumann doctrine. *See* 'CJEU (cases)'
plea of illegality
Article 277 TFEU, 319
EU factual conduct, 327
pleas, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 82

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

pluralism, 34, 35, 175, 259, 380
PNR. *See* passenger name record
Polakiewicz, Jörg (in footnote), 186
policy cycle, 368, 370
Polish constitutional court, 175
political accountability, 289, 306, 308
  DG COMP, 294–95
  OLAF, 302
political opportunity structures, 211
political rights, 156
  challenges to EU policies and EU integration, 172–74
political will, 152, 284
Portugal, 160, 168, 169, 170, 375
Portuguese Constitutional Court: in footnote, 376
post-legislative guidance, 368, 377
post-legislative soft law, 368, 369
Poulou, Anastasia, 376
praemissa maior (higher law), 15
praemissa minor (secondary measures), 15
preliminary reference procedure, 8, 95, 190, 211, 224, 225, 282, 371, 425, *See also* TFEU: Article 267
  admissibility, 323
  constraints, 383–84
  EU factual conduct cases, 323–24
  judicial review (difficulties), 323
  limitations, 119
  mobilisation (strategic litigation), 213–16
  possibility for third-party interventions, 219
  role, 99
  soft law, 382–84
  whether also 'citizens' infringement procedure', 99
  'works as decentralised infringement procedure', 99
preliminary reference procedure (fundamental rights complaints), 98–120
  conclusion, 119–20
  empirical material and research process, 100, 109–11
    claimants, 109
    framing of claim, 110
    fundamental rights treatment, 110
  empirical material and research process (limitation of study), 109
  inherent limitations in procedure
    limit (1) central role of national courts, 104–5
    limit (2) reduced role of parties in proceedings, 104, 105–6
    limit (3) procedural freedom of court, 104, 107–8
  private applicants and fundamental rights claimants, **112**
    framing of claim, **112**
    fundamental rights treatment by CJEU, **112**
  private applicants and fundamental rights (assessment), 100, 116–19
  private applicants and fundamental rights (mapping), 100, 111–15, 116
    case distribution among chambers, *115*
    claimants, 111–13
    framing of claim, 113–14
    framing of claim (breach of fundamental rights or CFR used without specific fundamental rights framing, 113
    fundamental rights treatment by CJEU, 114–15
    intervention of EU institutions, *116*
    policy areas, *113*
    summary of findings, **112**
  questions of interpretation, 102, 108, 110, 113, 118, 119
  raison d'être, 107
  references on validity, 101, 102
  reformulation, 108, 114
  use against EU (inherent limitations), 100, 103–8, 118
  use against EU (possibilities), 100–3
    challengeable acts, 100–1
    types of grounds, 103
    types of questions, 101–2
  validity rulings, 102, 108, 110, 113, 114, 118, 119
'prescribed by law', 368, 370, 372
presumption of innocence, xxxvi, 23, 69
pre-trial ODR, 254
primary law, 2, 76, 96, 101, 102, 117, 119, 120, 172, 180, 195, 331, 423
  in footnote, 341, 414
  includes CFR, 99
principle of equality, 170
  between men and women, 74
principle of equality of arms, 68, 85
  in footnote, 68
principle of legality, 280, 291, 306, 317
privacy, 13, 183, 223, 253. *See also* 'right to privacy' and 'right to respect for private life'
  AI risks, 400–3
Privacy International, 214

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

private actors, 155, 266, 276, 277, 285, 286, 287, 289, 306, 307, 308, 428
private applicants: fundamental rights complaints (assessment), 100, 116–19
private law, 38, 39, 232, 246
  in footnote, 133
private parties, 9, 386, 425
  action before EU courts (evidence as enabler or filter, *qv*), 64–97
  availability of remedies (judicial and non-judicial), 306
  vindication of fundamental rights within EU remedies system, 4
pro bono legal clinics, 161, 171
probandum, 79, 84, 93
  in footnote, 83
probatio diabolica, 81
procedural abilities, 67, 82, 86, 90, 93
  effectiveness, 93
  litigants' entitlements, 67
  theoretical vantage point, 73
procedural autonomy, 74, 77, 94, 306, 307, 383
procedural entitlements, 68, 74, 75, 87
procedural fairness, 23, 25, 28, 67, 96, 308
procedural law, 65, 94, 95, 117, 232, 362
procedural rights, 75, 295, 307, 330, 348, 391, 421
  CJEU, 30–35
  composite procedures, 352–56
  General Court, 23–28
professional associations, 169, 174
profiling, 396, 401
  GDPR definition (in footnote), 396
prohibition of torture, 171, 188, 316
  Article 4 CFR, 349
  in footnote, 52
proportionality, 32, 51, 164, 234, 243, 280, 291, 292, 306, 317, 373, 386, 415
public administration, 312, 314
  accountability, 331
public interest, 18, 33, 51, 136, 160, 214, 231
public sector purchasing programme (PSPP), 173
pushing boundaries, 8, 245–66
  international arbitration (supplementary tool for EU fundamental rights violations), 227–44
  online dispute resolution (ODR), 245–66
  strategic litigation, 8, 209–26

quasi-judicial, 334, 415
  in footnote, 258
  meaning 'often remains unclear' (in footnote), 139
quid iuris, 353

Rademacher, Timo, 50, 344
  in footnote, 319, 325, 328
Ranchordás, Sofia, 420
Rapid Exchange of Information System (RAPEX), 351, 352, 363, 364
ratione personae, 181
Rauchegger, Clara, xii, 8, 36–63, 424, 425, 426, 429
Raz, Joseph: in footnote, 15
receptivity of judiciary, 157, 162, 174, 212
  CJEU judgment on politically salient issues, 212
Rechtwijzer platform (2014–2017), 248, 250
  in footnote, 248
recurso de amparo, 3
Redressing Fundamental Rights Violations by EU
  book aim, 4–5
  book scope, 5–8
  three lines of enquiry, 4
Redressing Fundamental Rights Violations by EU (book scope), 5–8
  EU authorities, 6–7
  fundamental rights, 7–8
  remedies system, 5–6
Redressing Fundamental Rights Violations by EU (book structure), 8–9
  conclusion, 422–30
  final remarks, 429–30
  pushing boundaries, 8, 245–66
  remedies before CJEU, 8, 98–120
  remedies beyond CJEU, 8, 123–54
  testing of remedies systems, 8–9, 391–421
Regulation 1049/2001 (right to access documents), 85
Regulation 2019/1896. *See* EBCG Regulation (2019)
regulatory acts, 18, 83, 84
  in footnote, 84
regulatory sandboxes, 418, 419, 420
Regulatory Scrutiny Board, 389
relevance, 65, 70, 77
  definition (in footnote), 77
remedies before CJEU, 8, 98–120
  action for annulment, 13–35
  action for damages, 36–63

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

evidence as enabler or filter (action brought by private parties), 64–97
preliminary reference procedure (fundamental rights complaints), 98–120
remedies beyond CJEU, 8, 123–54
EU accession to ECHR, 177–205
national courts (role in redressing violations by EU), 155–76
Review Bodies, 123–54
remedies system, 4, 5–6, 9
creative use, 221–25
definition, 5
filling the gaps, 430
final remarks, 429–30
gaps, 423
jewels in crown, 16
'simply outdated', 429
testing, 391–421
whether has potential to enable individuals to vindicate their fundamental rights, 5
whether infringements of rights should be treated differently from other breaches of EU law, 5
whether tailor-made required, 5
remedies system (limits), 422–26
judicial remedies and outdated vision of EU as lawmaker, 422–23
over-reliance on national courts, 424–26
reluctance to engage in fundamental rights reasoning, 423–24
remedies system (potential), 426–29
applicants with agency, 428–29
looking beyond action for annulment, 426
looking beyond CJEU, 426–27
looking beyond EU law, 427–28
technology as opportunity, 428
repeat litigants, 172, 174, 222, 225
res judicata, 230, 231, 238, 239
Research Network on EU Administrative Law (ReNEUAL): in footnote, 343
Ress, J., 190
Review Bodies, 8, 123–54, 426, 427
access to justice perspective, 150
advantages, 126
ambivalent new normal, 124–32
complementarity and structural focus, 125–26
functional differentiation, 127–28
interim conclusion, 132
peril of ceremony (mimicry of justice), 130–31, 150
tripartite government, 128–30
authority emerges 'only incrementally', 145, 146, 148, 149
characteristics (taxonomy), 124, 136–50
authority and measures, 136, 138–46, 149
expertise and funding, 137, 146–49, 150
interim conclusion, 132–50
orientation towards public or individual interest, 136, 137–38
complentarity, structure, ambivalence, 123–54
conclusion (key takeaways), 124, 151, 153–54
crucial advantage, 151
definition, 124
'issue non-binding normative material', 140, 146
'less formal authority than courts', 126
'most efficient when teaming up with other accountability forums', 146
non-binding normative output, 151
possibilities for reform, 124, 150–53
more money, more wit, 152–53
teaming up, 150–52, 153
'quick fix to EU executive's accountability and legitimacy deficits', 130
role in protecting fundamental rights, 123–54
short portraits, 124, 132–36
structural issues, 151
Review Bodies (three types)
Boards of Appeal (*qv*), 133–34
Fundamental Rights Officers (*qv*), 135–36
Ombudsman (*qv*), 132–33
reviewable act, 35, 321, 328, 346, 357, 409
Article 263 TFEU, 322, 341
right to access courts, 68, 281, 293, 306
right to access documents, 27, 85, 291, 292, 296, 300, 306
right to access lawyer, 292, 299, 306
right to asylum, 316, 349, 377, 391, 398, 406
Article 18 CFR, 405
right to avoid self-incrimination, 279, 291, 296, 299, 306
'right to remain silent', 292
right to be heard, 27, 28, 31, 68, 280, 291, 292, 296, 306, 348, 353, 354
Article 41 CFR, 353
general obligation, 28
right to conduct business, 45, 46, 85, 103, 164, 187, 276, 279, 316, 351
Article 16 CFR (*qv*), 352

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

right to consumer protection: Article 38 CFR, 380
right to data protection, 45, 332, 338–40, 380, 400
  Article 8 CFR (*qv*), 352
right to decent living, 169, 170
  'right to fair working conditions', 44, 45
  'right to work', 159
right to effective defence, 25, 31, 44, 68, 91
right to effective remedy, 9, 14, 37, 42, 50, 61, 73, 74, 75, 82, 85, 86, 93, 114, 130, 241, 256, 281, 318, 323, 341, 346, 365, 408, *See also* effective judical protection
  Article 13 ECHR (in footnote), 272
  Article 47 CFR (*qv*), 53, 353, 406
  EU factual conduct, 318–19
  procedural, 82
right to fair trial, 44, 67, 68, 74, 75, 85, 166, 185, 256, 278, 291, 298, 306
  Article 47(2) CFR, 75
  Article 6 ECHR, 256
  in footnote, 14, 296
right to good administration, 22, 27, 44, 141, 277, 306, 310, 391, 407, 408, 421
  Article 41 CFR (*qv*), 52, 353, 407
  EU factual conduct, 329–31
right to health care, 157, 159, 169
right to housing, 159, 167
right to human dignity, 170, 316, 377
  Article 1 CFR (*qv*), 380
right to liberty, 315
  Article 6 CFR, 349
right to life, 53, 157, 163, 170, 171, 316, 332, 372
  Article 2 CFR, 405
right to non-discrimination, 45, 391, 403, 405, 421
  Article 21 CFR (*qv*), 380, 403
right to occupational freedom, 156, 165, 166
right to physical integrity, 38, 332
  Article 3 CFR, 316
  'right to integrity of person', 316
  'right to security of person', 315
right to privacy, 23, 170, 278, 282, 291, 298, 306, 332, 400
  Article 7 CFR, 306
  in footnote, 271
right to property, 23, 33, 38, 45, 46, 85, 156, 159, 165, 166, 169, 182, 279, 316, 376
  Article 17 CFR, 316
right to respect for private and family life, 45, 278, 315, 352, 375. *See also* 'right to privacy'
  Article 7 CFR (*qv*), 380
  in footnote, 188
right to respect for rights of child, 351
  Article 24 CFR, 380
right to social security, 157, 167
right to vote, 157, 159, 174
  'right to democracy', 174
  'right to free and fair elections', 172
rights enforcement, 241, 244, 428
Rocca, Penelope, 368
Romania, 168, 170
Rowan, Brian: in footnote, 126, 130, 131, 142
rule (supremacy) of law, 2, 14, 34, 140, 317, 362, 365, 399, 400, 419, 426, 429
  crucial manifestion, 16
  different visions, 35
  essence, 406
  EU notion (CJEU articulation), 34
  requirements on individuals, 271
  requirements on those who govern, 271
  role, 271
Rule of Law Conditionality Framework, 34
  evidence-based approach, 34
rule of law crisis, 156, 297
rule of law debate, 272
rules (tenets) of law, 88, 89, 325, 332
rules of evidence
  national, 74
  national (unrealistic burdens on private parties), 81
Rules of Procedure of Court of Justice. *See* CJEU (Rules of Procedure)
Russian Federation
  EU soft law, 378–79
  exclusion from Council of Europe, 177

Sarmiento, Daniel, 105
Scandinavia, 160, 161
Schengen Area, 392, 395, 397, 399
Schengen Information System (SIS), 351, 352, 363, 394, 395, 412
  in footnote, 317
Schengen Visa Code, 378
Schermers, H.: in footnote, 106
Schmidt-Kessen, Maria José, xii, 8, 245–66, 428
Scholten, Miroslava, xii, 9, 271–310, 423, 425, 426

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

Schramm, Moritz, xii, 8, 214–15, 262, 426, 427
in footnote, 6
Schrems, Maximilian, 215, 223
secondary law, 96, 99, 102, 191, 198, 199, 289, 426
secondary legislation, 47, 63, 101, 102, 117, 234, 238, 242, 311, 342
concretisation of CFR (greater chance to hold EU liable), 46
in footnote, 341
secondary measures, 15, 17
security threats, 394, 397
Senden, Linda, 367, 368
separation of powers, 128, 145
shield, 271, 273
in footnote, 271
Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), 314
small claims, 254, 258
Snowden, Edward, 215
social movements, 210, 211
social rights, 156
challenges to EU-induced austerity, 167–70
soft law, 6, 9, 50, 276, 277, 287
admissibility requirements, 388, 389
author and addressee, 369
challenges to access to justice, 366–90
conclusion, 389–90
constitutional relevance, 371
definition (Senden), 367
ex ante participation of private actors, 287
features, 367
in footnote, 314
functions, 368–70
implementation (different ways), 374
interferences with fundamental rights (practice), 375–80
area of freedom, security and justice (AFSJ), 377–79
digital sphere, 379–80
economic coordination and Euro crisis, 377
EU's response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, 378–79
EUAA, 377–78
interferences with fundamental rights (theory), 370–75
judicial remedies, 390
'no watertight system of remedies', 423
non-binding nature, 366, 382, 388
not easily amenable to judicial review, 306
possibility to question through preliminary reference procedure, 288
remedies, 380–89
action for damages, 381–82
administrative review, 384–88, 390
possible way forward (three issues), 388–89
preliminary reference procedure, 382–84
unavailability of action for annulment, 381
risks for EU executive overreach, 371
'unclear legal status', 288
soft-law documents, 277, 285
soft-law guidance, 277, 310, 368, 420
soft-law instruments, 277, 292, 294, 306, 307
software, 248, 249, 250, 251, 398
solange (German, 'as long as'), 164
Solum, Lawrence B.: definition of effective participation (in footnote), 67
Spain, 160, 239
stakeholders, 252, 255, 258, 263
standards of proof, 65, 69
beyond reasonable doubt, 69
in footnote, 65
preponderance of evidence, 69
standing, 333. *See also locus standi*
heavy burden of proof, 77–82
strict rules under Article 263(4) TFEU (in footnote), 83
state liability: system of evidence, 88
statement of objections (SO), 292
Stefan, Marco (in footnote), 337
Strasbourg: shorthand for 'ECtHR' (*qv*), 185
strategic litigation, 8, 209–26
creative use of remedies system, 210, 221–25
calling upon non-judicial institutions, 222–24
informal involvement, 224–25
petition to European Court of Auditors, 221–22
definition, 209
EU as system with closed legal opportunity structures, 210, 211–12
lessons (informing future action), 211, 225–26
successful mobilisation before CJEU (examples), 210, 213–21
direct actions, 216–19
mobilising preliminary reference procedure, 213–16
third-party interventions, 219–21
structural issues, 151, 152, 153
structure and internal practice: literature survey (in footnote), 126

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

subsidiarity, 17, 234, 243
substantive expertise, 137, 147, 148, 151
substantive law, 95
  in footnote, 189
sufficiently serious breach, 47, 49–53, 61, 62, 93, 325, 382
  CJEU's approach in fundamental rights cases, 53–55
  decisive test, 89
  non-contractual liability cases, 88
sword, 271, 273
  in footnote, 271

Taobao platform (Alibaba), 250
TEC: Articles 288(1) and 288(3), in footnote, 88
technology as opportunity, 428
TEEC
  Article 173 (currently Article 263 TFEU, *qv*), 78, 79
  Article 220, 232
Terpan, Fabien, 367
territoriality, 357, 364
testing of remedies systems, 391–421, 423
  access to justice, 271–310
  AI, 391–421
  composite procedures, 345–65
  EU factual conduct, 311–44
  EU law enforcement authorities, 271–310
  soft law, 366–90
TEU
  Article 02, 2, 16, 34, 399
  Article 03, 72
  Article 03(2), 234
  Article 04(3), 282
  Article 06, 16
  Article 06(1), 188
  Article 06(3), 186
  Article 17(8) (power of EP to dismiss Commission), 294
  Article 19, 16, 86
  Article 19(1), 384
  Article 24, 199
  Article 40, 201
  Article 40(1), 199
  Title V, 200
  Title V, chapter 2, 18
TFEU
  Article 016, 262
  Article 019, 200, 262
  Article 026, 262
  Article 067, 234
  Article 075, 17
  Article 078, 262
  Article 078(2)(d), 262
  Article 081, 234
  Article 081(2)(g), in footnote, 234
  Article 087(2)(a): in footnote, 413
  Article 101, 289, 290
    in footnote, 317
  Article 102, 71, 289, 290
  Article 114, 262, 410
    in footnote, 234
  Article 126(7), 375
  Article 215, 17
  Article 226, 294
  Article 227, 222
  Article 228, 263, 266
    in footnote, 330
  Article 228(1), 132
  Article 245, 297
  Article 256(1), 43
  Article 257, 134
  Article 258, 70
  Article 263, 2, 16, 24, 32, 50, 62, 64, 78, 82, 83, 86, 98, 101, 104, 117, 189, 190, 277, 282, 319–22, 327, 333, 334, 338, 341, 343, 344, 362, 370, 376, 381, 386, 387, 388, 389. *See also* action for annulment
    admissibility requirements, 335, 370
    in footnote, 328
    narrow interpretation 'remains contested', 99
  Article 263(4), 3, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 94, 192
    in footnote, 84, 189
  Article 265, 64, 80, 81, 82, 86, 218, 322. *See also* action for failure to act
  Article 265(3), 192
  Article 267, 16, 117, 119, 190, 193, 323–24, 341, 357, 382
    drafting 'minimalistic', 98
    passim, 100–4
    primary purpose, 213
  Article 267(3), 83, 94
  Article 268, 3, 192
  Article 268 *juncto* 340, 324
    action for damages (in footnote), 319
  Article 270, 192
  Article 272, 192
  Article 275, 18, 24, 199, 200, 201
  Article 277, 190, 319, 327

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

Article 278: in footnote, 328
Article 279: in footnote, 328
Article 285, 295
Article 286, 295
Article 287, 295
Article 288: in footnote, 312, 313, 314
Article 298(1): 'open, efficient and independent administration', 330
Article 340, 3, 61, 64, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 192, 216, 218, 324–27, 344
'high restrictive thresholds regarding EU liability conditions', 341
Article 340(2), 43, 47
Article 340(3): in footnote, 88
Article 344, 237
the Court. *See* CJEU
the Treaties, 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 65, 243, 324, 328, 340, 426
third parties, 20, 51, 152, 213, 215, 224, 226, 253, 296, 298, 305, 320, 321, 333, 339
strategic litigation, 219–21
Timmermans, Christiaan, 183
in footnote, 186
trade unions, 168, 169, 174, 187
transparency, 144, 231, 256, 338, 404, 409
OLAF, 302
Treaties of Rome (1957), 1
Treaties on which EU based. *See* 'the Treaties'
Treaty Establishing European Economic Community. *See* TEEC
Treaty of Amsterdam, 233
Treaty of Lisbon, 3, 76, 83, 84, 100, 101, 172, 175, 234, 384, 385
entry into force (1 December 2009), 109
in footnote, 189
Treaty of Maastricht, 159, 172, 174, 233
Treaty on European Union. *See* TEU
Treaty on Functioning of EU. *See* TFEU
tripartite government, 128–30
trust, 72, 247, 248, 252, 264
Turkey, 218, 405

Uitelkaar.nl platform (2017–): in footnote, 248
Ukraine, 237
EU soft law, 378–79
ultima ratio, 72
ultra vires control, 159
UN Charter, 30
UN Guidelines on Violations of International Humanitarian Law
definition of 'compensation' versus 'satisfaction', 39
definition of 'full reparation', 39
UN Security Council, 30
UNCITRAL, 251, 253
undertakings, 92, 290, 292, 295
in footnote, 317
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Directive (1998), 242
UNHCR, 220, 224
United Kingdom, xxxi, 73, 160, 193, 213, 220, 254
United States, 92, 215, 248
constitution, 161
federal rules of evidence, 65
unlawful conduct, 47, 48, 50, 56, 57, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 194
as condition for EU fundamental rights liability, 47–55
user interface, 264
USA (in footnote), 264

validity. *See also* reformulation
van den Brink, Ton, 368
van der Pas, Kris, xii, 8, 171, 209–26, 425, 429
Vanhala, Lisa, 212
Verfassungsbeschwerde, 3
vertical composite procedures. *See* composite procedures
Villiger, Mark Eugen:in footnote, 371
Visa Information System (VIS), 394, 395
Visa Requirement Regulation (2018), 379
von der Boegart, Sina, 152

Waelbroeck, D.: in footnote, 106
Weiler, Joseph H.H., 15, 16
Werkmeister, Christophe (in footnote), 84
Wessel, Ramses, 201, 203
WHO, 396
Wildemeersch, Jonathan, 75, 76
Wróblewski, Jerzy, 65
wrongful act, 376, 405
definition, 89
WTO, 92

Xanthoulis, Napoleon: in footnote, 313

Yefremova, Veronika, xii, 8, 227–44, 428

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 09:48:44, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009373814.025