

# 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 accession 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-judicial 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

- 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 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

- 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

- 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  
 Arnulf, 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  
 Blongren 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'Eerd, 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

- 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 contains '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

- 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 Akeros* 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 Állampolgársági 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  
*Codorniu* 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

- 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

- 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



- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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
- accountability, 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

- 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 (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

- 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

- 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), xxxiv, 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

- 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



- 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 arbitration (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), xxvii, 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

- 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, Hervig: 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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



- 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
  - complementarity, 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

- 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 judicial 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 manifestation, 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

