

# 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 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  
   vindicated 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  
*Plumann* 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'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

- 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
  - Bergadem* case (2000), 88, 89, 93
  - Berlusconi* ruling (2018), 359, 360–63, 365
  - Bevándorlási és Állmpolgársági 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  
 Kempster 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, 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

- 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  
 Edingen case (2001), 80  
 FIAMM case (2005), 92, 93  
 France-Aviation case (1995), 354  
 full list, xxii–xxvi  
 Hautala case (1999), xxii, 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
  - DC 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
- OCCMC. *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

