

The Effects of Judicial Decisions in Time

Editors:
P. Popelier
S. Verstraelen
D. Vanheule
B. Vanlerberghe

The Effects of Judicial Decisions in Time

P. Popelier, S. Verstraelen, D. Vanheule and B. Vanlerberghe (eds.)

The Effects of Judicial Decisions in Time

Intersentia Publishing Ltd
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

ISBN 978-1-78068-188-7
D/2014/7849/9
NUR 820



© 2014 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover image © Juliane Jacobs – Image licensed by Ingram Publishing

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photocopy, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter 1. The Effect of Judicial Decisions in Time: Comparative Notes | 1 |
| Patricia Popelier, Sarah Verstraelen, Dirk Vanheule and Beatrix Vanlerberghe | |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. A comparative overview: threads..... | 3 |
| 2.1. The need for flexibility | 3 |
| 2.2. The Court's discretion..... | 4 |
| 2.3. Variations in approaches to the balancing exercise | 7 |
| 3. Definition and terminology | 7 |
| 3.1. Effect <i>ex tunc</i> | 8 |
| 3.2. Effect <i>ex nunc</i> | 9 |
| 3.3. Effect <i>pro futuro</i> | 10 |
| 3.4. Umbrella terms | 11 |
| 4. Approach in this volume | 12 |
| | |
| PART I | |
| CONSTITUTIONAL COURTS: EFFECTS <i>EX TUNC</i> | 15 |
| | |
| Chapter 2. Germany | 17 |
| | |
| <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> – Excerpt from the Judgment of the First Senate of 28 March 2006 on the basis of the oral hearing of 8 November 2005 – 1 BvR 1054/01 – | 17 |
| | |
| Temporal Effects of Decisions of the German Federal Constitutional Court..... | 21 |
| Werner Schroeder | |
| 1. Introduction | 21 |
| 1.1. Decision of the Federal Constitutional Court in the <i>Sports Betting</i> case | 21 |
| 1.2. Role of the FCC within the German judicial system | 21 |
| 2. Limitation of the legal effects of judgments through a declaration of incompatibility | 22 |
| 2.1. Development of the practice | 22 |
| 2.2. Legal basis of the practice..... | 23 |

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| 2.3. | Prerequisites of a declaration of incompatibility..... | 23 |
| 2.3.1. | Declaration of incompatibility to preserve the scope of manoeuvring of the legislature..... | 24 |
| 2.3.2. | Declaration of incompatibility to prevent a situation 'more remote from the Constitution'..... | 25 |
| 3. | Legal effects of the declaration of incompatibility..... | 26 |
| 3.1. | Ban on application as standard consequence of the declaration of incompatibility..... | 26 |
| 3.2. | Continued application despite declaration of incompatibility due to order by the FCC..... | 27 |
| 3.3. | Provisional orders of the FCC..... | 30 |
| 4. | Résumé..... | 31 |

Chapter 3. Belgium

| | |
|--|----|
| Belgian Court of Cassation – 20 December 2007 – C.07.0227.N..... | 35 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| The Interplay of Temporal Effects of Judicial Decisions within the Belgian Legal Order..... | 37 |
| Sarah Verstraelen | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| 1. | Introduction..... | 37 |
| 2. | Belgian Constitutional Court..... | 38 |
| 2.1. | Appeals for annulment..... | 38 |
| 2.1.1. | General temporal effect..... | 38 |
| 2.1.2. | Deviation from the general temporal effect..... | 40 |
| 2.1.2.1. | Legal basis..... | 40 |
| 2.1.2.2. | Usage..... | 40 |
| 2.1.2.3. | Case in point..... | 41 |
| 2.2. | Preliminary rulings..... | 42 |
| 2.2.1. | General temporal effect..... | 42 |
| 2.2.2. | Deviation from the general temporal effect..... | 42 |
| 2.2.2.1. | No legal basis..... | 42 |
| 2.2.2.2. | Case no. 125/2011..... | 43 |
| 3. | Belgian Court of Cassation..... | 44 |
| 3.1. | General temporal effect..... | 44 |
| 3.2. | Deviation from general temporal effect..... | 46 |
| 3.2.1. | International private law case..... | 46 |
| 3.2.2. | Aftermath of the ECHR <i>Marckx</i> case..... | 47 |
| 4. | Decision of the Supreme Court of 20 December 2007: interplay..... | 48 |
| 4.1. | Circumstances of the case..... | 48 |
| 4.2. | Decision of the Court of Cassation..... | 49 |
| 4.3. | Analysis..... | 50 |
| 4.3.1. | Legislative lacuna until 2008..... | 50 |
| 4.3.2. | Further case law..... | 50 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.3.3. Competence of the Court of Cassation..... | 51 |
| 4.3.4. Article 4, §2 of the Special Act on the Constitutional Court | 52 |
| 4.3.5. Legal certainty | 52 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 53 |
| | |
| PART II | |
| CONSTITUTIONAL COURTS: EFFECTS <i>EX NUNC</i> | 55 |
| | |
| Chapter 4. Austria | 57 |
| Decision of the Austrian Constitutional Court, December 10, 1986, VfSlg 11190/1986 | 57 |
| <i>Pro Futuro</i> and Retroactive Effects of Rescissory Judgments in Austria | 63 |
| Manfred Stelzer | |
| 1. Introduction | 63 |
| 2. The <i>pro futuro</i> effect of a rescissory judgment | 64 |
| 3. Setting deadlines | 67 |
| 4. ‘Retroactive’ effect | 69 |
| 4.1. Case in point..... | 69 |
| 4.2. Granting (general) retroactive effect | 71 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 73 |
| | |
| Chapter 5. Hungary | 77 |
| 33/2012. (VII. 17.) AB határozat / Decision 33/2012 (VII. 17.) AB of the Constitutional Court of Hungary | 77 |
| Temporal Effects of Decisions of the Hungarian Constitutional Court | 87 |
| Tímea Drinóczi | |
| 1. Introduction to the constitutional review system in Hungary..... | 87 |
| 2. Temporal effects of the decisions of the Constitutional Court | 90 |
| 2.1. Temporal effect: general rules..... | 90 |
| 2.2. Invalidity (null and void) and temporal effect | 92 |
| 2.3. The concept of ‘living law’ and temporal effect | 93 |
| 2.4. Temporal effects..... | 94 |
| 2.4.1. <i>Ex nunc</i> effect: the main rule..... | 95 |
| 2.4.2. <i>Ex tunc</i> and <i>pro futuro</i> effects: deviations from the main rule | 95 |
| 3. Decision on the constitutionality of <i>ex nunc</i> effect..... | 96 |
| 4. Application of <i>pro futuro</i> effect | 97 |
| 4.1. Suspending the setting of the date of annulment..... | 97 |
| 4.2. ‘Condition-setting’ and combined ‘condition-setting’ and ‘time-setting’ | 98 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.3. Exact date setting..... | 99 |
| 4.4. ‘Warning to exercise the competence to annul’..... | 99 |
| 5. Application of <i>ex tunc</i> effect | 100 |
| 5.1. Decision on the general retirement case and implications | 100 |
| 5.1.1. The decision | 100 |
| 5.1.2. Temporal effect applied and some criticism | 101 |
| 5.1.3. Related decision of the Court of Justice of the European Union focusing on the temporal effect of the decision of the Constitutional Court..... | 103 |
| 5.1.4. Related decision of the Constitutional Court: retroactive annulment of the Transitory Provisions..... | 103 |
| 5.2. Combined ‘time-setting’ and ‘condition-setting’..... | 105 |
| 6. Conclusion..... | 105 |
| Chapter 6. France | 107 |
| Constitutional Council of France – Decision no. 2010-108 of 25 March 2011..... | 107 |
| Temporal Effects of Judicial Decisions in France..... | 111 |
| François-Xavier Millet | |
| 1. The Constitutional Council’s broad approach to the immediate effects of abrogation | 113 |
| 1.1. A limited retroactive effect..... | 114 |
| 1.2. The adoption of transitory measures by the constitutional judge..... | 115 |
| 2. The grounds for a deferred abrogation..... | 116 |
| 2.1. The respect for parliamentary will..... | 117 |
| 2.2. The ‘patently disproportionate consequences’ test..... | 118 |
| 2.3. The immediate application of EU law | 120 |
| 2.4. The emphasis on the ‘usefulness’ of the QPC decision | 121 |
| 3. Conclusion..... | 121 |
| Chapter 7. Italy | 123 |
| Italian Constitutional Court – Judgment no. 113 of 2011 | 123 |
| The Temporal Effects of the Italian Constitutional Court and the Mechanism of Warning Decisions..... | 135 |
| Giuseppe Martinico | |
| 1. Introduction and overview of the relevant literature..... | 135 |
| 2. The <i>Dorigo</i> saga as a case study | 140 |
| 2.1. Factual background..... | 140 |
| 2.2. <i>Dorigo I</i> | 141 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2.3. <i>Dorigo II</i> : the relevance of the ECHR in the case law of the ICC..... | 142 |
| 2.4. Why <i>Dorigo II</i> is relevant | 146 |
| 3. Final remarks | 149 |
| PART III | |
| SUPREME COURTS | 151 |
| Chapter 8. The UK | 153 |
| Opinions of the Lords of Appeal for Judgment in the Cause <i>National Westminster Bank plc v. Spectrum Plus Ltd and others</i> [2005] UKHL 41 on 30 June 2005 | 153 |
| The Temporal Effect of Judgments in the United Kingdom..... | 159 |
| Ben Juratowitch | |
| 1. Introduction | 159 |
| 2. Adjudicative retroactivity | 161 |
| 2.1. Private law: <i>Kleinwort Benson v. Lincoln City Council</i> | 162 |
| 2.2. Public law: <i>R v. Governor of Brockhill Prison, ex p Evans (No. 2)</i> | 163 |
| 2.3. Criminal law: <i>Shaw v. DPP</i> | 164 |
| 3. Consideration of prospective overruling in the United Kingdom..... | 166 |
| 4. Problems with prospective overruling | 172 |
| 4.1. Where the new rule does not apply to the case in which it is announced | 173 |
| 4.2. Where the new rule does apply to the case in which it is announced..... | 173 |
| 4.3. Where the new rule concerns the interpretation of a statute | 176 |
| 4.4. Evaluation of prospective overruling | 177 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 178 |
| Chapter 9. The Netherlands | 181 |
| High Council 13 November 1991, No. 27563, <i>BNB 1992/109</i> | 181 |
| The Temporal Effect of Dutch Tax Court Decisions | 183 |
| Hans Gribnau and Allard Lubbers | |
| 1. Introduction | 183 |
| 2. The temporal effect of court decisions in tax cases | 184 |
| 2.1. The duties of the tax courts..... | 184 |
| 2.2. Interpreting tax legislation..... | 184 |
| 2.3. Tax courts as developers of the law..... | 186 |
| 2.4. Principles of proper administration | 189 |
| 2.5. Review of tax regulations | 190 |
| 3. Instruments to limit the temporal effect..... | 192 |
| 4. Grounds for limiting the temporal effect | 194 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 195 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 10. Israel | 197 |
| Summary of the Judgment in HCJ 6298/07 <i>Ressler, adv. (IDF Major, ret.)</i> <i>v. The Knesset</i> | 197 |
| Time and Judicial Review in Israel: Tempering the Temporal Effects of Judicial Review..... | 207 |
| Ittai Bar-Siman-Tov | |
| 1. Introduction | 207 |
| 2. General rule about the temporal effects of judicial decisions..... | 208 |
| 3. Tempering the temporal effects of judicial decisions invalidating statutes..... | 210 |
| 3.1. Doctrine of relative voidance..... | 211 |
| 3.1.1. Absolute voidance, voidability and relative voidance..... | 211 |
| 3.1.2. Relationship between relative voidance and prospective effect..... | 212 |
| 3.2. Suspension of the declaration of invalidity | 213 |
| 3.2.1. Relationship between suspension and prospective effect | 214 |
| 3.2.2. Relationship between suspension and relative voidance | 215 |
| 4. From theory to practice: the actual use of modulating remedies | 215 |
| 4.1. Application of <i>Solel Boneh</i> in later cases..... | 216 |
| 4.2. Expansion and prevalence of relative voidance in Israeli law..... | 216 |
| 4.3. Remedies employed in cases invalidating statutes..... | 218 |
| 4.3.1. Trend towards modulated invalidations..... | 220 |
| 4.3.2. The surprising absence of relative voidance..... | 221 |
| 4.3.3. Emergence of suspension as the preferred remedy..... | 221 |
| 4.3.4. Prospective application as the latest development..... | 223 |
| 5. Normative evaluation | 226 |
| 5.1. Modulated remedies and rights..... | 226 |
| 5.2. Modulated remedies and separation of powers | 228 |
| 5.3. The need for flexibility and the fear of unbridled discretion | 229 |
| 5.4. The appropriate approach..... | 231 |
| 6. Conclusion..... | 232 |
| PART IV | |
| EUROPEAN COURTS..... | 235 |
| Chapter 11. The Court of Justice of the European Union | |
| Court of Justice of the European Union, C-292/04, <i>Meilicke and others</i> <i>v. Finanzamt Bonn-Innenstadt</i> , 6 March 2007 [2007] ECR I-1835 | 237 |
| Limitation of Temporal Effects of CJEU Judgments: Mission Impossible for Governments of EU Member States..... | 245 |
| Michael Lang | |
| 1. <i>Meilicke</i> and the CJEU case law on the limitation of the temporal effects of the CJEU..... | 245 |

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| 2. | Existing case law on the limitation of temporal effects of CJEU judgments..... | 248 |
| 2.1. | The rule and the exception..... | 248 |
| 2.2. | Good faith and legal uncertainty..... | 249 |
| 2.3. | Serious economic repercussions..... | 252 |
| 3. | Limitation of temporal effects: applicable in all Member States? | 256 |
| 3.1. | The relevant judgment | 256 |
| 3.2. | Good faith and legal uncertainty..... | 259 |
| 3.3. | Serious economic repercussions..... | 261 |
| 4. | Conclusion..... | 262 |
| Chapter 12. The European Court of Human Rights | | 265 |
| ECtHR, <i>Legrand v. France</i> (App No 23228/08) 26 May 2011 | | 265 |
| The European Court of Human Rights' Approach to Retrospective Judicial Reversals..... | | 269 |
| Patricia Popelier | | |
| 1. | <i>Legrand</i> : a failed operation and the quest for damages | 269 |
| 2. | Retroactive reversals and the principle of legal certainty | 271 |
| 2.1. | Reversals in the case law of the ECtHR..... | 271 |
| 2.2. | Reversals in the case law of national courts | 275 |
| 3. | The legitimacy of reversals in the case law | 277 |
| 3.1. | The legitimacy of reversals in the case law of the ECtHR..... | 277 |
| 3.2. | The legitimacy of reversals in the case law of national courts..... | 279 |
| 4. | The retroactive application of reversals..... | 280 |
| 4.1. | The temporal effect of ECtHR judgments..... | 280 |
| 4.2. | The temporal effect of national judicial judgments..... | 282 |
| 5. | Conclusion..... | 284 |

