

THE LIMITS OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS PROTECTION BY THE EU

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 79.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

THE LIMITS OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS PROTECTION BY THE EU

The Scope for the Development of Positive
Obligations

Malu Beijer



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Fax: +44 1223 370 169
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK and Ireland:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7 PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for Europe and all other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213
USA
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free) | Fax: +1 503 280 8832
Email: info@isbs.com

The Limits of Fundamental Rights Protection by the EU

© Malu Beijer 2017

The author has asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as authors of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

Artwork on cover © Pascal Tieman

ISBN 978-1-78068-455-0
Depot no. D/2017/7849/8
NUR 828

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

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Malu Beijer (1986) graduated from Utrecht University, the Netherlands, in 2012, where she obtained a bachelor's degree in law (with distinction) and a master's degree in Legal Research with a specialisation in European Public Law (cum laude). During her studies, Malu Beijer undertook several research projects on European migration law, internal market law and EU fundamental rights. She worked as a legal intern at the Dutch Council of State, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the law firm, Pels Rijcken & Drooglever Fortuijn. She also worked as a student-assistant at Utrecht University, where she organised two legal conferences, and took part in an exchange with Tsukuba University, Japan.

In 2012 Malu Beijer received a Research Talent grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). She carried out her research under the supervision of prof. dr. J.H. (Janneke) Gerards at the law faculty of the Radboud University, Nijmegen. At this university, Malu Beijer has taught several classes on EU fundamental rights law and EU judicial protection, and continues to do so. She is a member of the European law working group of the Netherlands Committee of Jurists for Human Rights (NJCM) and is a board member of the Dutch young network for European Law (STER). She also writes a weekly newsletter on ECtHR and ECJ cases.

Malu Beijer has participated in, and co-organised several legal conferences and has published in international and Dutch legal journals. She continues her work as a researcher and lecturer in the field of EU law and fundamental rights at Radboud University alongside her work as a judicial assistant.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing my PhD over the course of the past four years was a challenging but ultimately very rewarding experience. For a long time much of my work was only stored on a small USB device that I have carried with me during the journeys from Utrecht to Nijmegen and back. It has been difficult to work on a project that never is quite complete. Even after days, weeks and months of work, there are always further thoughts that remain and projects that are left unfinished. Now I am very pleased to be able to show the final results of my work in this book.

I would not have succeeded without the excellent guidance provided by Janneke. At every stage of the project, Janneke made time to listen to my thoughts and struggles with the materials, and to give me most helpful feedback on my work. Janneke has given me the confidence to write my PhD and to speak out about topics of EU law and human rights which have become very dear to me. For many reasons Janneke is a very important person who has helped me to complete this project and has been there for me on a personal level as well. I could not have wished for a better supervisor.

Of course there are others to thank too. I have met some inspiring people along the way in Nijmegen as well as in other places. I am grateful to the department of International and European Law of the Radboud University which has offered me a great working environment, and which has allowed me to keep learning about topics of International and European law. I have been able to learn more about human rights in practice, by attending the Venice Academy of Human Rights and the regular meetings of the working group of European law of the *NJCM*. I am especially grateful to have been allowed to share my work at the Realaw Research Forum of 2015 and at the seminar in Utrecht on positive obligations. Ellen – thank you for the smooth and fun cooperation! Further thanks to John Morijn for the opportunity to discuss my research and to Herman van Harten for writing about *Dhahbi v. Italy*.

Thanks to Marc for providing distractions and a lot of ‘gezelligheid’ during the final stages of my PhD, as well as to Jasper for sharing thoughts on our common research interests, and of course to the *Jonghe Gaerde* for other fun experiences. I am grateful to my friends from Utrecht and from the LRM, in particular Eduardo, Wouter and Frank. Special thanks to Irene and Caroline for their lasting friendship and for being my ‘paranimfen’. Further thanks to my family (in law).

This list would not be complete, far from it, if I did not mention Jie-Heda. You have been there for me for many years. I am very lucky to have you in my life.

CONTENTS

<i>About the Author</i>	v
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xvii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background to this Study	1
1.1.1. Two Supranational Courts in Europe Deciding on Fundamental Rights Cases	1
1.1.2. The Concept of Positive Obligations	4
1.1.3. The Debate about Positive Obligations within the Context of EU Law	5
1.1.4. The Main Research Question of this Study	8
1.2. Aims and Objectives	8
1.3. Methods and Approach	9
1.3.1. Defining the Concept of Positive Obligations and its Implications	10
1.3.2. Identifying the Scope and Limits for the Development of Positive Obligations under EU Law	10
1.3.3. Studying Specific Case-law Examples	11
1.4. Working Definition of Positive Obligations within the Context of EU Law	12
1.5. Outline of this Study	15
1.5.1. Part I: The Concept of Positive Obligations within the Context of the European Convention on Human Rights	15
1.5.2. Part II: The Scope for a Development of Positive Obligations within the Context of EU Law – An Analysis of the Specific Parameters of the EU Legal Order and the EU System of Fundamental Rights Protection	16
1.5.3. Part III: Synthesis	16

PART I: THE CONCEPT OF POSITIVE OBLIGATIONS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Chapter 2. The System of Fundamental Rights Protection Under the European Convention on Human Rights 19

2.1. Introduction 19

2.2. Background and Purpose of the European Convention on Human Rights 20

2.3. Enforcement Mechanisms 21

2.4. Subsidiary System of Protection of Fundamental Rights 22

2.5. The Role of the ECtHR 24

2.6. Tools of Interpretation of the European Court of Human Rights 26

2.6.1. The Principle of Effectiveness 27

2.6.2. The Principle of Dynamic or Evolutive Interpretation 29

2.6.3. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine 30

2.7. The Effects of the European Convention on Human Rights in the National Legal Order 31

2.8. Horizontal Effect of Convention Provisions 34

2.9. Conclusions 35

Chapter 3. The Development of Positive Obligations Under the European Convention on Human Rights 37

3.1. Introduction 37

3.2. The Development of Positive Obligations by the ECtHR 38

3.2.1. The Belgian Linguistic Case: Introducing Positive Obligations 38

3.2.2. Defining the Concept of Positive Obligations 41

3.2.3. The Distinction between Negative and Positive Obligations 42

3.2.3.1. Traditional versus Implied Obligations 42

3.2.3.2. State Action versus State Omission 44

3.2.3.3. Conjunctive versus Alternative Structure 46

3.2.4. Rationales for Recognising Positive Obligations 46

3.2.5. Explicit Legal Bases 50

3.2.6. Methodology for Determining the Existence of Positive Obligations 52

3.3. Typologies of Positive Obligations 54

3.3.1. Typology Developed by the ECtHR 55

3.3.2. Typologies Developed in Academic Literature 57

3.4. Implications of Positive Obligations for the Protection of Convention Rights 60

3.4.1. The Position of States Parties 60

3.4.2. The Position of Individuals 62

3.5.	Limitations on the Scope of Positive Obligations.	63
3.5.1.	Knowledge of Fundamental Rights Violations	65
3.5.2.	Direct and Immediate Link/Minimum Level of Severity	67
3.5.3.	No Impossible or Disproportionate Burdens	68
3.6.	Conclusions	69
Chapter 4. A Critical Appraisal of the Development of Positive Obligations Under the European Convention on Human Rights.		71
4.1.	Introduction	71
4.2.	Are Positive Obligations <i>Inherent</i> in Fundamental Rights Protection?	72
4.2.1.	Criticism Based on Originalism	72
4.2.2.	Contemporary Debates on the Nature of Fundamental Rights	73
4.2.3.	The Concern over Human Rights Inflation.	76
4.3.	Horizontal Positive Obligations	77
4.3.1.	The Limited Personal Scope of Fundamental Rights	77
4.3.2.	The Determination of State Responsibility for Private Acts	79
4.4.	The Political Character of Positive Obligations	80
4.4.1.	Lack of Democratic Legitimacy	81
4.4.2.	Empowerment of Individuals	83
4.5.	The Supranational Position of the ECtHR.	84
4.6.	Legal Uncertainty Regarding the Scope of Positive Obligations	86
4.7.	Ambiguous Methods of the ECtHR for Determining the Existence of Positive Obligations	88
4.7.1.	Critical Evaluation of the Fair Balance Test.	88
4.7.1.1.	Lack of Clarity, Structure and Fairness	88
4.7.1.2.	The Incorrect Use of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine	90
4.7.1.3.	Confused Approaches to Positive and Negative Obligations	91
4.7.2.	Proposals to Improve the Structure of the Court's Approach.	94
4.8.	Conclusions	96
Chapter 5. Part I – Conclusions		99
5.1.	The Main Features Relating to the Development of Positive Obligations by the ECtHR.	99
5.2.	The Definition of Positive Obligations and the Distinction between Positive and Negative Obligations	99

5.3. Typologies of Positive Obligations	101
5.4. Rationale and Effects of Recognising Positive Obligations.	102
5.5. Critical Evaluation of the Development of Positive Obligations	104
5.6. Concluding Remarks Looking Forward to the Analysis in Part II	106

PART II: THE SCOPE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF POSITIVE OBLIGATIONS
WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF EU LAW – AN ANALYSIS OF THE SPECIFIC
PARAMETERS OF THE EU LEGAL ORDER AND THE EU SYSTEM OF
FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS PROTECTION

Chapter 6. Main Principles of the EU System of Fundamental Rights Protection . . . 109

6.1. Introduction	109
6.2. Origins and Historical Development of EU Fundamental Rights Protection	110
6.3. Rationales of Fundamental Rights Protection within the EU Legal Order	113
6.4. Institutional Developments within the Field of Fundamental Rights Protection	115
6.5. The Charter	117
6.6. The General Principles of EU Law	119
6.7. The Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights	120
6.7.1. The Vertical Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights	120
6.7.2. The Horizontal Scope of Application of the Charter	122
6.8. The Scope for the Protection of National Fundamental Rights under EU law and the Principle of Mutual Recognition.	124
6.9. The Relationship between the EU and the European Convention on Human Rights	127
6.9.1. The Status of the European Convention on Human Rights and Judgments of the ECtHR under EU Law	127
6.9.2. Overlapping Jurisdiction between the ECtHR and the ECJ	130
6.10. The Distinction between Rights and Principles under the Charter	132
6.11. Conclusions	135

Chapter 7. The Institutional Characteristics and Judicial Culture of the ECJ. 137

7.1. Introduction	137
7.2. Doing too Little or Rather too Much?	138
7.2.1. The <i>Bostock</i> Case	138
7.2.2. The <i>Chatzi</i> Case.	139

7.3.	The Role and Judicial Style of the ECJ in General	141
7.4.	The Specific Characteristics of the Procedures before the ECJ	145
7.4.1.	The Preliminary Reference Procedure	146
7.4.1.1.	The Specific Function of the Preliminary Reference Procedure	146
7.4.1.2.	The Dialogue with the National Courts	147
7.4.2.	Direct Actions	149
7.5.	The Institutional Position of the ECJ	150
7.5.1.	Separation of Powers and the Supranational Position of the ECJ	150
7.5.2.	The Role of the ECJ towards the EU Institutions	151
7.5.3.	The Role of the ECJ towards the Member States	156
7.6.	The EU and the ECJ's Role in the Field of Fundamental Rights.	160
7.6.1.	The EU as a Human Rights Organisation?	161
7.6.2.	The ECJ as a Human Rights Court?	165
7.6.2.1.	The Role of the ECJ Pre-Lisbon	165
7.6.2.2.	The Role of the ECJ Post-Lisbon	168
7.6.2.3.	The Development of Fundamental Rights Doctrines by the ECJ	174
7.7.	Conclusions	176
Chapter 8. EU Competences and Subsidiarity in Fundamental Rights Protection 179		
8.1.	Introduction	179
8.2.	The Principle of Attributed Competences and the Division of Powers between the EU and its Member States	180
8.3.	EU Competences to Protect Fundamental Rights	183
8.3.1.	Silence in the EU Treaties and the Case-law of the ECJ	183
8.3.2.	A General Power to Protect Fundamental Rights.	186
8.3.3.	Specific Power to Protect Fundamental Rights.	187
8.3.4.	Indirect Power to Protect Fundamental Rights.	188
8.3.4.1.	An Indirect, Accessory or Functional Rule-making Power.	188
8.3.4.2.	Article 4(3) TEU: The Principle of Loyal Cooperation.	192
8.3.4.3.	Article 19(1) TEU: Provision of Remedies at National Level.	193
8.3.4.4.	Charter Rights Calling for Positive Measures	194
8.3.5.	Remaining Tensions: Competence Creep or Protection Gaps?	197
8.4.	Reasons for Actively Protecting Fundamental Rights at EU Level	200

8.4.1.	Different Approaches for Incorporating a Theory of Positive Obligations within EU Law	200
8.4.2.	An Approach Based on the Division of Powers between the EU and the Member States	204
8.4.3.	Subsidiarity and Proportionality.....	205
8.4.4.	Connections between EU Acts and Fundamental Rights Infringements	209
8.4.5.	Preventing a Race to the Bottom	214
8.4.6.	Ensuring the Primacy, Unity and Effectiveness of EU Law.....	216
8.5.	Providing Room for the Application of National or International Fundamental Rights Standards.....	217
8.6.	Conclusions.....	219
Chapter 9. The Limited Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights		221
9.1.	Introduction	221
9.2.	Article 51 of the Charter and its Effects on a Development of Positive Obligations by the ECJ.....	222
9.2.1.	Background to Article 51 of the Charter and its Main Effects on the Development of Positive Obligations	222
9.2.2.	Gaps in Protection or Competence Creep?.....	224
9.2.3.	Responding to Gaps in the Protection of Fundamental Rights: Flexibility in the Interpretation of the Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights Law	227
9.3.	The Interpretation of Article 51 by the ECJ	230
9.3.1.	The Relation between the Limited Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights and the Limited Powers of the EU.....	230
9.3.2.	The Specific Situations within the Meaning of 'Implementing Union Law'	232
9.3.2.1.	The Agency Situation.....	232
9.3.2.2.	The Situation of Derogation from the Free Movement Rules	235
9.3.2.3.	The Situation of Optioning Rules	239
9.3.3.	The Sovereign Powers of the Member States.....	241
9.3.4.	The Discretion for the Member States to Apply their own Fundamental Rights Standards	243
9.4.	Conclusions.....	244
Chapter 10. Part II – Conclusions		247
10.1.	The Specific Parameters of EU Law Defining the Scope and the Limits for the Development of Positive Obligations.....	247
10.2.	The Development of Positive Obligations under the Preliminary Reference Procedure.....	248

10.3. The Relevant Legal Framework for the Development of Positive Obligations under EU Law	249
10.4. The Limited Competences of the EU in Combination with the Limited Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights	251
10.5. Why and When Could the ECJ Accept Positive Obligations?	255
10.5.1. Reasons for Active Protection of Fundamental Rights at the EU level	255
10.5.2. The Role of the ECJ in the Field of Fundamental Rights.	257
10.5.3. The Judicial Style of the ECJ	258

PART III: SYNTHESIS

Chapter 11. The Development of Positive Obligations within the Context of EU Law: Overview and Evaluation of the Case-Law of the ECJ	263
11.1. Introduction	263
11.2. The Distinction between Positive and Negative Obligations within the Context of EU Law	263
11.3. Examples of Positive Obligations in the Case-law of the ECJ	267
11.3.1. Positive Obligations for the EU Institutions	267
11.3.2. Positive Obligations for the Member States in the Agency Situation.	269
11.3.2.1. Positive Obligations for the Member States' Judiciaries	270
11.3.2.2. Positive Obligations for the Member States' Administrative Authorities	271
11.3.2.3. Positive Obligations for the Member States' Legislatures	272
11.3.3. Positive Obligations for the Member States when Derogating from the Free Movement Rules	272
11.3.4. Positive Obligations for the Member States when Applying Optioning Rules	274
11.4. The Types of Positive Obligation within the Context of EU Law.	274
11.5. Respecting the Limits of EU Law?	275
11.5.1. The <i>Grant</i> Case	275
11.5.2. The <i>Chatzi</i> Case.	278
11.5.3. The <i>N.S. and others</i> Case	282
11.5.4. The <i>Abdida</i> Case	286
11.5.5. The <i>T. Port</i> Case.	289
11.6. Conclusions.	292

Chapter 12. Conclusions and Recommendations	295
12.1. Incorporating Positive Obligations to Protect Fundamental Rights in EU Law?	295
12.2. A Limited Scope for the Development of Positive Obligations under EU law.	297
12.2.1. The Relevance of Secondary EU Law as a Framework for the Protection of Fundamental Rights	297
12.2.2. The Development of Positive Obligations on the Basis of an Indirect Power to Protect Fundamental Rights.	299
12.2.3. The Division of Competences between the EU and the Member States.	300
12.2.4. Limited Scope of Application of EU Fundamental Rights	302
12.3. Contrasts with the Development of Positive Obligations by the ECtHR	303
12.3.1. A Wide Variety of Types of Positive Obligations	303
12.3.2. Procedural Limitations.	306
12.3.3. The Political Character of the Development of Positive Obligations	307
12.3.4. The Specific Role and the Judicial Style of the ECJ.	310
12.4. Recommendations for the Development of a Doctrine of Positive Obligations by the ECJ	311
12.5. Expansion of Competences or Gaps in the Protection of Fundamental Rights?	314
 <i>Bibliography</i>	 319
<i>Index</i>	339

ABBREVIATIONS

A-G	Advocate General
BVerfG	Bundesverfassungsgericht
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights ('the Convention')
ECSR	European Committee on Social Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EU	European Union
GC	General Court of the European Union
IACHR	Inter-American Court of Human Rights
TEC	Treaty establishing the European Community
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN	United Nations
US	United States of America

TABLE OF CASES

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

ECtHR 23 May 2016, no. 17502/07, <i>Avotiņš v. Latvia</i>	132
ECtHR 26 April 2016, no. 62649/10, <i>İzzetin Doğan and others v. Turkey</i>	93
ECtHR 2 February 2016, no. 3648/04, <i>Cavit Tinarlioglu v. Turkey</i>	66
ECtHR 4 December 2015, no. 47143/06, <i>Zakharov v. Russia</i>	131
ECtHR 20 October 2015, no. 15529/12, <i>Balázs v. Hungary</i>	81
ECtHR 22 September 2015, no. 62116/12, <i>Nabil and others v. Hungary</i>	131
ECtHR 16 June 2015, no. 64569/09, <i>Delfi and others v. Estonia</i>	131
ECtHR 13 January 2015, no. 65681/13, <i>Vékony v. Hungary</i>	273
ECtHR 4 November 2014, no. 29217/12, <i>Tarakhel v. Switzerland</i>	171, 172
ECtHR 3 October 2014, no. 12738/10, <i>Jeunesse v. the Netherlands</i>	93
ECtHR 24 July 2014, nos. 60908/11 to 62338/11, <i>Brincat and others v. Malta</i>	66
ECtHR 16 July 2014, no. 37359/09, <i>Hämäläinen v. Finland</i>	69, 93
ECtHR 24 June 2014, no. 33011/08, <i>A.K. v. Latvia</i>	56
ECtHR 8 April 2014, no. 17120/09, <i>Dhahbi v. Italy</i>	147, 173
ECtHR 26 March 2014, no. 8978/80, <i>O’Keefe v. Ireland</i>	54
ECtHR 12 December 2013, no. 5786/08, <i>Söderman v. Sweden</i>	44
ECtHR 5 December 2013, nos. 52806/09 and 22703/10, <i>Vilnes and others v. Norway</i>	66
ECtHR 4 July 2013, no. 21788/06, <i>Balakin v. Russia</i>	51
ECtHR 6 December 2012, no. 12323/11, <i>Michaud v. France</i>	132, 202
ECtHR 26 June 2012, no. 26828/06, <i>Kurić and others v. Slovenia</i>	33
ECtHR 23 February 2012, no. 27765/09, <i>Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy</i>	288, 289
ECtHR 10 January 2012, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, <i>Ananyev and others v. Russia</i>	33
ECtHR 20 December 2011, nos. 18299/03 and 27311/03, <i>Fingenov and others v. Russia</i>	66
ECtHR 3 November 2011, no. 12793/03, <i>Balitskiy v. Ukraine</i>	33
ECtHR 20 September 2011, nos. 3989/07 and 38353.07, <i>Ullens de Schooten and Rezabek v. Belgium</i>	173
ECtHR 26 July 2011, no. 41416/08, <i>M. and others v. Bulgaria</i>	32
ECtHR 26 July 2011, no. 9718/03, <i>Georgel and Georgeta Stoiescu v. Romania</i>	66, 87
ECtHR 26 May 2011, no. 27617/04, <i>R. R. V. Poland</i>	85
ECtHR 24 March 2011, no. 23458/02, <i>Giuliani and Gaggio v. Italy</i>	93
ECtHR 10 February 2011, no. 30499/03, <i>Dubetska and others v. Ukraine</i>	53
ECtHR 21 January 2011, no. 30696/09, <i>M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece</i>	126, 130, 131, 132, 283
ECtHR 18 January 2011, no. 272385/95, <i>Chapman v. the United Kingdom</i>	85
ECtHR 16 December 2010, no. 25579/05, <i>A.B. and C. v. Ireland</i>	56, 64, 95
ECtHR 1 March 2010, nos. 46113/99 to 21819/04 (adm. dec.), <i>Demopoulos and others v. Turkey</i>	22
ECtHR 7 January 2010, no. 25965/04, <i>Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia</i>	61
ECtHR 15 October 2009, no. 17056/06, <i>Micallef v. Malta</i>	23

ECtHR 17 September 2009, no. 10249/03, <i>Scoppola v. Italy</i> (No. 2).....	33
ECtHR 30 June 2009, no. 32772/02, <i>Verein gegen Tierfabriken Schweiz (VgT) v. Switzerland</i> (No. 2)	54
ECtHR 9 June 2009, no. 33401/02, <i>Opuz v. Turkey</i>	68
ECtHR 9 April 2009, no. 71463/01, <i>Silih v. Slovenia</i>	55, 56
ECtHR 3 February 2009, no. 31276/05, <i>Women on Waves v. Portugal</i>	90
ECtHR 16 December 2008, no. 23883/06, <i>Khurshid Mustafa and Tarzibachi v. Sweden</i>	64
ECtHR 4 December 2008, nos. 30562/04 and 30566/04, <i>S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom</i>	31, 195
ECtHR 24 July 2008, no. 36376/04, <i>Kononov v. Latvia</i>	25
ECtHR 27 May 2008, no. 26565/05, <i>N. v. the United Kingdom</i>	289
ECtHR 20 March 2008, nos. 15339/02 to 15343/02, <i>Budayeva and others v. Russia</i>	314
ECtHR 22 January 2008, no. 43546/02, <i>E.B. v. France</i>	24
ECtHR 4 December 2007, no. 44362/04, <i>Dickson v. the United Kingdom</i>	54
ECtHR 9 October 2007, no. 14484/04, <i>Hasan and Eylem Zengin v. Turkey</i>	33
ECtHR 31 May 2007, no. 7510/04, <i>Kontrová v. Slovakia</i>	51
ECtHR 31 May 2007, no. 26828/06 (adm. dec.), <i>Makuc and others v. Slovenia</i>	68
ECtHR 26 April 2007, no. 25389/05, <i>Gebremedhin v. France</i>	288, 289
ECtHR 10 April 2007, no. 6339/05, <i>Evans v. the United Kingdom</i>	31
ECtHR 20 March 2007, no. 5410/03, <i>Tysiąc v. Poland</i>	56
ECtHR 30 June 2006, no. 45036/98, <i>Bosphorus v. Ireland</i>	131, 132, 202
ECtHR 29 March 2006, no. 36813/97, <i>Scordino v. Italy</i> (No. 1)	269
ECtHR 23 February 2006, no. 51500/08, <i>Çam v. Turkey</i>	82
ECtHR 11 January 2006, nos. 52562/99 and 52620/99, <i>Sørensen and Rasmussen v. Denmark</i>	75
ECtHR 6 October 2005, no. 74025/01, <i>Hirst v. the United Kingdom</i> (No. 2).....	43
ECtHR 9 June 2005, no. 55723/00, <i>Fadeyeva v. Russia</i>	50, 61, 67
ECtHR 4 February 2005, nos. 46827/99 to 46951/99, <i>Mamatkulov and Askarov v. Turkey</i>	22, 27
ECtHR 4 January 2005, no. 14462/03 (adm. dec.), <i>Pentiacova and 48 others v. Moldova</i>	68
ECtHR 20 December 2004, no. 50385/99, <i>Maraktzis v. Greece</i>	78, 79
ECtHR 2 December 2004, no. 4672/02, <i>Farbtuhs v. Latvia</i>	55
ECtHR 30 November 2004, no. 48939/99, <i>Öneryildiz v. Turkey</i>	51, 54, 56, 57, 79, 94
ECtHR 18 November 2004, no. 58255/00, <i>Propokovich v. Russia</i>	25
ECtHR 16 November 2004, no. 4143/02, <i>Gómez v. Spain</i>	34
ECtHR 13 July 2004, no. 69498/01, <i>Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra</i>	34, 47, 63, 64, 271
ECtHR 8 July 2004, no. 53924/00, <i>Vo v. France</i>	30
ECtHR 24 June 2004, no. 59320/00, <i>Von Hannover v. Germany</i>	63, 271
ECtHR 22 June 2004, no. 31443/96, <i>Broniowski v. Poland</i>	48
ECtHR 8 April 2004, no. 71503/01, <i>Assanidze v. Georgia</i>	33
ECtHR 27 May 2004, no. 66746/01, <i>Connors v. the United Kingdom</i>	31
ECtHR 17 February 2004, no. 39748/98, <i>Maestri v. Italy</i>	34
ECtHR 24 July 2003, no. 40016/98, <i>Karner v. Austria</i>	25
ECtHR 8 July 2003, no. 36022/97, <i>Hatton and others v. the United Kingdom</i>	31, 45, 53, 56, 85, 89, 91
ECtHR 8 July 2003, no. 27677/02 (adm. dec.), <i>Sentges v. the Netherlands</i>	67
ECtHR 11 July 2002, no. 28957/95, <i>Christina Goodwin v. the United Kingdom</i>	29, 55
ECtHR 14 May 2002, no. 38621/97 (adm. dec.), <i>Zehnalova and Zehnal v. the Czech Republic</i>	64, 68, 313

ECtHR 21 December 2001, no. 31465/96, <i>Sen v. the Netherlands</i>	15
ECtHR 28 June 2001, no. 24699/94, <i>VgT Verein Gegen Tierfabriken v. Switzerland</i>	49
ECtHR 26 June 2001, no. 26390/95, <i>Beck v. Norway</i>	269
ECtHR 10 May 2001, no. 29392/95, <i>Z. and others v. the United Kingdom</i>	65
ECtHR 23 January 2001, no. 28342/95, <i>Brumărescu v. Romania (Article 41)</i>	33
ECtHR 18 January 2001, no. 24882/94, <i>Beard v. the United Kingdom</i>	32, 88
ECtHR 18 January 2001, no. 27238/95, <i>Chapman v. the United Kingdom</i>	55, 68, 69, 87, 93
ECtHR 17 January 2001, no. 32967/96, <i>Calvelli and Ciglio v. Italy</i>	69
ECtHR 26 October 2000, no. 30210/96, <i>Kudla v. Poland</i>	51, 68, 172, 269
ECtHR 13 July 2000, nos. 39221/98 and 41963/98, <i>Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy</i>	33
ECtHR 11 July 2000, no. 29192/95, <i>Ciliz v. the Netherlands</i>	15
ECtHR 16 March 2000, no. 23144/93, <i>Özgür Gündem v. Turkey</i>	68, 75
ECtHR 18 February 1999, no. 24833/94, <i>Matthews v. the United Kingdom</i>	131
ECtHR 28 October 1998, no. 23452/94, <i>Osman v. the United Kingdom</i>	53, 65, 68, 69, 95
ECtHR 9 June 1998, no. 23413/94, <i>L.C.B. v. the United Kingdom</i>	50
ECtHR 24 February 1998, no. 21439/93, <i>Botta v. Italy</i>	67
ECtHR 19 February 1998, no. 14967/89, <i>Guerra and others v. Italy</i>	67, 79
ECtHR 19 February 1998, no. 22729/93, <i>Kaya v. Turkey</i>	313
ECtHR 28 November 1996, no. 21702/93, <i>Ahmut v. the Netherlands</i>	15
ECtHR 25 April 1996, no. 15573/89, <i>Gustafsson v. Sweden</i>	47
ECtHR 19 February 1996, no. 23218/94, <i>Gül v. Switzerland</i>	15
ECtHR 31 October 1995, no. 14556/89, <i>Papamichalopoulos and others v. Greece (Article 50)</i>	33
ECtHR 27 September 1995, no. 18984/91, <i>McCann and others v. the United Kingdom</i>	24, 34, 51–53, 56, 86
ECtHR 23 March 1995, no. 15318/89, <i>Loizidou v. Turkey (preliminary objections)</i>	26, 27
ECtHR 9 December 1994, no. 16798/90, <i>López Ostra v. Spain</i>	50, 54, 67
ECtHR 25 November 1994, no. 18131/91, <i>Stjerna v. Finland</i>	91, 94
ECtHR 24 November 1994, no. 17621/91, <i>Kemmache v. France (No. 3)</i>	25
ECtHR 20 September 1994, no. 13470/84, <i>Otto-Preminger-Institut v. Austria</i>	50
ECtHR 26 May 1994, no. 16969/90, <i>Keegan v. Ireland</i>	54, 80, 91, 92
ECtHR 29 April 1994, nos. 25088/94 to 28443/95, <i>Chassagnou and others v. France</i>	85
ECtHR 25 March 1993, no. 13134/87, <i>Costello-Roberts v. the United Kingdom</i>	79
ECtHR 16 December 1992, no. 13710/88, <i>Niemitz</i>	168
ECtHR 4 March 1991, nos. 15299/89 to 15318/89 (adm. dec.), <i>Chrysostomos, Papachrysostomou and Loizidou v. Turkey</i>	26
ECtHR 27 September 1990, no. 10843/84, <i>Cossey v. the United Kingdom</i>	29, 41, 91
ECtHR 21 February 1990, no. 9310/81, <i>Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom</i>	54
ECtHR 7 July 1989, no. 14038/88, <i>Soering v. the United Kingdom</i>	26, 28
ECtHR 7 July 1989, no. 10454/83, <i>Gaskin v. the United Kingdom</i>	54
ECtHR 21 June 1988, no. 10126/82, <i>Plattform "Ärzte für das Leben" v. Austria</i>	41, 46, 47, 78
ECtHR 29 April 1988, no. 10328/83, <i>Belilos v. Switzerland</i>	34
ECtHR 8 July 1987, no. 9840/82, <i>B. v. the United Kingdom</i>	56
ECtHR 2 March 1987, no. 9267/81, <i>Mathieu-Mohin and Clerfayt v. Belgium</i>	43
ECtHR 17 October 1986, no. 9532/81, <i>Rees v. the United Kingdom</i>	52, 85, 91
ECtHR 21 February 1986, no. 8793/79, <i>James and others v. the United Kingdom</i>	31, 51, 81
ECtHR 28 May 1985, nos. 9214/80 to 9474/81, <i>Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom</i>	15, 41, 60, 85

ECtHR 26 March 1985, no. 8978/80, <i>X and Y v. the Netherlands</i>	34, 39, 41, 47, 49, 57, 67, 77, 82, 87
ECtHR 2 August 1984, no. 8691/79, <i>Malone v. the United Kingdom</i>	195
ECtHR 25 February 1982, nos. 7511/76 to 7743/76, <i>Campbell and Cosans v. the United Kingdom</i>	34, 50
ECtHR 13 August 1981, nos. 7601/76 and 7806/77, <i>Young, James and Webster v. the United Kingdom</i>	24, 49, 51
ECtHR 9 October 1979, no. 6289/73, <i>Airey v. Ireland</i>	28, 40, 44, 45, 46, 48, 61, 67, 71, 74
ECtHR 13 June 1979, no. 6833/74, <i>Marckx v. Belgium</i>	5, 29, 30, 32, 39–43, 48, 60, 64, 71–73, 75, 92, 95, 103, 265
ECtHR 26 April 1979, no. 653874, <i>Sunday Times v. the United Kingdom</i>	195
ECtHR 6 September 1978, no. 5029/71, <i>Klass and others v. Germany</i>	29, 34, 51
ECtHR 25 April 1978, no. 5856/72, <i>Tyrer v. the United Kingdom</i>	29, 72
ECtHR, 18 January 1978, no. 5310/71, <i>Ireland v. the United Kingdom</i>	25, 32, 51
ECtHR 7 December 1976, no. 5493/72, <i>Handyside v. the United Kingdom</i>	23, 30
ECtHR 7 December 1976, nos. 5095/71 to 5926/71, <i>Kjeldsen, Busk Madsen and Pedersen v. Denmark</i>	26
ECtHR 8 June 1976, nos. 5100/71 to 5370/72, <i>Engel and others v. the Netherlands</i>	23
ECtHR 6 February 1976, no. 5614/72, <i>Swedish Engine Driver's Union v. Sweden</i>	31
ECtHR 21 February 1975, no. 4451/70, <i>Golder v. the United Kingdom</i>	26, 27, 43, 44
ECtHR 10 March 1972, nos. 2832/66 to 2899/66, <i>De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp ('Vagrancy') v. Belgium (Article 50)</i>	45
ECtHR 23 July 1968, nos. 1474/62 to 2126/64, <i>Belgian Linguistic case</i>	23, 30, 38, 39, 42, 43, 47, 48, 51, 57, 71
ECtHR 27 June 1968, no. 2122/64, <i>Wemhoff v. Germany</i>	26
ECtHR 1 July 1961, no. 332/57, <i>Lawless v. Ireland</i>	27

EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

ECJ 20 September 2016, Joined Cases C-8/15 and C-10/15, <i>Ledra Advertising</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:701	120
ECJ 4 May 2016, C-358/14, <i>Poland v. Parliament and Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:323	191, 206–208
ECJ 4 May 2016, Joined cases C-477/14 and C-547/14, <i>Pillbox 38l</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:324	191
ECJ 19 April 2016, C-441/14, <i>Danski Industri</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:278	270
ECJ 5 April 2016, Joined cases C-404/15 and C-659/15, <i>Aranyosi and Căldărău</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:198	127, 152, 162, 175
ECJ 15 February 2016, C-601/115, <i>J.N.</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:84	114, 118, 131, 211
ECJ 6 October 2015, C-362/14, <i>Schrems</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:650	2, 131, 151, 155, 169, 174
ECJ 6 October 2015, C-61/14, <i>Orizzonte Salute</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:655	158
ECJ 10 September 2015, C-408/14, <i>Wojchiechowski</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:591	193
ECJ 9 September 2015, Joined Cases C-72/14 and C-197/14, <i>X. and T.A. van Dijk</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:564	173
ECJ 9 September 2015, C-160/14, <i>Ferreira da Silva</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:565	146
ECJ 18 June 2015, C-508/13, <i>Estonia v. Parliament and Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:403	208
ECJ 7 May 2015, C-608/14, <i>Pondiche</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:313	231
ECJ 7 May 2015, C-496/14, <i>Vărararu</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:312	231

ECJ 29 April 2015, C-528/13, <i>Léger</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:288.....	271
ECJ 16 April 2015, Joined cases C-446/12 to C-449/12, <i>Willems and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:238.....	159, 160, 242
ECJ 18 December 2014, C-562/13, <i>Abdida</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2453	130, 193, 272, 286–289, 298
ECJ 18 December 2014, C-542/13, <i>M’Bodj</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2452	130
ECJ 18 December 2014, <i>Opinion 2/13</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2431	3, 114, 117, 127, 129, 130, 169,189, 193, 203
ECJ 11 December 2014, C-249/13, <i>Boudjlida</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2431	272
ECJ 11 November 2014, C-333/13, <i>Dano</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2358.....	122
ECJ 5 November 2014, C-166/13, <i>Mukarubega</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2229.....	119, 272
ECJ 17 September 2014, C-562/12, <i>Liivimaa Lihaveis</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2229.....	270
ECJ 17 July 2014, Joined Cases C-141/12 and C-372/12, <i>YS and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2081	119, 272
ECJ 17 July 2014, C-474/13, <i>Pham</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2096.....	196
ECJ 10 July 2014, C-198/13, <i>Julian Hernández and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2055.....	114, 280
ECJ 3 July 2014, C-129/13, <i>Kamino International Logistics</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2041	272
ECJ 5 June 2014, C-146/14, <i>Mahdi</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:1320.....	271
ECJ 22 May 2014, C-56/13, <i>Érsekcsanádi Mezőgazdasági</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:352.....	231, 280
ECJ 22 May 2014, C-356/12, <i>Glatzel</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:350	134, 151, 152
ECJ 13 May 2014, C-131/12, <i>Google Spain</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:317.....	131, 121, 123
ECJ 8 May 2014, C-483/12, <i>Pelckmans Turnhout</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:304.....	231
ECJ 30 April 2014, C-390/12, <i>Pfleger and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:238	231, 235, 236
ECJ 8 April 2014, Joined cases C-293/12 and 594/12, <i>Digital Rights Ireland</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:238.....	131, 174, 190
ECJ 8 April 2014, C-288/12, <i>Commission v. Hungary</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:237	145
ECJ 27 March 2014, C-314/12, <i>UPC Telekabel Wien</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:192	123, 270
ECJ 27 March 2014, C-265/13, <i>Torralbo Marcos</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:187	122
ECJ 6 March 2014, C-206/13, <i>Siragusa</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:126	114, 122
ECJ 27 February 2014, C-79/13, <i>Saciri and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:103	196
ECJ 15 January 2014, C-176/12, <i>AMS</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2.....	123, 124, 134
ECJ 26 November 2013, C-58/12 P, <i>Group Gascogne v. Commission</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:770.....	172
ECJ 3 October 2013, C-583/11 P, <i>Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:625.....	149
ECJ 18 July 2013, C-584/10 P, <i>Commission and others v Kadi</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:518	113, 149, 169, 202
ECJ 6 June 2013, C-648/11, <i>MA and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:367.....	196
ECJ 4 June 2013, C-300/11, <i>ZZ</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:363.....	271
ECJ 7 March 2013, C-128/12, <i>Sindicato dos Bancários do Norte and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:149.....	122
ECJ 26 February 2013, C-399/11, <i>Melloni</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:107	114, 125, 126, 159, 218
ECJ 26 February 2013, C-617/10, <i>Åkerberg Fransson</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:105	120, 121, 126, 127, 169, 230, 233, 243
ECJ 22 January 2013, C-283/11, <i>Sky Österreich</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:28.....	119, 152, 174
ECJ 6 December 2012, Joined cases C-356/11 and C-357/11, <i>O and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:776.....	270
ECJ 27 November 2012, C-370/12, <i>Pringle</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:756	122
ECJ 22 November 2012, C-277/11, <i>M.</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:744.....	119, 272
ECJ 8 March 2011, C-34/09, <i>Zambrano</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:124.....	225

ECJ 9 November 2010, Joined Cases C-92/09 and C-93/09, <i>Volker und Markus Schecke</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:662	171
ECJ 8 November 2012, C-40/11, <i>Iida</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:691	122, 234
ECJ 6 November 2012, C-286/12, <i>Commission v. Hungary</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:687	145
ECJ 26 April 2012, C-92/12, <i>Health Service Executive</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:255	196
ECJ 24 April 2012, C-571/10, <i>Kamberaj</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:233	127
ECJ 16 February 2012, C-182/10, <i>Solvay</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:82	148
ECJ 24 January 2012, C-282/10, <i>Dominguez</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:33	271, 123
ECJ 21 December 2011, Joined cases C-411/10 and C-493/10, <i>N.S. and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:865	121, 126, 131, 152, 162, 175, 211, 215, 240, 274, 284, 286
ECJ 15 November 2011, C-256/11, <i>Dereci</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:734	159
ECJ 1 March 2011, Case C-236/09, <i>Test-Achats</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:100	169
ECJ 5 October 2010, C-400/10, <i>McB.</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:582	122
ECJ 22 December 2010, C-279/09, <i>DEB</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:811	158, 234
ECJ 22 December 2010, C-208/09, <i>Sayn-Wittgenstein</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:806	157
ECJ 16 September 2010, C-149/10, <i>Chatzi</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:534	121, 139, 140, 141, 148, 153, 272, 279–281
ECJ 8 June 2010, C-58/08, <i>Vodafone and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:321	151, 152
ECJ 19 January 2010, C-555/07, <i>Küçükdeveci</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:21	123, 124
ECJ 18 December 2008, C-349/07, <i>Sopropé</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:746	272
ECJ 3 September 2008, C-402/05, <i>Kadi and Al Barakat International Foundation v Council and Commission</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:461	113, 149, 267, 268
ECJ 1 April 2008, C-267/06, <i>Maruko</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:179	237, 238, 278
ECJ 29 January 2008, C-275/06, <i>Promusicae</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:54	123, 193, 270
ECJ 18 December 2007, C-341/05, <i>Laval</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2007:809	168
ECJ 11 December 2007, C-438/05, <i>Viking Line</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2007:772	123, 168
ECJ 11 September 2007, Joined cases C-76/05 and C-318/05, <i>Schwarz and Gootjes</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2007:492	237
ECJ 27 June 2006, C-540/03, <i>Parliament v. Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2006:429	14, 15, 145, 211
ECJ 26 June 2007, C-305/05, <i>Ordre des barreaux francophone and germanophone and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2007:383	123, 148, 270
ECJ 13 March 2007, C-432/05, <i>Unibet</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2007:163	158, 287, 298
ECJ 22 November 2005, C-144/04, <i>Mangold</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2005:709	121, 123, 124, 148, 170, 229, 270
ECJ 11 June 2005, C-98/14, <i>Berlington</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2015:386	273
ECJ 16 December 2004, C-293/03, <i>My</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2004:821	193
ECJ 11 November 2004, C-372/04, <i>Watts</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2006:325	237, 238
ECJ 14 October 2004, C-36/02, <i>Omega</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2004:614	142, 157, 167, 239
ECJ 6 November 2003, C-101/01, <i>Lindqvist</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2003:596	211
ECJ 30 September 2003, C-224/01, <i>Köbler</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2003:513	147
ECJ 12 June 2003, C-112/00, <i>Schmidberger</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2003:333	142, 156, 167, 174, 273
ECJ 10 December 2002, C-491/01, <i>British American Tobacco (Investments) and Imperial Tobacco</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2002:741	151, 152
ECJ 22 October 2002, C-94/00, <i>Roquettes Frères</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2002:603	168
ECJ 25 July 2002, C-50/00, <i>Unión de Pequeños Agricultores v. Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2002:462	150
ECJ 19 February 2002, C-309/99, <i>Wouters and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2002:98	123
ECJ 5 October 2000, C-376/98, <i>Germany v. Parliament and Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2000:544	191

ECJ 17 February 1998, C-249/96, <i>Grant</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1998:63	184, 275, 276, 278
ECJ 19 December 1997, C-309/96, <i>Annibaldi</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1997:631	120
ECJ 9 December 1997, C-265/95, <i>Commission v. France</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1997:595	174, 193
ECJ 26 June 1997, C-368/95, <i>Familiapress</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1997:325	273
ECJ 26 November 1996, C-68/95, <i>T. Port</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:452	13, 189, 287, 290
ECJ 30 April 1996, Case C-13/94, <i>P v S and Cornwall County Council</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:170	276–278
ECJ 28 March 1996, <i>Opinion 2/94</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:140	6, 111, 152, 165, 179, 184, 189
ECJ 15 December 1995, C-415/93, <i>Bosman</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1995:463	123
ECJ 9 November 1995, case C-465/93, <i>Atlanta Fruchthandelsgesellschaft and others (I) v. Budensansalt fuer Landwirtschaft</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1995:369	291
ECJ 24 March 1994, C-2/92, <i>Bostock</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1995:83	138
ECJ 19 November 1991, Joined cases C-6/90 and C-9/90, <i>Francoovich and Bonifaci v. Italy</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1991:428	123, 148, 192, 270, 271
ECJ 25 July 1991, C-208/90, <i>Emmott</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1991:333	148, 270
ECJ 18 June 1991, C-260/89, <i>ERT</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1991:254	3, 110, 121, 235
ECJ 28 February 1991, C-234/89, <i>Delimitis v. Henninger Bräu</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1991:91	192
ECJ 21 February 1991, Joined cases C-143/88 and C-92/89, <i>Zuckerfabrik Suederdithmarschen and Zuckerfabrik Soest</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1991:65	291
ECJ 13 November 1990, C-106/89, <i>Marleasing</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1990:395ECJ 19 June 1990, C-213/89, <i>Factortame</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1990:257	133
ECJ 21 September 1989, C-46/87, <i>Hoechst</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1989:337	168
ECJ 13 July 1989, C-5/88 <i>Wachauf</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1989:321	110, 121, 139
ECJ 15 October 1987, C-222/86 <i>Heylens</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1987:442	270, 272
ECJ 15 May 1986, C-222/84, <i>Johnston</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1986:206	270
ECJ 23 April 1986, C-294/83, <i>Les Verts v Parliament</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1986:166	165, 189
ECJ 26 February 1986, C-152/84, <i>Marshall</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1986:84	124
ECJ 11 July 1985, C-60/84, <i>Cinéthèque v. Fédération nationale des cinémas français</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1985:329	189
ECJ 6 October 1982, C-283/81, <i>Cilfit</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1982:335	146, 147
ECJ 13 December 1979, C-44/79, <i>Hauer</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1979:290	110, 114
ECJ 16 December 1976, C-33/76, <i>Rewe</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1976:188	194, 266, 287
ECJ 8 April 1976, C-43/75, <i>Defrenne v. Sabena (No 2)</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1976:56	214
ECJ 12 December 1974, C-36/74, <i>Walrave and Koch</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1974:140	123
ECJ 14 May 1974, C-4/73, <i>Nold</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1974:51	110
ECJ 7 February 1970, C-11/70, <i>Internationale Handelsgesellschaft</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1970:114	110
ECJ 12 November 1969, C-29/69, <i>Stauder</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1969:57	110
ECJ 15 July 1964, C-6/64, <i>Costa v. ENEL</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1964:66	110, 152
ECJ 15 July 1963, C-25/62, <i>Plaumann v. Commission of the EEC</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1963:17	149
ECJ 27 March 1963, Joined cases C-28/62 to 30/62, <i>Da Costa</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1963:6	146
ECJ 5 February 1963, C-26/62, <i>Van Gend en Loos</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1963:1	110, 147
ECJ 15 July 1960, Joined cases C-36/59 and C-40/59, <i>Geitling v. High Authority</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1960:36	110
ECJ 4 February 1959, C-1/58, <i>Stork & Cie. v High Authority</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1959:4	110
ECJ 29 November 1956, C-8/55, <i>Fédération charbonnière de Belgique v. High Authority</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1956:11	183

GENERAL COURT

GC 16 October 2014, T-208/11, *LTTE v. Council*, ECLI:EU:T:2014:885 268

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL RIGHTS

ECSR 14 November 2014, no. 90/2103, *Conference of European Churches v. the Netherlands*..... 21

INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

IACHR 29 July 1988, Inter-Am.Ct.H.R. Series C No 4, *Vélasquez Rodríguez v. Honduras (Merits)* 4

AFRICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND PEOPLE’S RIGHTS

African Commission on Human and People’s Rights No 211/89 (1 May 2001), *Legal Resources Foundation v. Zambia*..... 4

PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Permanent Court of International Justice, *Chorzów Factory (Germany v. Poland) (Indemnity) (Merits)*, case PCIJ Rep Series A No 17 83

BUNDESVERFASSUNGSGERICHT (GERMAN CONSTITUTIONAL COURT)

BVerfG 29 May 1974, 2 BvL 52/7, *Solange I*..... 110

U.S. SUPREME COURT

U.S. Supreme Court 6 June 1994, *Farmer/Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994) 78
 U.S. Supreme Court 27 June 2005, *Castle Rock/Gonzales*, 545 U.S. 189 (1989) 78