

REVERSE DISCRIMINATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Discriminatierecht in theorie en praktijk / Discrimination law in theory and practice

Editors

Stefan Sottiaux en Jogchum Vrielink

REVERSE DISCRIMINATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

A Recurring Balancing Act

Valérie VERBIST



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

Reverse Discrimination in the European Union. A Recurring Balancing Act

© Valérie Verbist 2017

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

Cover image: Hochstrebende Stadtvision, Klee Paul (1879–1940) © Centre Pompidou, MNAM-CCI, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Droits réservés

ISBN 978-1-78068-458-1
D/2017/7849/7
NUR 823



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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book arises out of my PhD thesis written at the KU Leuven. It would not have been possible without the support of many people. First, I would like to thank my PhD supervisor and co-supervisors, Professor Dr Marie-Claire Foblets, Professor Dr Piet Van Nuffel and Professor Dr Geert De Baere, for their suggestions, debate and discussion. I am also very grateful to Emeritus Professor René Foqué and my colleagues at the KU Leuven for their support and intellectual stimulation. Moreover, I owe gratitude to FWO for granting me a scholarship which made it possible to carry out research. I would also like to thank Pascale Van Houtte, publisher at Intersentia, for her invaluable cooperation in steering this book to publication. Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my friends and family for their ever-present support.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements v
Table of Cases of the European Court of Justice xvii

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

1. Problem Definition: Discrimination and Reverse Discrimination 1
 1.1. Equality and Non-Discrimination 1
 1.2. Reverse Discrimination 3
 1.2.1. The Concept of Reverse Discrimination 3
 1.2.1.1. Unexpected Group is Discriminated Against 3
 1.2.1.2. The Origins of Reverse Discrimination 4
 1.2.1.3. Purely Internal Situations versus Situations
 with a Connection with Union Law 5
 1.2.1.4. Examples of Reverse Discrimination 6
 1.2.2. Terminology 8
 1.2.2.1. Reverse Discrimination and Positive Action 9
 1.2.2.2. Renaming Reverse Discrimination? 10
2. Research Aim 10
 2.1. Research Questions 10
 2.2. Delineating the Scope of Research 11
 2.3. Added Value to Previous Literature 12
3. Methodology 13
4. Structure 15
 4.1. Reverse Discrimination from a Union Law Perspective (Part I) 15
 4.2. Reverse Discrimination from a Variety of National
 Perspectives (Part II) 16
 4.3. Reverse Discrimination in a Federal State Context (Part III) 16

PART I. REVERSE DISCRIMINATION FROM A UNION PERSPECTIVE

**Chapter 2. The European Court of Justice's Approach to Reverse
Discrimination** 21

1. ECJ's Traditional Approach: Reverse Discrimination is Not Prohibited
by Union Law 21
 1.1. The Early Case Law on Purely Internal Situations 21
 1.1.1. The Notion of a 'Purely Internal Situation' 21

1.1.2.	Definition of a ‘Purely Internal Situation’	22
1.1.3.	Justification Put Forward by the ECJ for the Purely Internal Situation Rule	23
1.2.	Reverse Discrimination is not Prohibited by Union Law	25
1.2.1.	Purely Internal Situations Outside the Scope of Union Law – Reverse Discrimination Not Prohibited by Union Law	25
1.2.2.	Reverse Discrimination Should be Addressed at the National Level	27
1.2.3.	Confirmation of the ECJ’s Traditional Approach on Reverse Discrimination Following the Introduction of Union Citizenship	28
2.	Proposals to Address Reverse Discrimination at Union Level	30
2.1.	In the Light of the Common and Internal Market	30
2.2.	In the Light of Freedom of Movement for Persons and Union Citizenship	32
2.2.1.	In the Light of Union Citizenship and EU Fundamental Rights Protection	32
2.2.2.	Reverse Discrimination Incompatible with the Union Principle of Equality	33
3.	The ECJ’s Traditional Approach Towards Reverse Discrimination Remains Valid	38
3.1.	Reverse Discrimination as a Side Effect of the Limited Scope of Application of Union Law	39
3.2.	A General Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination at the Union Level is Unnecessary and Undesirable	43
3.3.	Interpretation of the Purely Internal Situation Rule	46
 Chapter 3. Applicability and Interpretation of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine		 47
1.	Applicability of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	48
1.1.	The Purely Internal Situation Doctrine is Applicable to Treaty Provisions on Free Movement and Citizenship	48
1.2.	Refinements of, and Exceptions to, the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	48
1.2.1.	Harmonisation of National Laws: No Need for the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	49
1.2.1.1.	No Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine in the Case of Harmonisation of National Laws	49

1.2.1.2.	Not all Forms of Harmonisation Exclude Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine: Minimum Harmonisation with a Market Access Clause	51
1.2.2.	Internal Tariff Barriers: An Exception to the Purely Internal Situation Rule.	53
1.2.2.1.	An Overview of the ECJ's Case Law on Internal Tariff Barriers.	53
1.2.2.2.	Divergent Opinions on the ECJ's Cases on Internal Tariff Barriers.	56
1.2.3.	<i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases: Indirect Exceptions to the Purely Internal Situation Rule via Article 267 TFEU	60
1.2.3.1.	<i>Dzodzi</i> and <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases.	60
1.2.3.2.	Criticising the Justifications Put Forward in the <i>Dzodzi</i> and <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases	63
1.2.3.3.	ECJ Puts 'Limited' Limits on the <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases	65
2.	The Purely Internal Situation versus Sufficient Connection with Union Law.	68
2.1.	Traditional Interpretation of Sufficient Link with Union Law: Cross-Border Element as Actual Movement between Member States	69
2.1.1.	Treaty Provisions on the Freedom of Movement.	69
2.1.1.1.	Treaty Provisions on Freedom of Movement: Cross-Border Element and Economic Activity	69
2.1.1.2.	Having Exercised His or Her Right of Free Movement.	70
2.1.2.	Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship	71
2.1.2.1.	Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship: Cross-Border Element	71
2.1.2.2.	Justifications for the ECJ's Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine to the Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship.	75
2.2.	Ever More Generous Interpretation of a Sufficient Connection with Union Law by the ECJ?	79
2.2.1.	As a Preliminary Remark: Criteria of Evaluation	80
2.2.2.	Precise Indications on How Much Movement and (Re)introduction of Causal Link.	81
2.2.2.1.	Sufficient Connection with Union Law: How Much 'Movement' is Necessary?	82

2.2.2.2.	Causal Link Between the Exercise of Free Movement and the Right Protected by Union Law	84
2.2.3.	The ECJ's Restrictions Approach	86
2.2.3.1.	<i>Dassonville</i> Case Law in the Area of Free Movement of Goods	86
2.2.3.2.	Extension of Restrictions Approach to Free Movement of Workers, Services and Establishment and to Union Citizenship	88
2.2.3.3.	Risks Implied in the Restrictions Approach – Confining the Concept of Restriction	93
2.2.4.	Stretching the Notion of Movement	99
2.2.4.1.	'Returning Citizens': Moving Back to Home Member State after Residing and Working in Another Member State	100
2.2.4.2.	Residing in Another Member State	106
2.2.4.3.	Exercise of Free Movement without Moving Residence	114
2.2.4.4.	Abuse of Union Law: A Stricter Notion of Movement and Real Causal Link	124
2.2.5.	Reducing the Importance of Movement in the Light of Union Citizenship	128
2.2.5.1.	External Element Other than Movement between Member States: Nationality of One Member State and Resident in Another Member State	128
2.2.5.2.	Intrinsic Connection with Union Law Introduced in <i>Rottmann</i> and <i>Ruiz Zambrano</i>	135
2.2.5.3.	In the Aftermath of <i>Ruiz Zambrano</i>	138
2.2.5.4.	The Clear Impact of Union Citizenship on the Connection Required with Union Law – Recent Limits	153
Conclusion Part I		157
1.	Reverse Discrimination as a Side Effect of the Scope of Application of Union Law	157
2.	The ECJ's Interpretation of a Purely Internal Situation	158
3.	Distinguishing Problematic and Unproblematic Cases of Reverse Discrimination – Redefining the Scope of Application of Union Law	160
3.1.	Proposals in Literature Distinguishing Problematic Cases from Unproblematic Cases of Reverse Discrimination	160

3.2.	Redefining the Scope of Application of the Treaty Provisions on Free Movement and Citizenship	164
3.3.	Working Hypothesis Based on Compensation/Overcompensation by Union Law	166
3.3.1.	The Distinction between Compensation and Overcompensation by Union Law	166
3.3.2.	Interpretation of '(Over)Compensation' and 'Disadvantage Resulting from Exercise of Free Movement'	168
3.3.3.	Illustration: Reverse Discrimination in the Area of Family Reunification	170
3.3.3.1.	Family Reunification Directive 2003/86 and Citizenship Directive 2004/38	170
3.3.3.2.	The Evolution from Compensation to Overcompensation by Union Law in the Area of Family Reunification	171

PART II. REVERSE DISCRIMINATION FROM NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Chapter 4. Reverse Discrimination with Respect to Goods 183

1.	Assessment by National Courts of Reverse Discrimination with Respect to Goods	184
1.1.	The French Council of State on Ethyl Alcohol	184
1.2.	The French Court of Cassation on Emmenthal	186
1.3.	The German Federal Administrative Court on the Purity Requirement for Beer	188
1.4.	The Italian Constitutional Court on Dried Pasta	191
2.	Reverse Discrimination of Goods: Rare Cases?	194

Chapter 5. Reverse Discrimination of Persons 197

1.	Classic Economic Free Movement Rights of Persons	197
1.1.	Professional Qualifications	198
1.1.1.	The Austrian Constitutional Court on the Exemption from Proof of Qualification on the Basis of Previous Professional Activity in Another EEA Member State	198
1.1.2.	The French Council of State on Tourist Guides and Architects	200
1.1.2.1.	The French Council of State on Proof of Good Behaviour for Tourist Guides	200

1.1.2.2.	The French Council of State on the Restoration of Classified Historic Monuments by a Specific Type of Architect	202
1.1.2.3.	The French Council of State on Attestation of Professional Qualifications for Tourist Guides	205
1.1.3.	The German Federal Constitutional Court on Skilled Trades Order	206
1.1.4.	<i>Intermezzo</i> : Compensation by Union Law: Assessment of a Purely Internal Situation in the Light of National Law, but Union Rules May be Inspiration.	211
1.2.	Acquiring Immovable Property: The Austrian Constitutional Court	214
1.3.	Employment Conditions.	216
1.3.1.	Wage-Setting Mechanisms: Changing Approach of the French Court of Cassation's Social Chamber	216
1.3.2.	Duration of Contracts: Extensive Interpretation of Link with Union Law by the Italian Constitutional Court	219
2.	Family Reunification with a Union Citizen.	223
2.1.	Introduction	223
2.2.	Family Reunification: An Emotive and Politically Sensitive Subject	224
2.3.	Incomparable Situations According to French and German Courts	225
2.3.1.	The French Council of State on Family Reunification.	225
2.3.2.	German Administrative Courts on Family Reunification	226
2.3.2.1.	Administrative Appeal Court of Hesse 2006.	226
2.3.2.2.	German Federal Administrative Court 2011.	228
2.3.2.3.	Division of Competences Precedes Assessment in the Light of the Principle of Equality.	230
2.4.	A Change of Approach in Austria and Belgium	231
2.4.1.	Developments in Austrian Legislation on Family Reunification.	231
2.4.1.1.	Austrian Constitutional Court in 1997: Difference in Treatment is Discriminatory	231
2.4.1.2.	Austrian Constitutional Court in 2009: Autonomy of National Legislator to Treat Purely Internal Situations Differently	232
2.4.2.	Developments in Belgian Legislation on Family Reunification.	234
2.4.2.1.	Autonomous Legislative Alignment in the Area of Family Reunification	234

2.4.2.2.	<i>Intermezzo: Problems Concerning the Scope and Interpretation of Autonomously Aligned Legislation.</i>	236
2.4.2.3.	Introduction of Reverse Discrimination in the Field of Family Reunification in 2011	237
2.4.2.4.	The Judgments of the Belgian Constitutional Court of 26 September 2013	239
2.4.2.5.	The Constitutional Court's Judgments of 26 September 2013: Analysis	241
2.5.	The Unique Italian Position: From a Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination in the Area of Family Reunification to a General Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination	251
2.5.1.	The Italian Council of State Regarding Family Reunification	251
2.5.2.	The Italian Legislator: Autonomous Alignment	252
2.5.2.1.	Legislative Autonomous Alignment in Family Reunification	252
2.5.2.2.	General Legislative Autonomous Alignment	253
2.5.2.3.	Extensive Implications of General Legislative Autonomous Alignment	254
	Conclusion Part II.	257
1.	Conclusion by Area?	257
2.	Application of the Working Hypothesis to the National Level	258
2.1.	Interpretation of Compensation and Overcompensation at National Level	258
2.2.	National Assessment in Cases of Compensation by Union Law	258
2.3.	National Assessment in Cases of Overcompensation by Union Law	259
3.	Evaluation of the Application of the Working Hypothesis to the National Level	260
3.1.	Putting of Compensation and Overcompensation in Practice at National Level	260
3.2.	Alternatives to the Application of the Working Hypothesis at National Level	262
4.	Some Final Thoughts on Addressing Reverse Discrimination at the National Level	264

PART III. REVERSE DISCRIMINATION IN A FEDERAL STATE
CONTEXT

Chapter 6. Union Perspective on Reverse Discrimination in a Federal State Context 267

1. The Status of Regions from a Union Perspective 267

 1.1. The ECJ's Case Law on the Internal Division of Competences within a Member State. 267

 1.1.1. The Autonomy of the Member States in the Allocation of Internal Powers. 267

 1.1.2. The ECJ Does Not Accept Hiding behind Domestic Rules on State Structure. 268

 1.2. The Status of Regions in the Treaties 270

2. ECJ's Case Law on Reverse Discrimination in a Federal State Context. 272

 2.1. *Flemish Care Insurance* Case: Specific Situation of Reverse Discrimination as a Direct Consequence of the Flemish Decree. 273

 2.1.1. The ECJ's *Flemish Care Insurance* Judgment. 275

 2.1.2. Analysis of the ECJ's *Flemish Care Insurance* Judgment 276

 2.2. Specific Situation of Reverse Discrimination as a Possible Consequence of the ECJ's *Las* and *Libert* Judgments 280

 2.2.1. *Las* Case Regarding the Flemish Decree on Use of Languages 280

 2.2.1.1. ECJ's *Las* Judgment 280

 2.2.1.2. Analysis of the ECJ's *Las* Judgment. 282

 2.2.2. *Libert* Case Regarding the Flemish Decree on 'Living in Your Own Region' 283

 2.2.2.1. ECJ's *Libert* Judgment 283

 2.2.2.2. Analysis of the ECJ's *Libert* Judgment 286

 2.3. ECJ's Case Law on Specific Situations of Reverse Discrimination: Two Concluding Observations 287

3. Recognition of the Autonomy of Regional Authorities by the ECJ in the Context of State Aid 288

 3.1. ECJ's Judgments on State Aid Recognise the Autonomy of Infra-State Bodies 288

 3.1.1. ECJ's *Azores* Judgment. 288

 3.1.2. ECJ's *Trabajadores de la Rioja* Judgment. 291

 3.1.3. General Court's *Gibraltar v Commission* judgment. 292

 3.1.4. A Balancing Act in Cases on State Aid Involving Regional Authorities 293

3.2.	Does the ECJ Recognise the Autonomy of Regional Authorities in Other Areas as Well?	294
3.2.1.	Recognition of Regional Authorities for Implementation of Union Law: <i>Horvath</i>	294
3.2.2.	Recognition of Regional Authorities in the Assessment of Restrictions to Free Movement?	297
3.2.2.1.	AG Sharpston's Proposal in the <i>Flemish Care Insurance Case</i>	297
3.2.2.2.	Possibility of Preventing Specific Situations of Reverse Discrimination at Union Level.	298
Chapter 7. National Perspectives on Reverse Discrimination in a Federal State Context		303
1.	National Rules on the Internal Division of Competences.	304
1.1.	The Belgian Constitutional Court's Judgment on the Flemish Care Insurance	304
1.2.	Analysis of the Belgian Constitutional Court's Judgment on the Basis of the Internal Rules on Division of Competences	306
2.	Internal Free Movement	309
2.1.	Belgian Constitutional Court on the Belgian Economic and Monetary Union	311
2.1.1.	Belgian Constitutional Court's <i>Flemish Care Insurance Judgment</i>	311
2.1.2.	Belgian Constitutional Court on Inheritance Tax.	313
2.2.	Belgian Council of State on the Belgian Economic and Monetary Union	315
2.2.1.	Inheritance Tax for Legacies in Favour of the Bilingual Brussels-Capital Region.	316
2.2.2.	Flemish Integration Policy	317
2.2.3.	Amendment of Decree on Use of Languages after the ECJ's <i>Las Judgment</i>	319
2.2.3.1.	Council of State's Opinion on Amendment of Decree on Use of Languages	319
2.2.3.2.	Comparison with the Belgian Constitutional Court's Judgment on Family Reunification	322
2.2.4.	Freedom of Movement within the EU and Internal Free Movement Not Necessarily Convergent According to Belgian Case Law	324
3.	The Principle of Equality as Enshrined in National Law.	325
3.1.	Belgian Constitutional Court	325
3.1.1.	<i>Flemish Care Insurance Judgment</i> : No Assessment in the Light of Articles 10 and 11 Belgian Constitution	325

3.1.2. Belgian Constitutional Court Prevents Specific Reverse Discrimination in Land and Real Estate Policy	328
3.2. German Federal Constitutional Court on University Tuition Fees	329
Conclusion Part III	333
1. Specific Situations of Reverse Discrimination from the Union Perspective	333
2. Specific Situations of Reverse Discrimination from National Perspectives	334
Chapter 8. Conclusion	337
1. Reverse Discrimination as a Side Effect of the Scope of Application of Union Law	337
1.1. Situations of Reverse Discrimination Fall within the Scope of Application of National Law	337
1.2. The ECJ's Interpretation of a Purely Internal Situation.	338
2. Diverging National Perspectives on Reverse Discrimination.	340
3. Distinguishing Problematic and Unproblematic Cases of Reverse Discrimination	341
3.1. Redefining the Scope of Application of the Treaty Provisions on Free Movement and Citizenship	341
3.2. Working Hypothesis Based on the Concept of (Over)Compensation by Union Law	343
3.2.1. The Distinction Between Compensation and Overcompensation by Union Law	343
3.2.2. Interpretation of '(Over)Compensation' and 'Disadvantage Resulting from Exercise of Free Movement'	344
3.2.3. Reverse Discrimination in Case of Mere Compensation by Union Law	345
3.2.4. Reverse Discrimination in Case of Overcompensation by Union Law	346
3.2.4.1. A Solution at Union Level	346
3.2.4.2. A Solution at National Level	348
<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>351</i>

TABLE OF CASES OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

References are to paragraph numbers.

<i>Airport Shuttle Express</i> , ECJ joined cases C-162/12 and C-163/12 [2014]	150–151
<i>Akrich</i> , ECJ case C-109/01 [2003] ECR I-9607	12, 228, 232, 234, 278, 279, 284, 748
<i>Alevizos v Ypourgos Oikonomikon</i> , ECJ case C-392/05 [2007] ECR I-3505	466
<i>Allué and Coonan</i> , ECJ joined cases C-259/91, C-331/91 and C-332/91 [1993] ECR I-4309.	504–506, 509, 511, 747
<i>Alokpa</i> , ECJ case C-86/12 [2013]	310, 346–348, 352
<i>Alpine Investments</i> , ECJ case C-384/93 [1995] ECR I-1141	198, 209, 211, 259
<i>Angonese</i> , ECJ case C-281/98 [2000] ECR I-4139	140, 270, 272–274, 693
<i>Anker e.a. v Germany</i> , ECJ case C-47/02 [2003] ECR I-10447	466
<i>Anomar</i> , ECJ case C-6/01 [2003] ECR I-8621	141
<i>Attanasio</i> , ECJ case C-384/08 [2010] ECR I-2055	141
<i>Aubertin e.a.</i> , ECJ joined cases C-29 to C-35/94 [1995] ECR I-301	111, 396
<i>Azores</i> , ECJ case C-88/03 [2006] ECR I-7115	671–675, 677, 679–681, 685–686, 690
<i>BAA</i> , ECJ case C-98/01 [2003] ECR I-4641.	207
<i>Bartsch</i> , ECJ case C-427/06 [2008] ECR I-7245.	3, 6, 371
<i>Baumbast</i> , ECJ case C-413/99 [2002] ECR I-7091	88, 163–165, 514
<i>Bickel and Franz</i> , ECJ case C-274/96 [1998] ECR I-7637	267–269, 272
<i>Blanco Pérez</i> , ECJ joined cases C-570/07 and C-571/07 [2010] ECR I-4629	141
<i>Bogendorff von Wolffersdorff</i> , ECJ case C-438/14 [2016]	280, 296–298, 378
<i>Bond</i> , ECJ case 352/85 [1988] ECR 2085	259
<i>Bosman</i> , ECJ case C-415/93 [1995] ECR I-4921	199, 202, 205, 209
<i>Boukhalfa</i> , ECJ case C-214/94 [1996] ECR I-2253	82, 499
<i>Caixa Bank</i> , ECJ case C-442/02 [2004] ECR 15.	100, 208–211, 218, 408, 646, 716, 779
<i>Carbonati Apuani</i> , ECJ case C-72/03 [2004] ECR I-8027.	82, 119, 122–123, 126, 129, 131–133, 136, 307, 372, 377, 499, 606
<i>Carpenter</i> , ECJ case C-60/00 [2002] ECR I-6279	79, 86, 89, 188, 207, 257, 261–265, 292, 386, 395, 511, 589, 593
<i>Centro Europa</i> , ECJ case C-380/05 [2008] ECR I-349.	141
<i>Centros</i> , ECJ case C-212/97 [1999] ECR I-1459.	293, 735, 736
<i>Chatzi</i> , ECJ case C-149/10 [2010] ECR I-8489	6
<i>Cipolla e.a.</i> , ECJ joined cases C-94/04 and C-202/04 [2006] ECR I-11421	145
<i>Collins</i> , ECJ case C-138/02 [2004] ECR I-2703	254
<i>Commission v Austria</i> , ECJ case C-102/06 [2006]	625

<i>Commission v Belgium</i> , ECJ case 149/79 [1982] ECR 1845	466
<i>Commission v Belgium</i> , ECJ case C-323/96 [1998] ECR I-5063	625
<i>Commission v Belgium</i> , ECJ case C-47/08 [2011] ECR I-4105	466
<i>Commission v France</i> , ECJ case C-50/08 [2011] ECR I-4195	466
<i>Commission v Germany</i> , ECJ case 178/84 [1987] ECR 1227	430–434, 444
<i>Commission v Gibraltar</i> , ECJ joined cases C-106/09 P and C-107/09 P [2011]	682
<i>Commission v Italy</i> , ECJ case C-33/90 [1991] ECR I-5987	625
<i>Commission v Italy</i> , ECJ case C-388/01 [2003] ECR I-721	625
<i>Commission v Italy</i> , ECJ case C-87/02 [2004] ECR I-5975	624–625
<i>Commission v Netherlands</i> , ECJ case 96/81 [1982] ECR I-1791	624
<i>Commission v Spain</i> , ECJ case C-157/03, [2005] ECR I-2911	12, 232
<i>Commission v Spain</i> , ECJ case C-610/10 [2012]	625
<i>Corsica Ferries</i> , ECJ case C-49/89 [1989] ECR 4441	207
<i>Cowan</i> , ECJ case 186/87 [1989] ECR 195	267–269, 272, 625
<i>Crono Service</i> , ECJ joined cases C-419/12 and C-420/12 [2014]	150–151
<i>CWF</i> , ECJ case C-1/96 [1998] ECR I-1251	117
<i>D’Hoop</i> , ECJ case C-224/98 [2002] ECR I-6191	203
<i>Dano</i> , ECJ case C-333/13 [2014]	278, 352, 747
<i>Dassonville</i> , ECJ case 8/74 [1974] ECR I-837	177, 192, 194–198, 206, 286, 443
<i>De Agostini</i> , ECJ joined cases C-34/95 to C-36/95 [1997] ECR I-3843	259
<i>De Coster</i> , ECJ case C-17/00 [2001] ECR I-9445	100, 606, 646
<i>Debaue</i> , ECJ case 52/79 [1980] ECR 833	70, 107
<i>Defrenne III</i> , ECJ case 194/77 [1987] ECR 1365	6
<i>Defrenne</i> , ECJ case 43/75 [1976] ECR 455	15
<i>Deliège</i> , ECJ joined cases C-51/96 and C-191/97 [2000] ECR I-2549	174, 269, 705
<i>Demirkan</i> , ECJ case C-221/11 [2013]	275, 713
<i>Dereci</i> , ECJ case C-256/11 [2011] ECR I-11315	13, 70, 106–107, 284, 319–322, 325, 328, 335–336, 345, 351–352, 361, 525, 533–534, 771
<i>Dim-dip lighting</i> , ECJ case 60/86 [1988] ECR I-3921	115, 378
<i>Drei Glocken</i> , ECJ case 407/85 [1988] ECR 4233	11, 371
<i>Driancourt v Cagnet</i> , ECJ case 355/85 [1986] ECR 3231	70, 110, 173, 500
<i>Dzodzi</i> , ECJ joined cases C-297/88 and C-197/89 [1990] ECR I-3763	45, 108, 137–138, 142–146, 299, 533
<i>Edah</i> , ECJ joined cases 80/85 and 159/85 [1986] ECR 3375	74, 101, 606, 646, 716
<i>Eind</i> , ECJ case C-291/05 [2007] ECR I-10719	230–231, 245–246, 254, 526, 565
<i>Eman and Sevinger</i> , ECJ case C-300/04 [2006] ECR I-8055	185, 611, 482
<i>ETI</i> , ECJ case C-280/06 [2007] ECR I-10893	138, 533
<i>Federconsorzi</i> , ECJ case C-88/91 [1992] ECR I-4035	137, 143, 299
<i>Flemish Care Insurance</i> , ECJ case C-212/06 [2008] ECR I-1683	62, 87–88, 119, 134, 136, 169, 185, 254, 299, 564, 619, 625, 634, 637–649, 663, 667, 669, 683, 689–694, 700, 703, 705, 708–709, 715, 740–741, 746, 748, 753, 755, 759–761
<i>Foglia II</i> , ECJ case 244/80 [1981] ECR 3045	145
<i>Franzén</i> , ECJ case C-189/95 [1997] ECR I-5909	100, 371, 646, 716
<i>Freskot</i> , ECJ case C-355/00 [2003] ECR I-5263	259
<i>Futura Participations</i> , ECJ case C-250/94 [1995] ECR I-4821	209

<i>Gallaher</i> , ECJ case C-11/92 [1993] ECR I-3545	116–117
<i>Garcia Avello</i> , ECJ case C-148/02 [2003] ECR I-11613	10, 69, 87, 101, 134, 169, 185, 287–292, 295, 297, 299, 301, 314, 706
<i>Gauchard</i> , ECJ case 20/87 [1987] ECR 4879	70, 107, 284
<i>Gebhard</i> , ECJ case C-55/94 [1995] ECR I-4165	199, 205, 209
<i>Germany v Commission</i> , ECJ case C-8/88 [1990] ECR I-2321	624
<i>Geurts and Vogten</i> , ECJ case 464/05 [2007] ECR I-9325	718–720
<i>Gibraltar v Commission</i> , EGC joined cases T-211/04 and T-215/04 [2008] ECR II-3745	681
<i>Gourmet Classic</i> , ECJ case C-458/06 [2008] ECR I-4207	138, 145, 533
<i>Gourmet International</i> , ECJ case C-405/98 [2001] ECR I-1795	259
<i>Graf</i> , ECJ case C-190/98 [2000] ECR I-1287	202, 209
<i>Groener</i> , ECJ case C-379/87 [1989] ECR 3967	644
<i>Grunkin & Paul</i> , ECJ case C-353/06 [2008] ECR I-7639	294, 295, 300
<i>Grzelczyk</i> , ECJ case C-184/99 [2001] ECR I-6193	167
<i>Guimont</i> , ECJ case C-448/98 [2000] ECR I-10663	11, 45, 137, 139–143, 145–148, 150, 196, 425, 427–429, 444, 533, 664
<i>Hartmann</i> , ECJ case C-212/05 [2007] ECR I-6303	647
<i>Heinz Huber</i> , ECJ case C-524/06 [2008] ECR I-9705	57, 82, 167, 499
<i>Horvath</i> , ECJ case C-428/07 [2009] ECR I-6355	382, 624, 628, 684–688, 694
<i>Hünermund</i> , ECJ case C-292/92, [1993] ECR I-6787	96, 218
<i>Hurd</i> , ECJ case 44/84 [1986] ECR 29	60, 179, 369
<i>Iida</i> , ECJ case C-40/11 [2012]	301, 310, 325–329, 335–336, 351–352
<i>Inasti e.a.</i> , ECJ joined cases C-393/99 and C-394/99 [2002] ECR I-2829	648
<i>Internationale Handelsgesellschaft</i> , ECJ case 11/70 [1970] ECR 1125	627
<i>Jäger</i> , ECJ case C-256/06 [2008] ECR I-123	70, 107
<i>Jakubowska</i> , ECJ case C-225/09 [2010] ECR I-12329	19
<i>Jersey Produce</i> , ECJ case C-293/02 [2005] ECR I-9543	124–126, 132–133, 136, 235, 280, 299, 378, 443
<i>Jia</i> , ECJ case C-1/05 [2007] ECR I-1	86, 183, 189, 511, 589, 593
<i>Jonkman</i> , ECJ joined cases C-231/06 to C-233/06 [2007] ECR I-5149	19
<i>Keck and Mithouard</i> , ECJ joined cases C-267/91 and C-268/91 [1993] ECR I-6097	211
<i>Kenny</i> , ECJ case 1/78 [1978] ECR 1489	62
<i>Kleinwort Benson</i> , ECJ case C-346/93 [1995] ECR I-640	137, 533
<i>Knoors</i> , ECJ case 115/78 [1979] ECR I-399	49, 54, 50, 70, 82, 223, 225, 228
<i>Kofisa Italia</i> , ECJ case C-1/99 [2001] ECR I-207	137, 533
<i>Kol</i> , ECJ case C-285/95 [1997] ECR I-309	278, 747
<i>Kraus</i> , ECJ case C-19/92 [1993] ECR I-1663	199, 205, 209, 211, 225, 446
<i>Kremzow</i> , ECJ case C-299/95 [1997] ECR I-2629	159, 301, 327
<i>Kurt</i> , ECJ Order in case C-104/08 [2008] ECR I-97	19
<i>Lancry</i> , ECJ joined cases C-363/93 and C-407/93 to C-411/93 [1994] ECR I-3957	119, 125–129, 133, 135, 235, 258, 366, 507
<i>Las</i> , ECJ case C-202/11 [2013]	635, 650–667, 692, 735, 737, 759, 761
<i>Laval</i> , ECJ case C-341/05 [2007] ECR I-11767	219
<i>Legros</i> , ECJ case C-163/90 [1992] ECR I-4625	119, 129

<i>Leur Bloem</i> , ECJ case C-28/95 [1997] ECR I-4161	137–138, 533
<i>Levin</i> , ECJ case 53/81 [1982] ECR 1035	279, 747, 748
<i>Libert e.a.</i> , ECJ joined cases C-197/11 and C-203/11 [2013]	635, 650–667, 692, 747–748, 759, 761
<i>Lindqvist</i> , ECJ case C-101/01 [2003] ECR I-12971	15, 390
<i>Lourenço Dias</i> , ECJ case C-343/90 [1992] ECR I-4673	145
<i>Luisi & Carbone</i> , ECJ joined cases 286/82 and 26/83 [1984] ECR 377	266–267
<i>Mac Quen</i> , ECJ case C-108/96 [2001] ECR I-837	209
<i>Mangold</i> , ECJ case C-144/04 [2005] ECR I-9981	6
<i>Marleasing</i> , ECJ case C-106/89 [1990] ECR I-4135	583
<i>Martinez Sala</i> , ECJ case C-85/96 [1998] ECR I-2691	161–162, 166
<i>Mathot</i> , ECJ case 98/86 [1987] ECR 809	70, 101, 107, 113, 277, 378, 646, 716
<i>McCarthy II</i> , ECJ case C-202/13 [2014]	278
<i>McCarthy</i> , ECJ case C-434/09 [2011] ECR I-3375	13, 70, 79, 106–107, 169, 190, 229, 284, 299–301, 310–317, 322, 351–352, 361, 525, 527–528, 589, 606, 664, 771
<i>Metallgesellschaft</i> , ECJ joined cases C-397/98 and C-410/98 [2001] ECR I-1727	209
<i>Metock</i> , ECJ case C-127/08 [2008] ECR I-6241	12, 89, 233–235, 254, 284, 395, 544, 588
<i>Miritz</i> , ECJ case 91/75 [1976] ECR 217	423
<i>Morgan</i> , ECJ joined cases C-11/06 and C-12/06 [2007] ECR I-9161	205
<i>Morson and Jhanjan</i> , ECJ joined cases 35/82 and 36/82 [1982] ECR 3723	13, 55–56, 59–60, 70, 92, 107, 155, 158, 167, 229
<i>Mosconi</i> , ECJ Order in case C-3/02, OJ C 118, 30 April 2004	111, 148, 277, 378
<i>Moser</i> , ECJ case 180/83 [1984] ECR 2539	159
<i>MRAX</i> , ECJ case C-459/99 [2002] ECR I-6591	12, 232, 565
<i>Nerkowska</i> , ECJ case C-499/06 [2008] ECR I-3993	169, 205
<i>Nino</i> , ECJ joined cases C-54/88, C-91/88 and C-14/89 [1990] ECR I-3537	70, 107
<i>O and B</i> , ECJ case C-456/12 [2014]	12, 229, 231, 237, 243–254, 264–265, 275–281, 323, 335–336, 338, 359, 378, 395, 511, 565, 610, 642, 709, 713, 747, 769, 796
<i>O and S</i> , ECJ joined cases C-356/11 and C-357/11 [2012]	310, 339–345, 351–352, 361, 771
<i>Omalet</i> , ECJ case C-245/09 [2010] ECR I-13771	147–148
<i>Omega</i> , ECJ case C-36/02 [2004] ECR I-9609	644
<i>Ordine degli ingegneri di Verona e provincia e.a.</i> , ECJ case C-111/12 [2013]	19, 61, 65, 147–148, 179, 589
<i>P v S</i> , ECJ case C-13/94 [1996] ECR I-2143	6
<i>Payroll Data Services</i> , ECJ case C-79/01 [2002] ECR I-8923	209
<i>Perfili</i> , ECJ case C-177/94 [1996] ECR I-161	209, 686
<i>Peureux</i> , ECJ case 86/78 [1979] ECR 897	422–423, 444
<i>Pistre</i> , ECJ joined cases C-321/94, C-322/94, C-323/94 and C-324/94 [1997] ECR I-2343	195, 443–444, 565
<i>Presidente del Consiglio dei Ministri v Regione Sardegna</i> , ECJ case C-169/08 [2009] ECR I-10821	682
<i>Provide</i> , ECJ case C-150/88 [1989] ECR I-3891	115, 378
<i>Pusa</i> , ECJ case C-224/02 [2004] ECR I-5763	201, 202, 203

<i>Reisch</i> , ECJ joined cases C-515/99, C-519/99 to C-524/99 and C-526/99 to C-540/99 [2002] ECR I-2157	141
<i>Rendon Masin</i> , ECJ pending joined cases C-165/14 and C-304/14	349
<i>Rewe</i> [known as <i>Cassis de Dijon</i>], ECJ case 120/78 [1979] ECR I-649	196
<i>Rewe</i> , ECJ case 47/95 [1976] ECR 569	423
<i>Rheinmuehlen</i> , ECJ case 166/73 [1974] ECR 33	144
<i>Rottmann</i> , ECJ case C-135/08 [2010] ECR I-1419	136, 302–305, 308, 350
<i>Roux</i> , ECJ case C-363/89 [1991] ECR I-273	155
<i>Ruiz Zambrano</i> , ECJ case C-34/09 [2011] ECR I-1177	26, 79, 88–91, 136, 141, 158–159, 169, 183, 190, 229, 275, 299, 301, 305–352, 360–361, 511, 525, 527–528, 589, 593, 664, 713, 770–771
<i>S and G</i> , ECJ case C-457/12 [2014]	12, 166, 252–254, 258, 260–265, 275, 281, 511
<i>S.A. Krüger</i> , ECJ case C-253/01 [2004] ECR I-1191	65, 407
<i>Säger</i> , ECJ case C-76/90 [1991] ECR I-4221	198
<i>Salonia</i> , ECJ case 126/80 [1981] ECR 1563	140
<i>Salzmann II</i> , ECJ case C-300/01 [2003] ECR I-4899	490, 492, 495
<i>Saunders</i> , ECJ case 175/78 [1979] ECR I-1129	13, 52–53, 57–58, 60, 66, 70, 82, 93, 101, 106, 136, 167, 566
<i>Sayn-Wittgenstein</i> , ECJ case C-208/09 [2010] ECR I-13693	295, 300
<i>Schempp</i> , ECJ case C-403/03 [2005] ECR I-6421	10, 12, 15, 69, 101, 158, 169, 237–242, 287, 610, 686, 743, 753
<i>Schmidberger</i> , ECJ case C-112/00 [2003] ECR I-5659	644
<i>Scholz</i> , ECJ case C-419/92 [1994] ECR I-505	155, 157, 647
<i>Semeraro</i> , ECJ case C-418/93 [1996] ECR I-2975	209
<i>Simitzi</i> , ECJ joined cases C-485/93 and C-486/93 [1995] ECR I-2655	119, 125–126, 129, 133
<i>Simmenthal</i> , ECJ case 106/77 [1978] ECR 629	584
<i>Singh</i> , ECJ case C-370/90 [1992] ECR I-4265	186–187, 203, 224, 227–229, 232, 245–246, 275–278, 394, 482, 526, 610–611, 747
<i>Sokoll-Seebacher</i> , ECJ case C-367/12 [2014]	141
<i>Steen</i> , ECJ case C-132/93 [1994] ECR I-2715	63–64, 128
<i>Susisalo</i> , ECJ case C-84/11 [2012]	141, 147–149
<i>Tas-Hagen</i> , ECJ case C-192/05 [2006] ECR I-10451	203–204
<i>Terhoeve</i> , ECJ case C-18/95 [1999] ECR I-345	70, 107, 155, 157, 284, 647
<i>The Queen</i> , ECJ case C-137/00 [2003] ECR I-7975	686
<i>Thomasdünge</i> , ECJ case 166/84 [1985] ECR 3001	137, 143, 299
<i>Trabajadores de la Rioja</i> , ECJ joined cases C-428/06 to C-434/06 [2008] ECR I-6747	676–679, 683
<i>Uecker and Jacquet</i> , ECJ joined cases C-64/96 and C-65/96 [1997] ECR I-3171	10, 15, 65–70, 101, 107, 160, 169, 287, 407, 529, 676, 679–680, 683
<i>Van Dam en Zonen</i> , ECJ joined cases 185/78 to 204/78 [1979] ECR 2345	686
<i>Van Hilten – van der Heijden</i> , ECJ joined cases C-513/03 [2006] ECR I-1957	70, 107
<i>Vatsouras and Koupatantze</i> , ECJ joined cases C-22/08 and C-23/08 [2009] ECR I-4585	696
<i>Venturini</i> , ECJ case C-159/12 [2013]	141, 151
<i>Viking</i> , ECJ case C-438/05 [2007] ECR I-10779	219

<i>Werner</i> , ECJ case C-112/91 [1993] ECR I-429	187, 482, 611
<i>Ymeraga</i> , ECJ case C-87/12 [2013]	310, 325, 330–336, 351
<i>Zenatti</i> , ECJ case C-67/98 [1999] ECR I-7289	209
<i>Zhu and Chen</i> , ECJ case C-200/02 [2004] ECR I-9925	12, 26, 89, 158, 239, 278–279, 291–293, 307, 346–347, 349, 546, 548, 735–736, 747–748
<i>Zoni</i> , ECJ case 90/86 [1988] ECR 4285	17, 438, 444