

Editors:
C.H. van Rhee
A. Uzelac

Civil Justice between Efficiency
and Quality:
From Ius Commune to the CEPEJ



Editors:

C.H. van Rhee

A. Uzelac

Editorial Advisory Board:

Prof. Dr. Dirk Heirbaut (Ghent, Belgium); Prof. Dr. Burkhard Hess (Heidelberg, Germany); Prof. Dr. Rob Jagtenberg (Rotterdam, the Netherlands); Prof. Dr. Jon T. Johnsen (Oslo, Norway); Prof. Dr. Paul Oberhammer (Zurich, Switzerland); Prof. Dr. Vesna Rijavec (Maribor, Slovenia); Prof. Dr. Annie de Roo (Rotterdam, the Netherlands); Prof. Dr. Marcel Storme (Ghent, Belgium).

Civil Justice between Efficiency and Quality:

From Ius Commune to the CEPEJ

ISBN 978-90-5095-802-8

D/2008/7849/46

NUR 822

© 2008 Intersentia Antwerp – Oxford – Portland

www.intersentia.com

Cover photograph

© iStockphoto.com/Ericksphotography – ‘Constitutional rights’

© iStockphoto.com/Tomasz Tulik – ‘Quality rubber stamp’

This book was published with the financial support of the British Embassy and the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Zagreb, and the MATRA programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

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

FOREWORD

As Vice President of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) I was very pleased and honoured to be invited to participate in the 2007 Public and Private Justice event in Dubrovnik. It was particularly exciting to see that the contribution of the CEPEJ as an instrument for reform in the field of justice across Europe was the focus of the event.

The papers that make up this publication, when presented in Dubrovnik, stimulated some very thought-provoking debate and I believe this was due to a number of factors deliberately created by the principal course directors, Alan Uzelac and Remco van Rhee. The participants, although all from the field of justice, were from diverse backgrounds including academics, judges, court administrators, lawyers and students, and demonstrated that they shared one common aim; to improve access to and the quality of justice while drawn together to share experiences and learn from one another.

It would be impossible to avoid mentioning some of the authors of this publication; this in no way undervalues the contributions of those I will not mention. First I must mention an exceptional servant of the CEPEJ, Pim Albers; he provided details of the evaluation exercise organised and published by the CEPEJ. This evaluation is probably the single most important publication evaluating judicial systems across Europe and has become a model for other parts of the world. Anyone intent on conducting research into judicial systems will find Pim's work an essential point of reference.

The contribution by Alan Uzelac on the vexed issue of the judiciary and time management is a subject dear to my heart as I share Alan's opinion that proactive case management by the judiciary is one of the most important factors in creating effective time frames and eliminating unnecessary delay from judicial proceedings. Alan and I have spent the last few years working together, first on the CEPEJ Task Force on effective timeframes and more recently as part of the Saturn Centre where the Time Management Checklist and the Compendium of Best Practices were produced.

It was the use of this checklist in the Commercial Court of Zagreb that illustrated the value of the CEPEJ in producing practical tools for judicial systems to utilise. The experiences of Jonathan Radway in his work to improve the court's case

progression demonstrated this to good effect. He has clearly shown what can be achieved in the way of reducing delay by introducing sound management practices in the conduct of litigation.

In these current times, no event would be complete without a debate on the merits and developments in ADR. Here you will find an insight into the direction that ADR is taking across Europe and identifies some of the benefits to be obtained from avoiding determination of the dispute by the court. The differing features of court- and non-court-based ADR are revealed in a number of contributions. Also, the work of the CEPEJ in producing guidance in this area indicates to states what is achievable. It indirectly goes a long way to show the value of the CEPEJ as a commission of national experts, which is not subject to any national agenda. The European Community, in contrast, has invested a lot of time and effort in developing the Mediation Directive and the end result falls far short of what the CEPEJ believes is achievable. This is not a criticism of the EC, but merely that the freedom the CEPEJ has allowed them to identify what is possible and what should be aimed for, and recognises that states would have to work with differing timetables to achieve this, and that this freedom is a luxury not possible when working within the EC.

J. Stacey

Vice President of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice

London, March 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	v
List of Authors	xv
Introduction	1
Bibliography	6
CIVIL PROCEDURE – IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY AND QUALITY OF NATIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN EUROPE	
P. Albers	
Judicial Systems in Europe Compared	9
1. Introduction	9
2. The Early Phase: 2003 – May 2005	10
3. Content, Political Impact and Lessons Learned from the First Evaluation Round	13
4. The Second Evaluation Round: 2005-2006	15
5. The 2006 Report	17
6. Media Attention for the Report and (Political) Impact	19
7. From Description to a Real Evaluation	20
7.1. Ratios	22
7.2. Common Case Categories	23
7.3. Qualitative Information	23
7.4. The Need for a Scientific Research Programme	24
8. Evaluation Cycle, Electronic Questionnaire, Side-Effects and Future Ambition	24

9.	Future Ambitions?	25
	Bibliography	27
J. Niemi Kiesiläinen		
	Efficiency and Justice in Procedural Reforms: The Rise and Fall of the Oral Hearing.....	29
1.	Introduction	29
2.	Part I: The Council of Europe and the Law of Procedure.....	30
2.1.	Human Rights	30
2.2.	Recommendations.....	31
2.3.	Procedural Reform.....	31
2.4.	Concluding on Reform Policy	33
3.	Part II: Case Study: Finland	34
3.1.	The Background of the Reform	34
3.2.	The Reform of Civil Procedure	35
3.3.	Shortcomings of the Reform	37
3.4.	Subsequent Developments	38
3.5.	Criminal Procedure.....	39
3.6.	Appeal	39
3.7.	Court Structure.....	41
4.	Conclusion	42
	Bibliography	43
C.H. van Rhee		
	Dutch Civil Procedure: Reform and Efficiency	47
1.	Introduction.....	47
2.	The 2002 Reforms.....	48
3.	The Asser/Groen/Vranken Commission; A New Approach to Dutch Civil Procedure.....	50
3.1.	The Position of the Administration of Justice by the State Courts in Relation to Other Means of Dealing with (Legal) Conflicts.....	50
3.2.	Civil Litigation: <i>Ultimum Remedium</i> ?.....	51
3.3.	Civil Litigation that is Quick, Reasonably Priced, Efficient and of a High Quality	52
3.3.1.	Pre-action	53
3.3.2.	'Procedural Differentiation'	54
3.4.	The Division of Tasks between Judge and Parties.....	55
3.5.	The Relationship between First-Instance Litigation, Appeal and Cassation and the Goals of Appeal and Cassation.....	57

3.6.	The Need for Clear-Cut and Flexible Civil Procedure Rules	58
4.	Conclusion	59
	Bibliography	60
P. Oberhammer		
	Improving the Efficiency of Civil Justice: Some Remarks from an Austrian Perspective	61
1.	Introduction	61
2.	Structure of the Procedure and Efficiency of Civil Justice.....	62
2.1.	Procedural Rules: An Overestimated Factor in Procedural Delay	62
2.2.	A Glance at History	63
3.	Initiation of the Procedure	64
4.	Control over the Substance of the Procedure and Freedom of New Allegations	65
5.	Conclusion	67
	Bibliography	69
A. Uzelac		
	Reforming Mediterranean Civil Procedure: Is there a Need for Shock Therapy?.....	71
1.	The Myth about the Unity of Civil Procedures in Continental Europe	71
2.	Shock Therapy in Eleven Steps: a Strong Cure is the Only Cure	75
2.1.	Instant Dismissal of Manifestly Ill-Founded Claims and Appeals.....	76
2.2.	Setting the Trial Date at the Very Beginning of the Proceedings	78
2.3.	Opening all Channels of Communication among the Parties, the Judge and the Court	80
2.4.	Minimal Threshold of Tolerance for Passive Behaviour and Delaying Tactics in the Proceedings.....	82
2.5.	The Collection and Presentation of Evidence as the Principal Responsibility of the Parties	84
2.6.	The Trial Should be Completed in no more than Two Hearings	86
2.7.	Planning the Process and Setting the Calendar for Future Actions in the Proceedings at the Outset of the Case.....	87
2.8.	Reinforcing Orality in the Proceedings	89
2.9.	The Instant Enforceability of First Instance Judgments	90
2.10.	The Limitation of the Right to Appeal Solely to Cases that Deserve Appeal	91
2.11.	The (Re)introduction of Adversarial Hearings in Appellate Courts and Excluding the Possibility of Remittals.....	93
3.	Concluding Remarks: Can We Do It?.....	95

Bibliography	97
CASE MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY THROUGH BETTER ORGANISATION OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS	
G.Y. Ng	
Case Management: Procedural law v. Best Practices	103
1. Introduction and Methodology.....	103
1.1. Introduction	103
1.2. Methodology	105
2. Theoretical Framework	106
2.1. Theories of Procedural Law.....	106
2.2. Undue Delay	108
2.3. Best Practices	110
3. Civil Procedure v. Best Practices: Case Studies	111
3.1. The Netherlands.....	111
3.1.1. Analysis of Code of Civil Procedure	111
3.1.2. Analysis of Policies and Best Practices.....	113
3.2. France	116
3.2.1. Analysis of Code of Civil Procedure	116
3.2.2. Analysis of Policies and Best Practices.....	121
4. Conclusions.....	123
Bibliography	126
J.M. Radway	
Improving Case Progression and Efficiency in the Commercial Court of Zagreb..	131
1. Background.....	131
2. CEPEJ and the Time Management Checklist	132
3. Trgovački Sud u Zagrebu (TSZG) – The Commercial Court of Zagreb	133
4. Improving Case Progression	135
5. Developing and Launching the Pilot Project.....	138
6. Conclusion	139
Bibliography	141
Appendix A.....	142
Appendix B	144
Appendix C.....	145
Appendix D.....	146

LEGAL AID AND ACCESS TO COURT – EFFICIENT JUSTICE FOR ALL USERS

J.T. Johnsen and F. Regan

How to Use an International ‘Best Policy’ Model in the Analysis and Improvement of Finnish Legal Aid	151
1. Research, Theory and Policy	151
1.1. Introduction	151
1.2. Best Policies for Legal Aid	153
1.2.1. General Standards for Legal Aid Schemes	153
1.2.2. Research Findings and their Implications	154
1.2.3. Legal Aid Policy in Comparative Perspective.....	156
2. The Strengths and Deficits of Finnish Policy.....	159
2.1. Main Features of Finnish Legal Aid	160
2.2. Funding	162
2.3. How Generous is Finnish Legal Aid in Practice?	164
2.3.1. Capacity.....	164
2.3.2. Every-day Problems	165
2.3.3. The Significance of the Salaried Sector.....	167
3. Finnish Legal Aid in a Comparative Perspective	168
4. Recommendations for Developing Finnish Legal Aid.....	173
4.1. ‘Best Policy’ Models and Policy Recommendations. Methodology	173
4.2. Overall Considerations.....	175
4.3. Adding-on Telephone Advice Services.....	176
4.4. Promoting ‘Legally Literate Citizens’	178
4.5. Legal Literacy for Non-Jurist Advisers	180
4.6. Building Stronger Community Links.....	181
4.7. Representing Collective Interests.....	182
5. Conclusions: Is Finland Really Swimming Against the Tide?	183
Bibliography	185

B. Hess

EU Trends in Access to Justice	189
1. Introduction	189
2. The EU Directive on Legal Aid	191
2.1. The Legal Technique of the Directive.....	191
2.2. The Implementation of the Directive in the Member States: The German Example.....	194
3. New Avenues in Financing Cross-Border Litigation	196
3.1. Legal Insurance Covering Litigation Risks.....	196
3.2. Capital Investments in Civil Litigation.....	197
3.3. The Admissibility of Contingency Fee Arrangements.....	198

4.	Cross Border Collective Litigation as an Alternative	199
4.1.	The Growth of Class Actions and Group Litigation	199
4.2.	Private Law Enforcement in the Internal Market	200
5.	Final Remark.....	201
	Bibliography	202

F. Fernhout

	Formal Rules in Civil Procedure and Access to Justice: Striking a Balance between Excessive Formalism and ‘Anything goes’	207
1.	Introduction	207
2.	The Attractiveness of Formal Rules.....	207
3.	The Concept of Excessive Formalism	209
4.	Rules of Thumb	211
4.1.	Rule of Thumb 1	212
4.2.	Rule of Thumb 2	212
4.3.	Rule of Thumb 3	213
4.4.	Rule of Thumb 4	213
4.5.	Rule of Thumb 5	214
4.6.	Rule of Thumb 6	214
5.	Concluding Remarks	215
	Bibliography	216

A. Grgić

	Legal Aid under the Case Law of the European Court of Human rights with Specific Regard to Croatia.....	217
1.	Introduction	217
2.	Legal Aid and Access to Court.....	217
2.1.	General Principles	217
2.2.	The Court's Case Law	218
2.2.1.	General	218
2.2.2.	Effective Access	220
2.2.3.	Alternative Measures	221
2.2.4.	Court Fees	221
2.2.5.	Conclusion	223
3.	Legal Aid and Fairness of Proceedings	223
3.1.	Scope of the Right	223
3.2.	The Court’s Case Law	224
4.	Situation in Croatia	225
4.1.	De Lege Lata	225

4.2. The New Legal Aid Act.....	226
5. Conclusion	227
Bibliography	228
MEDIATION – EFFICIENCY THROUGH ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
A. de Roo and R. Jagtenberg	
Mediation and Employment Disputes: European Traditions and Global Pressure	231
1. Introduction	231
2. Employment Disputes.....	231
3. Historical Development of Employment Dispute Resolution	232
4. Collective Dimension of Labour Disputes.....	233
5. Court Annexed Mediation.....	233
6. Mediation Standards set By or enabled Through the European Agencies	234
6.1. The EU; Draft Directive and Code of Conduct	234
6.2. The Council of Europe: Two Times Article 6	235
7. European Survey of Mediation Practices.....	236
8. Hypothesis on Court Annexed Mediation	239
9. Employment Disputes: Anything left to Negotiate?	240
10. Conflict Management Systems.....	244
Bibliography	246
E. Silvestri	
ADR Italian Style: Panacea or Anathema?.....	249
Bibliography	254
POST SCRIPTUM – HISTORY OF CIVIL PROCEDURE	
M. Petrak	
The Procedural <i>Ius Commune</i> as a Source of Contemporary Law: A Croatian Example in a European Context.....	257
1. Introductory Remarks	257
2. Procedural <i>Ius Commune</i> Rules as an Indirect Source of Contemporary Croatian Law	258

Table of Contents

3.	The Procedural <i>Ius Commune</i> Rules as a Direct Source of Contemporary Croatian Law	261
4.	Concluding Remarks	263
	Bibliography	267

LIST OF AUTHORS

Pim Albers, Special Advisor of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), Council of Europe; Former President of the CEPEJ-GT-EVAL and Former Member of the CEPEJ Bureau; Senior Policy Advisor, Strategy Department for the Administration of Justice, Ministry of Justice, The Hague (The Netherlands).

Tanja Domej, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Zurich (Switzerland).

Fokke Fernhout, Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Maastricht; Former Vice-President of the District Court in Maastricht (The Netherlands).

Aida Grgić, Référéndaire at the European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg (France).

Burkhard Hess, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Heidelberg (Germany); Director of the Institute of Comparative and Private International Law.

Rob Jagtenberg, Associate Professor of Comparative Law, Faculty of Law, University of Rotterdam (The Netherlands); Former General Rapporteur on the subject of mediation, Council of Europe.

Jon T. Johnsen, Professor at the Department of Public and International Law, Former Dean of the Law Faculty of the University of Oslo (Norway); Former Member of the CEPEJ's Task Force for Timeframes of the Judicial Proceedings (IF-DEL) and Member of the SATURN Centre for judicial time management of the CEPEJ.

Gar Yein Ng, Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Maastricht (The Netherlands).

Johanna Niemi Kiesiläinen, Senior Researcher, National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki (Finland).

Paul Oberhammer, Professor of Swiss and International Civil Procedure, Enforcement and Bankruptcy Law, Private and Business Law, Faculty of Law, University of Zurich (Switzerland).

Marko Petrak, Associate Professor of Roman Law, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb (Croatia).

Jonathan Radway, Barrister (Middle Temple), Accredited Mediator (CEDR), Deputy District Judge (Magistrates' Courts), Expert in the Project of Modernising Court Administration at the Commercial Court in Zagreb; Former Performance Director, Her Majesty's Courts Service, London (England).

C.H. (Remco) van Rhee, Professor of European Legal History, Faculty of Law, University of Maastricht (The Netherlands).

Annie de Roo, Associate Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Rotterdam (the Netherlands); Accredited Mediator (NMI); Key Expert in the CILC Project on Labour Dispute Conciliation in Croatia.

Elisabetta Silvestri, Associate Professor of Comparative Civil Procedure, Faculty of Law, University of Pavia (Italy).

Alan Uzelac, Professor of Civil Procedure, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb (Croatia); Croatian delegate in the CEPEJ; Former President of the TF-DEL, Former Member of the CEPEJ Bureau; Member of the SATURN Centre for judicial time management of the CEPEJ.