

Subject Index

A

- Administrative Law and Human Rights Standards in Legal Aid, 165–191
 - administration of legal aid in Finland and England & Wales, 171–174
 - different jurisdictions, 171
 - ‘Henry VIII’ clauses, 172
 - Legal Aid Act, 171
 - State Legal Aid Offices, 173
 - administrative law principles in Finland and England & Wales, 174–176
 - Administrative Judicial Procedure Act, 175
 - Legal Aid Unit, 175
 - §6 of the Administration Act, 174
 - lack of arbitrariness, 177–184
 - appropriateness of decision-making structure, 180–184
 - legal constraints on decision-making, 178–180
 - need for legal aid system, 168–170
 - Andronicou and Constantinou v. Cyprus* case, 168–169
 - ECtHR, 170
 - requirement of legal aid in international human rights law, 166–168
 - Airey v. Ireland* case, 167
 - Article 47 of Charter, 166–167
 - criminal and civil proceedings, 166
 - Golder v. UK* case, 167
 - role of administrative law in ensuring the implementation of human rights standards, 190–191
 - systemic requirements imposed by IHRL, 176–190
 - diligence, 189
 - flexibility to grant legal aid throughout proceedings, 189–190
 - GREP v. Freistaat Bayern* case, 176
 - lack of arbitrariness, 177–184
 - Laskowska v. Poland* case, 176
 - proportionality, 184–186
 - reasons for decision, 186–188
- Austrian Constitutional Court post case-law after landmark decision, 221–235
 - critical assessment of the VfGH’s case-law, 231–235
 - Article 15 of the Charter, 234
 - Article 6 StGG, 232
 - Article 267 (3) TFEU, 235
 - VfSlg 19.632/2012, 233
 - overview, 221–231
 - case-law of the VfGH in the aftermath of decision U 466/11 and others, 222–231
 - statistical data, 221–222
- VfGH confirms decision U 466/11 and others but does not apply pertinent Charter Right, 228–230
 - Article 47 of the Charter (cases concerning lack of an oral hearing,

decision within a reasonable time
 and right to legal aid), 228–229
 Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter (case
 concerning data protection/data
 retention), 229
 Articles 15, 16 and 17 of the Charter
 (cases concerning restrictions on
 performing commercial activities
 and interferences with the right to
 property), 229–230
 VfGH confirms decision U 466/11
 and others but holds that Charter
 does not apply in the case at hand,
 230–231
 VfGH effectively applies the rights of
 the Charter of Fundamental Rights,
 222–228
 Article 21 of the Charter (cases
 concerning discriminations), 227
 Article 47(2) of the Charter (lack of
 an oral hearing in Asylum
 proceedings only), 222–224
 Article 47 of the Charter (other
 cases), 224
 Articles 4 and 7 of the Charter (cases
 concerning expulsions), 225
 Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter (cases
 concerning data protection),
 225–226
 Articles 15, 16 and 17 of the Charter
 (cases concerning gaming
 machines), 226–227
 Articles 39 and 40 of the Charter
 (cases concerning the right to
 vote), 228
 Authority to carry (ATC), 787–810
 carrier sanctions, 792–793
 Counter-Terrorism and Security Act
 2015, 787, 810
 grounds of security, 793–794
 legal accountability, 810
 privatization of national security,
 804–809

legal accountability, 805–808
 public-private link, 808–809
 schemes, 794–804
 legal basis and scope, 796–801
 refusal, 801–804
 security limitations on the right to
 travel, 788–792

B

Brexit, 437–446
 Charter of Fundamental Rights (CFR),
 442–443
 devolved administrations and the
 dependencies, 446
 Great Repeal Bill (GRB), 440–441
 role of secondary legislation, 443–446
 terms of negotiation, 437–440
 what does the GRB convert into UK
 law?, 441–442

C

Conflict and complementarity, 347–364
 complementarity between Union
 obligations and Member State
 interests, 352–354
 Article 1(1) TEU, 352
 Article 4(2) TEU, 353
 Article 5(3) TEU, 352
 Article 106(2) TFEU, 353
 complementarity, Member State
 interests and SGI, 354–364
 complementarity and specific EU
 rules, 358–364
 general legal framework, 355–357
 conflict between Union obligations and
 Member State interests, 349–352
 Article 1(1) TEU, 349
 freedom of movement in the Single
 Market, 350
 principle of loyalty under Article 4(3)
 TFEU, 351
 Constitution implications of Brexit,
 757–786

- constitutionalization, 779–785
 - Democratic Alliance v. Minister of International Relations*, 785–786
 - European Communities Act 1972, 758
 - European Union (EU), 758–761
 - Jackson v. Attorney General*, 776
 - judicialization, 760, 786
 - and multi-layered constitution, 761–774
 - Attorney General v. Jonathan Cape*, 772
 - Brexit and Union, 763–769
 - ‘Brexit means Brexit,’ 761–763
 - legal enforcement, 771
 - The Sewel Convention, 770–774
 - Supreme Court, 770
 - parliamentary scrutiny, 758
 - principle of parliamentary sovereignty, 759–760
 - and sovereignty, 775–779
 - Constitution in Times of Emergency – Sweden, 27–37
 - financial powers facing a crisis, 28–31
 - Christian Democrats, 30
 - December agreement, 29–31
 - Migration Agreement, 31
 - Riksdag Act and the Budget Act, 28–29
 - legislative powers in state of emergency, 32–34
 - Council on Legislation, 34
 - IG and the Riksdag Act, 33
 - IG, Chapter 7, Article 2, 32
 - Riksdag’s Committee, 32
 - recent events, 36–37
 - December Agreement, 36
 - Riksdag Act, 37
 - times they are changing ... ?, 27–28
 - welfare in emergency, 34–36
 - Chapter 1, Article 2 IG, 35
 - draft bill, 35
 - draft proposal, 35
 - Swedish welfare state, 36
 - Controlling Nordic Municipalities, 123–145
 - autonomy, 125
 - constitutional basis for local self-government, 126–128
 - local self-government, defined, 127
 - outside control mechanisms, 128
 - ‘self-government of the residents,’ 126
 - control by state authorities, 134–138
 - Ministry functions, 138
 - municipal appeal institution, 137
 - power of Regional State
 - Administration Agencies, 135
 - prerequisites for taking loan, 135
 - role of County Governor, 134, 136
 - Finland and Sweden, 128–132
 - concept of *member of the municipality*, 129
 - features of municipal appeals, 130
 - municipal appeal and administrative appeal, 129
 - two-part procedure, 131
 - legal control mechanisms, 126
 - local self-government and control, 123–124
 - municipal appeal as means of control, 128–133
 - Finland and Sweden, 128–132
 - Norwegian model of municipal appeal, 132–133
 - Nordic countries in relation to the European Charter of local self-government, 138–141
 - Article 8 in the Charter, 139
 - Article 11 in the Charter, 110
 - other controlling institutions, 133–138
 - control by state authorities, 134–138
 - Ombudsman, 133–134
- D**
- Danish Principle of Administrative Law, 739–754
 - citizen’s legal status, 743
 - Danish Ombudsman, 744–745

- e-government, 740–743
 - citizen's legal status, 743
 - decision-making systems, 742–743
 - decision support systems, 741–742
 - digital administration, 740
 - electronic paper, 741
 - self-service systems, 742
- e-mail system, 754
- Good Administration Impact Assessment, 751–753
- ICT, 739–740
- public sector, 745–746
- supplementary requirement of default settings, 750–751
- value-based/value-sensitive design, 747–750
 - minSU, 748–749
 - NemID, 748–749
 - University of Copenhagen's records system, 747

E

- European and German Law in the migration crisis, 41–53
- conscious decisions, 42–43
 - German de facto approval of border crossings, 42
 - Schengen Borders Code (Regulation (EC) No 562/2006), 43
- domestic separation of powers, 48–49
 - § 18(4) point 2 AsylG, 49
 - § 18(2) points 1 and 2 AsylG, 48–49
- failure of Dublin Regime, 43–47
 - Article 16a(1) of the German constitution, 43–44
 - Article 79(3) GG, 46
 - Article 3(1) of the Dublin Regulation, 45
 - Article 78(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, 44
 - Dublin Regulation ((EU) No 604/2013 / Dublin III Regulation, 44

- European Dactyloscopy (EURODAC) Regulation ((EU) No 603/2013), 45
- Temporary Protection Directive, 47–48
 - Article 7, 47
 - Dublin Regulation, 48
- tensions for federalism, 49–52
 - Article 1(1) GG, 51
 - Article 87(1) GG, 50
- European Commission v. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*, 723–737
- citizens and workers, 732–734
- factual and legal background, 724–728
 - Judgment of the Court, 727–728
 - Opinion of Advocate General Cruz Villalón, 726–727
- right to reside, 724–725
- free movement, 731–732
- legal statuses, 737
- right to reside, 723
- social security, 729–731
- wider political context and court, 734–736
- European Court of Human Rights, 665–698
 - access to official information, Article 10, 680–688
 - awarding compensation, non-pecuniary damage, Article 41, 694–698
 - Court's workload, 665–666
 - delayed access to legal advice, Article 6, 672–679
 - guidelines on the minimum cell space for prisoners, Article 3, 666–671
 - scrutiny of unilateral declarations, Article 37, 688–693

F

- French *Conseil constitutionnel* under evolving constitution, 245–251
- changes in the *Conseil*, 250–251

- 'judicialised' role, *Conseil*, 251
 - members replacement, 250
 - QPC's annual report, 250
 - Jospin Report, implementation, 245–250
 - 'a break with the practice of *cumul des mandats*,' 247–248
 - 'a comprehensive strategy to prevent conflicts of interests,' 249–250
 - 'a more representative Parliament,' 246–247
 - 'a status before the courts more consistent with the principle of equality, for the Head of State and Ministers,' 248–249
 - 'democratic renewal,' 245
 - 'modernisation' of presidential elections, 245–246
 - French PATRIOT Act, 707–722
 - Article L 811-2 of the Internal Security Code, 711
 - counter terrorism, 711–713
 - scope, opting for, 711–712
 - the US experience, learning, 712–713
 - FREEDOM Act, 707
 - French Surveillance State, 708–711
 - intelligence techniques, 713–717
 - mass surveillance/bulk data collection, 716–717
 - sophisticated techniques, 714–715
 - postscript, 722
 - safeguards, 717–722
 - independent administrative authority and *Conseil d'Etat*, 718–719
 - US choice for special court, 720–722
 - Fundamental Animal Rights in European Law, 547–585
 - animals are sentient, 567–568
 - Anthropocentrism in law, 548–551
 - are animals sufficiently protected by European Animal Welfare Law?, 551–556
 - fundamental animal rights before the courts, 568–571
 - how could the six freedoms be recognized?, 581–583
 - non-governmental organization (NGO), 548
 - reasons for not granting animals fundamental rights, 556–567
 - Gray's standard, 564–565
 - at least some animals, like humans, are conscious, 565–567
 - moral agency argument, 559–564
 - social compact argument, 556–559
 - what are the consequences of recognizing fundamental rights for animals?, 571–573
 - what fundamental rights of animals should be recognized?, 573–581
 - are the six freedoms sufficiently concrete to be operable?, 578–579
 - the five freedoms, 574–576
 - fundamental rights and property, 580–581
 - predator problem and the sixth freedom, 576–578
 - standing, 579–580
- I**
- International Delegation, 527–546
 - defined, 527–528
 - how Swedish regulation is constructed?, 535–539
 - European Economic Community (EEC), 537
 - Government bill, 538
 - regulation on international delegation, 536
 - rules on international delegation, 536
 - Treaty of Rome, 537
 - as international law phenomenon, 529–531
 - internal legal order, 529

- international obligations, 530
- in the Swedish Constitution, 531–535
 - 1810 Act of Succession, 531
 - EC bodies, 534
 - The 1949 Freedom of the Press Act, 531
 - 1974 Instrument of Government, 531–533
- Swedish Regulation from international law perspective, 539–544
 - decision-making authority as defined in the constitution, 543–544
 - delegation under national and international law, 541–542
 - international and constitutional decision-making authority, 539–541
- Israel Judicial Enforcement of ethical norms in politics, 15–26
 - comparative law, 22–23
 - decisions on Mayors' affair, 18–20
 - Option 1, 19
 - Option 2, 19–20
 - Option 3, 20
 - duty to dismiss, 24–26
 - Der'i case, 25
 - MKs case, 25
 - HCJ intervention in politics, 16
 - HCJ verdicts, 15–16
 - Israeli legislature response: on the new suspension law, 23–24
 - judicial decisions from the 1990s, 16–18
 - 'Der'i affair,' 16–17
 - 'Eisenberg affair,' 16
 - 'Pinhasi affair,' 17–18
 - reflections on the courts reasoning's, 20–22
 - Der'i and Pinhasi cases, 20–21
 - Mayors' case, 22
- Italian Public Law Reforms, 471–486
 - Italian administrative system, 471
 - new Public Contract Code, 475–478
 - innovative profile, 477
 - Legislative Decree no. 50, 18 April 2016, 475
 - regulation acts, 476
 - public accounting reform, 472–475
 - Law no. 163/2016, 472–474
 - relative expenditure forecasts, 474
 - reform of public administration, 478–482
 - 'certified announcement on the commencement of activity,' 480
 - legislative proxy, 479
 - 'Madia' law, 480
 - reforming actions, 480
 - reform of territorial local government, 482–486
 - constitutional referendum, 485
 - Delrio law, 484–485
 - 'fundamental administrative functions,' 483
- Italian Public Service Broadcasting (PSB), 507–524
 - anomalies of Italian broadcasting system, 510–518
 - anomalous establishment of duopoly, 510–514
 - 'Berlusconi decrees,' 513
 - centralized organization of public service broadcasting, 514–516
 - criticisms, 511
 - 'Gasparri Law,' 514
 - 'Mammì Law,' 513
 - parliamentary supervisory committee on RAI and the relationship with the political class, 516–518
 - State monopoly, 512
 - variety of factors, 510
- Law 220 of 2015, 507–524
 - a 'light' reform, 518–521

'blank proxies,' 520
 innovations, 519
 new and existing anomalies in the
 reform law and existing models,
 521–524
 concept of anomaly, 521
 'historical-political-cultural'
 principle, 522
 Mediterranean model, 522–523
 print media, 508
 TV as common source of information,
 508

J

'Judicial Activism' or Constitutional
 Interpretation?, 147–164
 'Clarification of Judgment,'
 152–153
 Constitutional Court of Kosovo,
 147–164
 identifying jurisdiction, 149,
 153–158
 tracing judicial activism and
 jurisprudence, 149, 158–164
 core meanings of judicial activism, 152
 'final authority,' 'interpretation of the
 Constitution' and 'compliance of laws
 with the Constitution,' 151
 identifying jurisdiction of the
 Constitutional Court of Kosovo, 149,
 153–158
 abstract control, 155
 as controller of accountability, 156
 institutional mechanism, 154
 limits of judiciary review, 155
 as protector of individuals, 157
 as protector of minorities, 157
 separation of powers, 153
 methods of interpretation, 150
 term 'judicial activism,' 149–150
 tracing judicial activism and
 jurisprudence of the Constitutional
 Court, 149, 158–164

changing constitutional norms: Case
 No. KO 57112, 161–164
 setting the standard; 'the Prizren logo
 case,' 159–161

L

Legal limits of citizenship deprivation,
 57–92
 controversial policy, 58–64
 denationalization laws, 59
 legal, moral and historical objections,
 63–64
 US and German dissent, 59–63
 convention rights, 68–84
 prohibition of discrimination, 76–80
 prohibition of inhuman / degrading
 treatment / punishment, 68–72
 rights to fair trial and to effective
 national remedy, 80–84
 right to respect for private and family
 life, 72–75
 denationalization of terrorists, 58
 difficulties, 87–92
 discretionary powers, 91
 interpreting and applying the law, 88
 limitation of laws, 87–88
 personal scope of application, 90
 terrorist offences, 89
 'vital interests of the state,' 89
 legal obstacles, 65–86
 Article 8 of the 1961 Convention, 65
 convention rights, 68–84
 Draft Articles, 66
 European Union law, 84–86
 international law, 65–67
Rottmann case, 84–85
 recommendations, 86–87
 terrorist attacks in Paris, 57
 US and German dissent, 59–63
 Article 16, § 1, of the Basic Law,
 60
 Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth
 Amendment, 60

- Eighth Amendment, 60
- Entziehungsverbot*, 61–62
- ‘Living Instrument’ approach of the
 - ECHR, 587–614
 - compatibility with international law, 600–607
 - domestic interpretation of
 - international law obligations, 605–607
 - the ‘living instrument’ under the VCLT, 600–605
 - compatibility with the convention, 592–600
 - convention text, 592–593
 - democratic endorsement & state practice, 594–596
 - relevance of the preamble, 593–594
 - Travaux Préparatoires* and Original Intent, 596–600
 - controversy in the UK, 590–591
 - defending the interpretative approach, 591–613
 - compatibility with international law, 600–607
 - compatibility with the convention, 592–600
 - institutional criticism, 607–613
 - judges and rights, 608–613
 - state sovereignty and human rights, 607–608
 - the ‘living instrument’ interpretative approach, 589–590
 - the ‘living instrument’ under the VCLT, 600–605
 - abstract and concrete intentions, 602–604
 - evolutionary interpretation, 601–602
- Local self-government development in Lithuania, 253–268
- financial situation and administrative supervision, 262–263
- local self-government: territorial issues, 254–258
 - administrative functions, 255
 - intermediate level, 254
 - lower level, 254
 - regional authorities, 255–257
 - wards (or neighbourhoods) (SENİÜNIJA), 257–258
- political context and development, 253–254
 - administrative courts, 254
 - legal system, 253–254
- relations between state and local authorities, 258–261
 - ALAL, 261–262
 - allocation of sufficient resources to local authorities, 261
 - decentralization, 259–260
 - delegated functions, 258–259
 - duality between independent and delegated functions, 259
- state of implementation of human rights at local and regional levels:
 - participation and elections, 264–267
 - Article 4.12 of LLSG, 264
 - dealing with complaints against municipalities, 266–267
 - non-discrimination, 265–266
 - status of capital city, 263–264
- Losses through European Central Bank’s Balance Sheet, 365–394
- final deposition in the European Monetary Union (EMU), 371–392
 - assumption of financially destabilizing losses by Eurosystem, 373–376
 - eligibility of inferior assets for monetary policy refinancing, 376–379, 389–391
- Eurosystem without ‘bad bank’-function, 391–392
- externalities and polluter pays-principle, 381–383
- inherent financial instability, 371–372

legal limits for Eurosystem's final
 deposition tools, 385–391
 outright monetary transactions,
 385–389
 parliamentary control over
 Eurosystem's final deposition,
 383–385
 redistribution and fiscal equalization
 effects between Member States,
 379–381
 final deposition tools, 367–369
 assumption of financially
 destabilizing losses by asset
 purchase, 367–368
 eligibility of inferior assets for
 monetary policy refinancing,
 368–369
 financial liberalization, 365
 financial stability policy with final
 depository, 369–371
 category, 369
 final deposition tools, 370
 prerequisites, 366
 sovereignty and financial stability union,
 392–393

N

Norwegian Constitution of 1814,
 699–703
 Christian and humanist heritage,
 699–700
 human rights, 699–703
 Norwegian law, 700–701, 703
 Supreme Court, 699–700

P

Plea for principled approach to
 extraordinary judicial power, 319–346
 Article 11(1) of Regulation 1255/199,
 322
 Article 6(3) TEU, 321
 'domestic' methods, 321
 Niemann case, 322

'purposive interpretation,' 320
 REACH Regulation, 321–322
 reading up or down English statutory
 law, 323–330
 common law powers of reading up/
 down, 324
 individual detriment, 325–326
 presumptions in conflict, 326–330
 sectoral a priori approaches, 326–327
 statutory powers of reading up/
 down: Section 3(1) HRA 1998,
 324–325
 weighing approaches, 327–330
 reading up or down EU legislation,
 335–346
 detrimental reading up or down is
 problematic, 336–337
 jurisdiction/degree distinction, 341
 Member States' 'rights' and
 directives, 337–338
 'no surprise effect' approach,
 343–346
 peculiarities of EU law, 338–339
 sectoral a priori approaches, 339–341
 'substantive interest out-weighed'
 approach, 342–343
 reading up or down German legislation,
 330–335
 general a priori approach, 332
 individual detriment, 330–331
 a priori approaches concerning
 specific subject matters, 332–333
 Rechtsfortbildung, 330
 weighing approaches, 333–335
 'subjective' interpretation, 319
 'wide' / 'extensive' / 'narrow' /
 'restrictive' interpretation, 320
 Polish Constitutional Tribunal Crisis,
 489–506
 apolitical and impartial judges, 490–496
 application regarding
 recommendation, 492
 appointment of judges, 491

- 'judges of Civic Platform,' 494
 - 'meritocratic,' 495
 - nomination of candidates and selection of judges, 493
 - Polish Constitution of 2 April 1997, 490
- collapse of abstract control, 496–501
 - Article 195 section 1 of the Constitution, 498
 - change in proceedings, 497
 - Kelsen's paradigm, 499–500
 - procedural issue, 497
- 'Kelsenian,' model of centralized review, 490
- parliament 'recovery' act, 489
- war between parliament and tribunal – counter-majoritarian dilemma, 501–506
 - Council of Europe opinion, 503
 - 'protection of judicial minority,' 504
 - 'the minority motion,' 505
- Process-oriented proportionality review in EU, 93–121
 - Gauweiler*, 109–111
 - Article 296 TFEU, 109–110
 - circular form of reasoning, 110
 - trend towards process-oriented review, 111
 - Inuit*, 107–109
 - Commission proposal' for a Regulation, 107
 - 'objective criteria,' 108
 - Luxembourg v. Parliament and Council*, 106–107
 - observations, 112–117
 - advantages of process-oriented review, 113
 - Article 296 TFEU, 112
 - 'counter-majoritarian' difficulty, 116
 - 'legislative procedure,' 116
 - 'process-based theories,' 115
 - 'representation reinforcing' role, 114
 - principle of proportionality, 98–101
 - disproportionate penalty, 99
 - legislative discretion and judicial scrutiny, 99
 - 'manifestly inappropriate' standard, 100
 - necessity stage, 98
 - suitability stage, 98
 - 'procedural proportionality,' 94
 - process/substance distinction, 95–98
 - annulment, 98
 - Article 263(2) of TFEU, 95
 - Article 296 of TFEU, 96
 - Commission v. Parliament and Council*, 97
 - 'infringement of the treaties,' 96
 - question of thresholds, 117–121
 - Spain v. Council*, 102–105
 - legitimate objectives, 102
 - 'substantive outcomes' with 'process review,' 103
 - Vodafone*, 105–106
- Promoting human health and functioning of the internal market, 271–283
 - challenging the legality of Tobacco Products Directive, 274–275
 - Philip Morris Brands and Others*, 275
 - Pillbox 38*, 274–275
 - Poland V. Parliament and Council*, 274
 - ECJ position : backing the Directive, 275–281
 - admissibility, 275–276
 - challenges to the Directive under Article 114 TFEU, 276–280
 - challenges to the Directive under the Charter, 280–281
 - regulatory significance of the three rulings, 281–283
 - anti-tobacco stance in Europe, 282
 - 'Brexit' referendum, 283
 - FCTC, 281
 - smoking, 271–272
 - tobacco products, 272

- 2014 Tobacco Products Directive,
273–274
- Article 114(3) of the TFEU, 273
- WHO Framework Convention on
Tobacco Control (FCTC), 273

R

- Recent Developments in Luxembourg,
449–470
- constitutional principles, 449–452
 - Article 21 of the Charter and that
Directive 2000/78, 450
 - Ingeniorforeningen I Danmark*, 451
- Court activities in 2016, 449–470
- EU citizenship, 452–457
 - Article 7(1)(b) of the Directive, 453
 - Article 28 (1) of the Directive, 454
 - Article 20 TFEU, 456
 - Article 21 TFEU and the Directive,
455
 - Zambrano* formula, 452
- Euro crisis, 468–470
 - Article 340 TFEU, 469
 - Ledra Advertising and Mallis* cases,
468–469
- immigration and asylum, 457–464
 - Affum* case, 457–458
 - Alo and Osso* case, 461–462
 - Article (5)(1)(f) of ECHR, 459
 - Article 33 of that Directive, 462
 - Article 8 (3) of the Directive, 459,
461
 - Article 5(1)(f) of the ECHR, 461
- police and judicial cooperation in
criminal matters, 464–468
 - Article 1 of the Charter, 465
 - Article 54 of the CISA, 466–467
 - Article 3(2) TEU, 467
 - principle of mutual recognition,
464–465
- R (Miller) etc v. Secretary of State for Exiting
Europe*, 1–11
- incorporating EU legal edifice, 5–7

- Miller* and the government concessions,
3–5
- problems, 9–11
- removal of EU rights?, 7–9
- R v. Miller*, 205–217
 - ‘ambulatory statute,’ 205
 - ‘constitutional revolution,’ 206
 - devolution arguments, 216–217
 - Great Repeal Bill (GRB), 206–207
 - Reed’s judgment, 210–213
 - Referendum Act of 2015, 208

S

- Sanctioning Under Article 260 (3) TFEU,
301–316
 - analysis of the cases brought to the
court, 308–316
 - Articles 258 and 260 (2) TFEU,
309
 - cases initiated under 260 (3) TFEU,
310–314
 - period of time, 309
 - transposition cases, 308
- Article 260(3) Proceeding in practice,
306–308
 - notification of national transposition
measures, 306
 - request for financial sanctions under
Article 260(3), 307
- Commission’s communication on the
implementation of Article 260(3) of
the Treaty, 304–306
 - Article 260(2) TFEU procedure,
305
 - ‘failing to notify,’ 304
 - fundamental criterias, 305
 - penalty payment, 306
- imposition of financial penalties on
Member States, 302
- infringement proceedings, 302
- legal harmonization, 301
- Secularism French Style, 237–244
 - Abbé Olivier* case, 243–244

- ban on religious signs, 242
- behaviour of users of the public service, 239–240, 241
- funding of religious activities, 238–239
- Republic, defined by Article 1 of the Constitution of 1958, 237
- requirements for the delivery of public services, 240–241
- SAS v. France* case, 242–243
- ‘yeast of secularism,’ 237
- State Aid Rules in the financial sector
 - during economic crisis, 615–639
 - concept of ‘compatibility with EU law,’ 615–616
 - developments prior the Third Economic Adjustment Programme, 633–634
 - financial and economic crisis, 615
 - the First Economic Adjustment Programme, 628–630
 - general framework, 616–623
 - forms and types of state aid, 622–623
 - historic and factual background, 616–617
 - State Aid Law in the financial system, 618–622
- Greece, in example, 623–638
 - current banking environment, 624–625
 - general concept, 623–624
 - impact of financial crisis on Greek banking sector, 625–638
- impact of financial crisis on Greek banking sector, 625–638
 - applicable measures during 2008–2013, 626–632
 - Case Study: The Agricultural Bank of Greece (ATE), 631–632
 - general measures, 626–628
 - restructuring plans and measures implemented during 2014–2016, 633–638
 - the way ahead (2016 onwards), 637–638
- the Second Economic Adjustment Programme, 630–631
- the Third Economic Adjustment Programme, 635–637
- Subsidiarity in Directive 2014/104 EU on Damages Actions for Breach of EU Competition Law, 395–421
 - Article 101 or 102 TFEU, 395
 - Article 114 TFEU, 396
 - Directive 2014/104 EU, 398
 - overview of the commission’s arguments on subsidiarity in private enforcement, 404–412
 - co-ordination of public and private enforcement, 408–410
 - disparity of judicial protection, 405–406
 - effectiveness of private enforcement, 410–412
 - forum shopping, 406–408
 - private enforcement and its regulatory goals, 398–400
 - Article 101 TFEU, 400
 - Courage v. Crehan* case, 398–399
 - Kone* case, 400
 - regulatory competition in private enforcement?, 412–415
- sectoral regulation of antitrust tortious liability, 397
- subsidiarity and the commission’s policy discretion, 415–419
- subsidiarity in EU law, 400–404
 - principle of subsidiarity, 400–401
 - Protocol n. 2 of the Treaty of Lisbon, 401

selected recent case law of the Court
of Justice on subsidiarity, 402–404

T

Transparencies and persistence of opacity
in the Italian Government System,
285–299

constitutional roots of principle of
transparency, 286–288
features, 287–288
Legislative Decree no. 33 of 2013, 287

disclosure and access to government
documents, 288–291
changes, 290–291

Law No. 241 of 1990, 288–289
privacy of personal data, 290
right of private individuals, 289
right to environmental information,
291

freedom of information act, 295–298
Article 24 of the law on procedure,
298

Data Protection Authority opinions,
295

‘FOIA’ laws, 297

Law no. 124 of 2015, 296

Legislative Decree of 25 May 2016,
no. 97, 296

‘opacity through confusion,’ 295

online accessibility and transparency,
292–295

Article 1, Clause 2 of Legislative
Decree no. 33 of 2013, 293

Article 11 of Legislative Decree no.
150 of 2009, 292–293

Article 54 of the Digital
Administration Code, 292

Civic Access, 293

Digital Administration Code, 294

‘digital illiterates,’ 294–295

Law No. 241 of 1990, 295

National Anti-Corruption Authority
(ANAC), 294

reform ‘package,’ 285–286