

PATRÍCIA FRAGOSO MARTINS

**RETHINKING ACCESS BY PRIVATE PARTIES  
TO THE COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Judicial Review of EU Acts before and after the Lisbon Treaty**

UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA EDITORA  
Lisboa 2016

# Preface

This book corresponds in its core to my Ph.D dissertation which was submitted at the Catolica Global School of Law in October 2012 and discussed publicly in July 2013.

Attention is drawn to the following methodological options:

- a) The dissertation includes apart from the main text, one table of cases, one table of legislation, one table of abbreviations, one table of correspondence, the abstract and the list of bibliographic references;
- b) Apart from the introduction and conclusion, the dissertation is divided in two main parts, each of them divided in three chapters;
- c) The numbering of the chapters is autonomous in each part;
- d) For the sake of simplification, clarity and consistency, all bibliographic references included in footnotes follow the same pattern: AUTHOR(S)' LAST NAME, Title (for books) or "Title" (for articles/working papers), year of publication, relevant page(s);
- e) Bibliographic references in the same footnote are indicated by chronological order (starting with the oldest), and in case of references of the same year by alphabetical order of the author(s)' name;
- f) Full bibliographic references may be found in the final list of references;
- g) Cases are referred to in the main text according to their short designation, and are identified in footnotes only the first time they are mentioned in the text;
- h) In footnotes, references to cases are included in full and said references may also be found in the table of cases;
- i) Cases are indicated in footnotes by chronological order following the corresponding number of process regardless of the court which decided them and the date of the final decision;
- j) All the CJEU's cases cited are available in the Court's website ([www.curia.eu](http://www.curia.eu));
- k) Legal acts are referred to in short, with full reference being included in the table of legislation;

# Contents

Preface	7
Table of cases	9
Table of Legislation	40
Table of Abbreviations	43
Table of Contents	45

## INTRODUCTION

1. From the “Complete System of Legal Remedies and Procedures” to the Need to Ensure Effective Judicial Protection of Private Parties	49
2. The European Union as a <i>Rechtsgemeinschaft</i> and the Deficits of Judicial Protection	56
3. Plan and Terminology	65

## PART I

### **A Conceptual Analysis: the *Les Verts* Approach to the Union's System of Judicial Protection**

1. Judicial Review of Union Acts under the CJEU's General Jurisdiction	71
1.1. Direct Access of Private Parties to the Union Courts: the Objectivist, Institutional and Systemic Approach to Judicial Review in the European Union	71
1.1.1. <i>The Action for Annulment Established in the Treaties</i>	71
1.1.2. <i>An Approach Mostly Focused on the Type of Reviewable Act:                 a Recours Donn� Contre un Act?</i>	79
1.1.3. <i>The Restrictive Case-Law Regarding the Locus Standi Requirements                 of Private Parties</i>	115
1.1.4. <i>The Irrelevance of a Breach of the Right to Effective Judicial                 Protection: “Do as I Say and not as I do...”</i>	168
1.1.5. <i>The Case-Law Favouring Objective and Institutional Dimensions                 of the System of Judicial Review</i>	179
1.1.6. <i>The “Hidden Reasons” for the CJEU's Restrictive Approach                 to Direct Access: Une Certaine Id�e of the Union's Judicial                 System and the Issue of Caseload</i>	190
1.2. Indirect Access by Private Parties to the CJEU: Still an Objectivist, Institutional and Systemic Approach to the Judicial Protection of Private Parties	199

1.2.1. <i>The “Alternative Routes” Approach</i>	199
1.2.2. <i>The So-called “Gap Theory”: Practical Difficulties Surrounding Indirect Access to the CJEU</i>	211
1.2.3. <i>Conceptual Difficulties Surrounding Jurisdictional Subsidiarity</i>	240
1.3. Caught in between: the <i>TWD</i> and <i>Nachi</i> “Guillotines”	280
2. The CJEU’s Jurisdiction over the Intergovernmental Pillars: Articles 6(2), 46 and 47 TEU	298
2.1. The Jurisdiction of the CJEU under the Treaties	298
2.2. The Case-Law of the CJEU and the Gaps of the System of Judicial Review	307
2.2.1. <i>General Remarks</i>	307
2.2.2. <i>On the Institutional Balance between the Union and the Member States: from Air Transport Visa to the Small Arms Case</i>	308
2.2.3. <i>On the Effective Judicial Protection of Private Parties: from Pupino to the Fight against Terrorism</i>	318
3. The Right to Effective Judicial Protection as an Institutional Guarantee	331
3.1. The Objective, Institutional and Systemic Elements in the CJEU’s Case-Law: Summary of the CJEU’s Views on the Union’s System of Judicial Review	331
3.2. Echoes of Institutional Guarantees in the CJEU’s Case-Law	341

## PART II

### **A New Conceptual Approach after the Lisbon Treaty: the Impact of the Johnston Principle on the Union’s System of Judicial Protection**

1. The Right of Access to Justice within the Union’s Judicial System in Light of the Renewed System of Fundamental Rights Protection	351
1.1. General Remarks	351
1.2. Article 6(1) TEU: the Binding Legal Value of the Charter of Fundamental Rights	359
1.2.1. <i>The Protection of Fundamental Rights within the European Union: from Substance to Procedure</i>	359
1.2.2. <i>The Johnston Principle: the Right to Effective Judicial Protection and the Effectiveness of Union Law</i>	370
1.2.3. <i>Beyond Johnston: Effective Judicial Protection vis-à-vis the European Union?</i>	381
1.2.4. <i>Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights</i>	389
1.2.5. <i>The Impact of the Charter on the Union’s System of Judicial Protection</i>	399
1.3. Article 6(2) TEU: the Mandatory Accession to the ECHR	406

1.3.1. <i>General Remarks: from Opinion 2/94 to the Draft Agreement on Accession</i>	406
1.3.2. <i>The Right of Access to Justice under the ECHR: Articles 6 and 13 ECHR</i>	412
1.3.3. <i>The Union's Judicial System under the ECtHR's Watch</i>	430
2. Access by Private Parties to the CJEU under the Lisbon Treaty: Reforming Jurisdiction within the Union's Judicial System	466
2.1. A New Test on <i>Locus Standi</i> of Private Parties: the Scope and Meaning of the new Article 263(4) TFEU	466
2.1.1. <i>General Remarks: the Lisbon Treaty and the Establishment of a Pro Actore Approach</i>	466
2.1.2. <i>The Notion of Regulatory Acts</i>	477
2.1.3. <i>The Test of Direct Concern and the Absence of Implementing Measures</i>	495
2.1.4. <i>A New Approach to the Test of Individual Concern</i>	505
2.1.5. <i>Ensuring Fundamental Rights Review</i>	539
2.1.6. <i>"Plugging the Gaps": Taking Effective Judicial Protection Seriously or "Do as I do..."</i>	561
2.1.7. <i>TWD and Nachi after Lisbon: an Overlapping of Available Remedies?</i>	578
2.2. The CJEU's Jurisdiction over the CFSP under the Lisbon Treaty	584
2.2.1 <i>The Unified and Extended Jurisdiction of the CJEU</i>	584
2.2.2. <i>The Scope and Meaning of Article 275 TFEU</i>	588
2.2.3. <i>Expanding Jurisdiction over CFSP Measures: a Move towards Constitutionalism</i>	595
2.2.4. <i>Reasons for Judicial Self-Restraint: a "Political Questions" Doctrine for the EU?</i>	614
3. Dealing with Caseload: the Reform of the Union's Judicial System	623
3.1. From Jurisdictional Subsidiarity to the Limits of the Judicial System	623
3.2. A <i>Certiorari</i> Approach for the Union Courts: <i>de Minimis non Curat</i> the CJEU?	631
3.3. The Issue of Judicial Reform	643
Conclusion	653
ANNEX	665
ABSTRACT	667
RESUMO	669
REFERENCES	671