

# Law and Policy of the European Union advanced - M3031 - Nuno Ferreira (Aut / Spr)

View Online



[1]

Academy of European Law (Florence, Italy) 2007. The fundamentals of EU law revisited: assessing the impact of the constitutional debate. Oxford University Press.

[2]

Academy of European Law (Florence, Italy) 2007. The fundamentals of EU law revisited: assessing the impact of the constitutional debate. Oxford University Press.

[3]

Accetto, M. and Zleptnig, S. 2005. The Principle of Effectiveness: Rethinking Its Role in Community Law. *European Public Law*. 11, 3 (2005), 375–403.

[4]

Accetto, M. and Zleptnig, S. 2005. The Principle of Effectiveness: Rethinking Its Role in Community Law. *European Public Law*. 11, 3 (2005), 375–403.

[5]

Adam Cygan 2000. Defining a sufficiently serious breach of Community law: the House of Lords casts its net into the waters. *European Law Review*. 25, 4 (2000).

[6]

Allott, P. 2000. Preliminary rulings - another infant disease. *European Law Review*. 25, 5

(2000), 538–547.

[7]

Alston, P. and Weiler, J.H.H. 1998. An 'Ever Closer Union' in Need of a Human Rights Policy. *European Journal of International Law*. 9, (1998), 658–723.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/9.4.658>.

[8]

Anagnostaras, G. 2002. Not as unproblematic as you might think: the establishment of causation in governmental liability actions. *European Law Review (E.L. Rev.)*. 27, 6 (2002), 663–676.

[9]

Anagnostaras, Georgios 2001. State Liability and Alternative Courses of Action: How Independent Can an Autonomous Remedy Be? *Yearbook of European Law*. 21, 1 (2001).

[10]

Anthony Arnull 2011. The principle of effective judicial protection in EU law: an unruly horse? *European Law Review*. 36, 1 (2011).

[11]

Arnull, A. et al. 2011. *Constitutional Order of States?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

[12]

Arnull, A. 2006. Out with the old... *European Law Review*. 31, 1 (2006), 1–2.

[13]

Arnull, A. 2010. The Law Lords and the European Union: swimming with the incoming tide.

European Law Review. 35, 1 (2010), 57–87.

[14]

Avbelj, M. Supremacy or Primacy of EU Law-(Why) Does it Matter? European Law Journal. 17, 6, 744–763. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00560.x>.

[15]

Avbelj, M. 2011. Theory of European Union. European Law Review. 36, 6 (2011), 818–836.

[16]

Baker, E. and Harding, C. From past imperfect to future perfect? A longitudinal study of the third pillar. European Law Review. 34, 1, 25–54.

[17]

Bale, T. et al. 'May Contain Nuts'? The Reality behind the Rhetoric Surrounding the British Conservatives' New Group in the European Parliament. Political Quarterly. 81, 1, 85–98. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2009.02067.x>.

[18]

Barber, N.W. The Limited Modesty of Subsidiarity. European Law Journal. 11, 3, 308–325. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2005.00261.x>.

[19]

BARBER, T. 2010. The Appointments of Herman van Rompuy and Catherine Ashton. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. 48, (Sep. 2010), 55–67. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02093.x>.

[20]

Barents, R. 2004. Court of Justice in the Draft Constitution, The. Maastricht Journal of

European and Comparative Law. 11, 2 (2004).

[21]

Barents, R. 2010. The Court of Justice after the Treaty of Lisbon. *Common Market Law Review*. 47, Issue 3 (Jun. 2010), 709–728. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2010031>.

[22]

Barnard, C. ed. 2007. *The Cambridge yearbook of European legal studies: Vol. 9: 2006-2007*. Hart Pub.

[23]

Barnard, C. ed. 2007. *The Cambridge yearbook of European legal studies: Volume 9: 2006-2007*. Hart.

[24]

Barnard, C. 2016. *The substantive law of the EU: the four freedoms*. Oxford University Press.

[25]

Barnard, C. and Academy of European Law 2007. *The fundamentals of EU law revisited: assessing the impact of the constitutional debate*. Oxford University Press.

[26]

Barnard, C. and Academy of European Law 2007. *The fundamentals of EU law revisited: assessing the impact of the constitutional debate*. Oxford University Press.

[27]

Barnard, C. and Peers, S. eds. 2017. *European Union law*. Oxford University Press.

[28]

Barrett, G. 2008. The king is dead, long live the king": the recasting by the Treaty of Lisbon of the provisions of the Constitutional Treaty concerning national parliaments. *European Law Review*. 33, 1 (2008), 66–84.

[29]

Beatson, J. and Tridimas, T. eds. 1998. *New directions in European public law*. Hart Pub.

[30]

Beatson, J. and Tridimas, T. eds. 1998. *New directions in European public law*. Hart Pub.

[31]

Beck, G. The Lisbon Judgment of the German Constitutional Court, the Primacy of EU Law and the Problem of Kompetenz-Kompetenz: A Conflict between Right and Right in Which There is No Praetor. *European Law Journal*. 17, 4, 470–494.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00559.x>.

[32]

Belling, V. Supranational Fundamental Rights or Primacy of Sovereignty? *European Law Journal*. 18, 2, 251–268. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00596.x>.

[33]

Berki, G. 2018. Free movement of patients in the E.U.: a patient's perspective. Intersentia.

[34]

Betlem, G. The Doctrine of Consistent Interpretation: Managing Legal Uncertainty. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 22, 3, 397–418.

[35]

Beutler, B. 2009. State liability for breaches of Community law by national courts: Is the requirement of a manifest infringement of the applicable law an insurmountable obstacle? *Common Market Law Review*. 46, 3 (2009), 773-804.

[36]

Beutler, Björn State liability for breaches of Community law by national courts: Is the requirement of a manifest infringement of the applicable law an insurmountable obstacle? *Common Market Law Review*. 46, 3, 773-804.

[37]

von Bogdandy, A. and Schill, S.W. 2011. Overcoming absolute primacy: Respect for national identity under the Lisbon Treaty. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, Issue 5 (Oct. 2011), 1417-1453. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2011057>.

[38]

Breuer, M. 2004. State liability for judicial wrongs and Community law: the case of *Gerhard Kobler v Austria*. *European Law Review*. 29, 2 (2004), 243-254.

[39]

British Institute of International and Comparative Law and Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. Europa Instituut *Common Market Law Review*.

[40]

Broberg, M. 2008. Acte clair revisited: Adapting the acte clair criteria to the demands of the times. *Common Market Law Review*. 45, 5 (2008), 1383-1397.

[41]

Broberg, M. 2008. Acte clair revisited: Adapting the acte clair criteria to the demands of the times. *Common Market Law Review*. 45, 5 (2008), 1383-1397.

[42]

Büchs, M. How Legitimate is the Open Method of Co-ordination? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 46, 4, 765–786. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2008.00804.x>.

[43]

de  
Bu

rca, G. and Weiler, J.H.H. eds. 2001. *The European Court of Justice*. Oxford University Press.

[44]

Buzek, J. State of the Union: Three Cheers for the Lisbon Treaty and Two Warnings for Political Parties. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 49, 7–18. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02190.x>.

[45]

Cabral, P. and Chaves, M.C. 2006. Member State Liability for Decisions of National Courts Adjudicating at Last Instance. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*. 13 (2006), 109–126.

[46]

Caranta, R. Judicial protection against Member States: a new *jus commune* takes shape. *Common Market law review*. 32, 3, 703–706.

[47]

Cass, D.Z. The Word that Saves Maastricht? The Principle of Subsidiarity and the Division of Powers within the European Community. *Common Market Law Review*. 29, 6, 1107–1136.

[48]

Castillo de la Torre, F. 2005. Tribunal Constitucional (Spanish Constitutional Court), Opinion 1/2004 of 13 December 2004, on the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

Common Market Law Review. 42, Issue 4 (Aug. 2005), 1169–1202.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2005033>.

[49]

Chalmers, D. 2005. Editorial: Constitutional modesty. *European Law Review*. 30, 4 (2005).

[50]

Chalmers, D. et al. 2014. *European Union law: text and materials*. Cambridge University Press.

[51]

Conway, G. Recovering a Separation of Powers in the European Union. *European Law Journal*. 17, 3, 304–322. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00552.x>.

[52]

Conway, G. Recovering a Separation of Powers in the European Union. *European Law Journal*. 17, 3, 304–322. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00552.x>.

[53]

Cooper, I. The Watchdogs of Subsidiarity: National Parliaments and the Logic of Arguing in the EU. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 44, 2, 281–304.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2006.00623.x>.

[54]

Coppel, J. and O'Neill, A. The European Court of Justice: taking rights seriously? *Legal Studies*. 12, 2, 227–239. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.1992.tb00467.x>.

[55]

Craig, P. Subsidiarity: A Political and Legal Analysis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market*



Studies. 50, 72–87. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02228.x>.

[56]

Craig, P. Subsidiarity: A Political and Legal Analysis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 50, 72–87. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02228.x>.

[57]

Craig, P. 2011. The ECJ and ultra vires action: A conceptual analysis. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 2 (2011), 395–437.

[58]

Craig, P. 2011. The ECJ and ultra vires action: A conceptual analysis. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, Issue 2 (Apr. 2011), 395–437. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2011018>.

[59]

Craig, P. 2011. The European Union Act 2011: Locks, limits and legality. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, Issue 6 (Dec. 2011), 1915–1944.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2011074>.

[60]

Craig, P. 2009. The legal effect of Directives: policy, rules and exceptions. *European Law Review*. 34, 3 (2009).

[61]

Craig, P. 2009. The legal effect of Directives: policy, rules and exceptions. *European Law Review*. 34, 3 (2009).

[62]

Craig, P. 2009. The legal effect of Directives: policy, rules and exceptions. *European Law Review*. 34, 3 (2009).

[63]

Craig, P. 2008. The Treaty of Lisbon, process, architecture and substance. *European Law Review*. 33, 2 (2008), 137–166.

[64]

Craig, P.P. 1997. Directives: direct effect, indirect effect and the construction of national legislation. *European Law Review*. 22, 6 (1997).

[65]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. *EU law: text, cases, and materials*. Oxford University Press.

[66]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. *EU law: text, cases, and materials*. Oxford University Press.

[67]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. *EU law: text, cases, and materials*. Oxford University Press.

[68]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. *EU law: text, cases, and materials*. Oxford University Press.

[69]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. *EU law: text, cases, and materials*. Oxford University Press.

[70]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. EU law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[71]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. EU law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[72]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. EU law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[73]

Craig, P.P. and De Búrca, G. 2015. EU law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[74]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[75]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[76]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[77]

Craig, P.P. and De

Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[78]

Craig, P.P. and De

Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[79]

Craig, P.P. and De

Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[80]

Craig, P.P. and De

Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[81]

Craig, P.P. and De

Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[82]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[83]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[84]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[85]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[86]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[87]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[88]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[89]

Craig, P.P. and De  
Bu

rca, G. eds. 2011. The evolution of EU law. Oxford University Press.

[90]

Crespy, A. and Gajewska, K. New Parliament, New Cleavages after the Eastern Enlargement? The Conflict over the Services Directive as an Opposition between the Liberals and the Regulators. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, 5, 1185–1208. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02109.x>.

[91]

Cygan, A. 2011. The parliamentarisation of EU decision-making? The impact of the Treaty of Lisbon on national parliaments. *European Law Review*. 36, 4 (2011), 480–499.

[92]

Cygan, A. 2011. The parliamentarisation of EU decision-making? The impact of the Treaty of Lisbon on national parliaments. *European Law Review*. 36, 4 (2011), 480–499.

[93]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart Publishing.

[94]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in

honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart.

[95]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart.

[96]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart Pub.

[97]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart.

[98]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart Pub.

[99]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart.

[100]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart Publishing.

[101]

Dashwood, A. and Arnull, A. 2011. A constitutional order of states?: essays in EU law in honour of Alan Dashwood. Hart.

[102]

Dashwood, A. and Wyatt, D. 2011. Wyatt and Dashwood's European Union law. Hart.

[103]

Davies, G. 2006. Subsidiarity: The wrong idea, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. *Common Market Law Review*. 43, Issue 1 (Feb. 2006), 63–84.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2005083>.

[104]

Davis, R.W. 2006. Liability in damages for a breach of Community law: some reflections on the question of who to sue and the concept of 'the State'. *European Law Review*. 31, 1 (2006), 69–80.

[105]

Dawson, M. 2009. The ambiguity of social Europe in the open method of coordination. *European Law Review*. 34, 1 (2009), 55–79.

[106]

Dawson, M. 2011. Three waves of new governance in the European Union. *European Law Review*. 36, 2 (2011), 208–225.

[107]

De Witte, B. 1999. Ch. 27: 'The past and future role of the European Court of Justice in the protection of Human Rights' □□ *The EU and human rights* □□ *The EU and human rights*. P. Alston et al., eds. Oxford University Press. 859–897.

[108]

Dickson, J. Directives in EU Legal Systems: Whose Norms Are They Anyway? *European Law Journal*. 17, 2, 190–212. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2010.00544.x>.



[109]

Dimitra Nassimpian 2007. ...And we keep on meeting: (de)fragmenting state liability. *European Law Review*. 32, 6 (2007).

[110]

Dinan, D. Governance and Institutions: Implementing the Lisbon Treaty in the Shadow of the Euro Crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 49, S1: Special Issue, 103-121. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02183.x>.

[111]

Dinan, D. Institutions and Governance: A New Treaty, a Newly Elected Parliament and a New Commission. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, Suppl 1, 95-118.

[112]

Dinan, D. Institutions and Governance: A New Treaty, a Newly Elected Parliament and a New Commission. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, Suppl 1, 95-118.

[113]

Dinan, D. Institutions and Governance: A New Treaty, a Newly Elected Parliament and a New Commission. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, Suppl 1, 95-118.

[114]

Dougan, M. 2007. When worlds collide! Competing visions of the relationship between direct effect and supremacy. *Common Market Law Review*. 44, 4 (2007), 931-963.

[115]

Dougan, M. 2007. When worlds collide! Competing visions of the relationship between direct effect and supremacy. *Common Market Law Review*. 44, 4 (2007), 931-963.

[116]

Dougan, M. 2007. When worlds collide! Competing visions of the relationship between direct effect and supremacy. *Common Market Law Review*. 44, 4 (2007), 931–963.

[117]

Drake, S. 2005. Twenty years after Von Colson: the impact of 'indirect effect' on the protection of the individual's community rights. *European Law Review*. 30, 3 (2005), 329–348.

[118]

Eckes, C. Protecting Supremacy from External Influences: A Precondition for a European Constitutional Legal Order? *European Law Journal*. 18, 2, 230–250.

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00595.x>.

[119]

Eilmansberger, T. The relationship between rights and remedies in EC law: In search of the missing link. *Common Market Law Review*. 41, 5, 1199–1246.

[120]

Eleanor Drywood Giving with one hand, taking with the other: fundamental rights, children and the family reunification decision. *European Law Review*.

[121]

Emiliou, N. 1994. Subsidiarity: Panacea or fig leaf? □□ Legal issues of the Maastricht treaty. *Legal issues of the Maastricht treaty*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd. 65–83.

[122]

Estella de Noriega, A. 2002. *The EU principle of subsidiarity and its critique*. Oxford University Press.

[123]

Fairhurst, J. 2016. Law of the European Union. Pearson.

[124]

Fairhurst, J. 2016. Law of the European Union. Pearson.

[125]

Figueroa Regueiro, P.V. 2002. Invocability of Substitution and Invocability of Exclusion: Bringing Legal Realism to the Current Developments of the Case-Law of 'Horizontal' Direct Effect of Directives. The Jean Monnet Working Papers. 7, 2 (2002).

[126]

Foster, N. ed. Blackstone's EU treaties & legislation 2017-2018. Oxford University Press.

[127]

Georgios Anagnostaras Not as unproblematic as you might think: the establishment of causation in governmental liability actions. European Law Review.

[128]

van Gerven, W. 2000. Of rights, remedies and procedures. Common Market Law Review. 37, 3 (2000), 501-536.

[129]

Giorgi, F. and Triart, N. National Judges, Community Judges: Invitation to a Journey through the Looking-glass-On the Need for Jurisdictions to Rethink the Inter-systemic Relations beyond the Hierarchical Principle. European Law Journal. 14, 6, 693-717.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2008.00441.x>.

[130]

Gordon, M. and Dougan, M. 2012. The United Kingdom's European Union Act 2011: 'who won the bloody war anyway?' *European Law Review*. 37, 1 (2012), 3–30.

[131]

Granger, M.-P.F. 2007. National applications of Francovich and the construction of a European administrative ius commune. *European Law Review*. 32, 2 (2007), 157–192.

[132]

Greer, S. and Williams, A. Human Rights in the Council of Europe and the EU: Towards 'Individual', 'Constitutional' or 'Institutional' Justice? *European Law Journal*. 15, 4, 462–481. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2009.00473.x>.

[133]

Greer, S. and Williams, A. Human Rights in the Council of Europe and the EU: Towards 'Individual', 'Constitutional' or 'Institutional' Justice? *European Law Journal*. 15, 4, 462–481. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2009.00473.x>.

[134]

Griller, S. International Law, Human Rights and the Community's Autonomous Legal Order. *European Constitutional Law Review*. 4, 3, 528–553. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1574019608005282>.

[135]

Grimmel, A. Judicial Interpretation or Judicial Activism? The Legacy of Rationalism in the Studies of the European Court of Justice. *European Law Journal*. 18, 4, 518–535. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00615.x>.

[136]

von der Groeben, C. Aida Torres Perez. Conflicts of Rights in the European Union. A Theory of Supranational Adjudication. *European Journal of International Law*. 22, 1, 296–300. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chr017>.

[137]

Hagemann, S. and Høyland, B. Bicameral Politics in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, 4, 811–833.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02075.x>.

[138]

Hagemann, S. and Høyland, B. Bicameral Politics in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, 4, 811–833.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02075.x>.

[139]

Hagemann, S. and Høyland, B. Bicameral Politics in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, 4, 811–833.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02075.x>.

[140]

Harlow, C. Francovich and the Problem of the Disobedient State. *European Law Journal*. 2, 3, 199–225. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.1996.tb00026.x>.

[141]

Harpaz, G. 2011. European Integration in the Aftermath of the Ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon: Quo Vadis? *European Public Law*. 17, 1 (2011), 73–89.

[142]

Hartley, T.C. 1999. *Constitutional problems of the European Union*. Hart.

[143]

Hartley, T.C. 2014. *The foundations of European Union law: an introduction to the constitutional and administrative law of the European Union*. Oxford University Press.

[144]

Hatzopoulos, V. Why the Open Method of Coordination Is Bad For You: A Letter to the EU. *European Law Journal*. 13, 3, 309–342.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00368.x>.

[145]

Havu, K. Horizontal Liability for Damages in EU Law-the Changing Relationship of EU and National Law. *European Law Journal*. 18, 3, 407–426.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00606.x>.

[146]

Hepple, B. 2001. The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. *Industrial Law Journal*. 30, 2 (2001), 225–231. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ilj/30.2.225>.

[147]

Herdegen, M. 1994. Maastricht and the German Constitutional Court: Constitutional Restraints for an "Ever Closer Union" and Document "Extracts from: Brunner v. The European Union Treaty (Bundesverfassungsgericht). *Common Market Law Review*. 31, 2 (1994), 235–262.

[148]

Héritier, A. Institutional Change in Europe: Co-decision and Comitology Transformed. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 50, 38–54.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02226.x>.

[149]

Herlin-Karnell, E. 2008. The Ship–Source Pollution Case C–440/05, *Commission v. Council*, Judgment of 23 October 2007 (Grand Chamber). *European Public Law*. 14, Issue 4 (Nov. 2008), 533–544. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/EURO2008036>.

[150]

Hilson, C. and Downes, T.A. 1999. Making sense of rights: Community rights in E.C. law.

European Law Review. 24, 2 (1999).

[151]

Hinarejos, A. 2011. Integration in criminal matters and the role of the Court of Justice. European Law Review. 36, 3 (2011), 420–430.

[152]

History of the EU:

[https://european-union.europa.eu/principles-countries-history/history-eu\\_en](https://european-union.europa.eu/principles-countries-history/history-eu_en).

[153]

Horsley, T. Subsidiarity and the European Court of Justice: Missing Pieces in the Subsidiarity Jigsaw? JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. 50, 2, 267–282. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02221.x>.

[154]

Horsley, T. Subsidiarity and the European Court of Justice: Missing Pieces in the Subsidiarity Jigsaw? JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. 50, 2, 267–282. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02221.x>.

[155]

Isiksel, N.T. Fundamental rights in the EU after Kadi and Al Barakaat. European Law Journal . 16, 5, 551–577. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2010.00522.x>.

[156]

Israel De Jesus Butler 2012. Ensuring compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights in legislative drafting: the practice of the European Commission. European Law Review. 37, 4 (2012).

[157]

Itzcovich, G. Legal Order, Legal Pluralism, Fundamental Principles. Europe and Its Law in Three Concepts. *European Law Journal*. 18, 3, 358–384.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00604.x>.

[158]

Itzcovich, G. Legal Order, Legal Pluralism, Fundamental Principles. Europe and Its Law in Three Concepts. *European Law Journal*. 18, 3, 358–384.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00604.x>.

[159]

Itzcovich, G. Legal Order, Legal Pluralism, Fundamental Principles. Europe and Its Law in Three Concepts. *European Law Journal*. 18, 3, 358–384.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00604.x>.

[160]

Jacobs, F.G. et al. 2008. *Continuity and change in EU law: essays in honour of Sir Francis Jacobs*. Oxford University Press.

[161]

Jacobs, F.G. 2001. Human rights in the European Union: the role of the Court of Justice. *European Law Review*. 26, 4 (2001).

[162]

Jacobs, F.G. 2001. Human rights in the European Union: the role of the Court of Justice. *European Law Review*. 26, 4 (2001).

[163]

Jacobs, F.G. 2001. Human rights in the European Union: the role of the Court of Justice. *European Law Review*. 26, 4 (2001).

[164]



Jacqué, J.P. 2011. The accession of the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 4 (2011), 995-1023.

[165]

Jacqué, J.P. 2011. The accession of the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 4 (2011), 995-1023.

[166]

Jans, J.H. 2007. The Effect in National Legal Systems of the Prohibition of Discrimination on Grounds of Age as a General Principle of Community Law. *Legal Issues of Economic Integration*. 34, 1 (2007), 53-66.

[167]

Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) and European Parliament v Council of the European Union 27AD. Immigration policy - Right to family reunification of minor children of third country nationals - Directive 2003/86/EC - Protection of fundamental rights - Right to respect for family life - Obligation to have regard to the interests of minor children.

[168]

Kiiver, P. 2011. The early-warning system for the principle of subsidiarity: the national parliament as a Conseil d'Etat for Europe. *European Law Review*. 36, 1 (2011), 98-108.

[169]

Kiiver, P. 2011. The early-warning system for the principle of subsidiarity: the national parliament as a Conseil d'Etat for Europe. *European Law Review*. 36, 1 (2011), 98-108.

[170]

Kiiver, P. The Lisbon Judgment of the German Constitutional Court: A Court-Ordered Strengthening of the National Legislature in the EU. *European Law Journal*. 16, 5, 578-588. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2010.00523.x>.

[171]

Kiiver, P. 2008. The Treaty of Lisbon, The National Parliaments and the Principle of Subsidiarity. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*. 15, 1 (2008), 77-84.

[172]

Kilpatrick, C. et al. eds. 2000. *The future of remedies in Europe*. Hart Publishing.

[173]

Kilpatrick, C. et al. 2000. *The future of remedies in Europe*. Hart.

[174]

Klamert, M. Conflicts of legal basis: No legality and no basis but a bright future under the lisbon treaty? *European Law Review*. 35, 4, 497-515.

[175]

Klamert, M. Conflicts of legal basis: No legality and no basis but a bright future under the lisbon treaty? *European Law Review*. 35, 4, 497-515.

[176]

Komarek, J. 2007. In the court(s) we trust? On the need for hierarchy and differentiation in the preliminary ruling procedure. *European Law Review*. 32, 4 (2007), 467-491.

[177]

Komarek, J. 2007. In the court(s) we trust? On the need for hierarchy and differentiation in the preliminary ruling procedure. *European Law Review*. 32, 4 (2007), 467-491.

[178]

Komarek, J. 2007. In the court(s) we trust? On the need for hierarchy and differentiation in

the preliminary ruling procedure. *European Law Review*. 32, 4 (2007), 467–491.

[179]

Konig, T. and Junge, D. Why Don't Veto Players Use Their Power? *European Union Politics*. 10, 4, 507–534. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116509346780>.

[180]

Koutrakos, P. 2011. The Court of Justice as the guardian of national courts - or not? *European Law Review*. 36, 3 (2011), 319–320.

[181]

Kumm, M. The Jurisprudence of Constitutional Conflict: Constitutional Supremacy in Europe before and after the Constitutional Treaty. *European Law Journal*. 11, 3, 262–307. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2005.00260.x>.

[182]

Kunoy, B. and Dawes, A. 2009. Plate tectonics in Luxembourg: The ménage à trois between EC law, international law and the European Convention on Human Rights following the UN sanctions cases. *Common Market Law Review*. 46, Issue 1 (Feb. 2009), 73–104. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2009003>.

[183]

La Torre, M. The Law beneath Rights' Feet. Preliminary Investigation for a Study of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. *European Law Journal*. 8, 4, 515–535. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0386.00163>.

[184]

Leczykiewicz, D. 2010. 'Effective judicial protection' of human rights after Lisbon: should national courts be empowered to review EU secondary law? *European Law Review*. 35, 3 (2010), 326–348.

[185]

Legrand, P. 1996. European Legal Systems Are Not Converging. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*. 45, 1 (1996), 52–81.

[186]

Lenaerts, K. and Corthout, T. 2006. Of birds and hedges: the role of primacy in invoking norms of EU law. *European Law Review*. 31, 3 (2006), 287–315.

[187]

Lenaerts, Koen 2007. The Rule of Law and the Coherence of the Judicial System of the European Union. *Common Market Law Review*. 44, 6 (2007), 1625–1659.

[188]

de León, S.A. 2012. Regions and Subsidiarity in the European Union: A Look at the Role of the Spanish and other Regional Parliaments in the Monitoring of Compliance with the Principle of Subsidiarity. *European Public Law*. 18, Issue 2 (Jun. 2012), 305–321.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/EURO2012017>.

[189]

Liisberg, J.B. 2001. Does the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights Threaten the Supremacy of Community Law? *Common Market Law Review*. 38, 5 (2001), 1171–1199.

[190]

Lock, T. 2011. Taking national courts more seriously? Comment on Opinion 1/09. *European Law Review*. 36, 4 (2011), 576–588.

[191]

Lock, T. 2011. Walking on a tightrope: The draft ECHR accession agreement and the autonomy of the EU legal order. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 4 (2011), 1025–1054.

[192]

Lock, T. 2011. Walking on a tightrope: The draft ECHR accession agreement and the autonomy of the EU legal order. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 4 (2011), 1025–1054.

[193]

MacCormick, N. Beyond the Sovereign State. *The Modern Law Review*. 56, 1, 1–18.

[194]

Mancini, G.F. and Keeling, D.T. 1991. From CILFIT to ERT: The Constitutional Challenge facing the European Court. *Yearbook of European law*. 11, (1991), 1–13.

[195]

Masson, A. and Micheau, C. 2007. The Werner Mangold Case: An Example of Legal Militancy. *European Public Law*. 13, Issue 4 (Dec. 2007), 587–593.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/EURO2007034>.

[196]

Mikko, M. 2008. Unveiling the Council of the European Union | Ch 2: 'Voting and coalitions in the Council after Enlargement'. *Unveiling the Council of the European Union: games governments play in Brussels*. D. Naurin and H. Wallace, eds. Palgrave Macmillan. 23–35.

[197]

Mitsilegas, V. 2009. The third wave of third pillar law. Which direction for EU criminal justice? *European Law Review*. 34, 4 (2009), 523–560.

[198]

Morano-Foadi, S. and Andreadakis, S. Reflections on the Architecture of the EU after the Treaty of Lisbon: The European Judicial Approach to Fundamental Rights. *European Law Journal*. 17, 5, 595–610. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00568.x>.

[199]

Muir, E. 2011. Of ages in – and edges of – EU law. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 1 (2011), 39–62.

[200]

Muir, E. 2011. Of ages in – and edges of – EU law. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 1 (2011), 39–62.

[201]

Neve, G. de and Prentice, R. eds. 2017. *Unmaking the global sweatshop: health and safety of the world's garment workers*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

[202]

Neyer, J. Justice, Not Democracy: Legitimacy in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48, 4, 903–921.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02079.x>.

[203]

Niglia, L. Form and Substance in European Constitutional Law: The 'Social' Character of Indirect Effect. *European Law Journal*. 16, 4, 439–457.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2010.00517.x>.

[204]

Niglia, L. Form and Substance in European Constitutional Law: The 'Social' Character of Indirect Effect. *European Law Journal*. 16, 4, 439–457.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2010.00517.x>.

[205]

Ortega, L. 2005. Fundamental Rights in the European Constitution. *European Public Law*. 11, Issue 3 (Sep. 2005), 363–373.

[206]

Papadopoulos, T. 2011. Criticising the horizontal direct effect of the EU general principle of equality. *European Law Review*. 4 (2011).

[207]

Papadopoulos, T. 2011. Criticising the horizontal direct effect of the EU general principle of equality. *European Law Review*. 4 (2011).

[208]

Payandeh, M. 2011. Constitutional review of EU law after Honeywell : Contextualizing the relationship between the German Constitutional Court and the EU Court of Justice. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, Issue 1 (Feb. 2011), 9–38.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2011002>.

[209]

Peers, S. 2010. Supremacy, equality and human rights: comment on Kucukdeveci (C-555/07). *European Law Review*. 35, 6 (2010), 849–856.

[210]

Peers, S. 2010. Supremacy, equality and human rights: comment on Kucukdeveci (C-555/07). *European Law Review*. 35, 6 (2010), 849–856.

[211]

Peers, S. 2008. The European Community's criminal law competence: the plot thickens. *European Law Review*. 33, 3 (2008), 399–410.

[212]

Peers, S. and Ward, A. eds. 2004. *The European Union charter of fundamental rights: politics, law and policy*. Hart Publishing.

[213]

Pliakos, A. and Anagnostaras, G. 2011. Who is the ultimate arbiter? The battle over judicial supremacy in EU law. *European Law Review*. 36, 1 (2011), 109–123.

[214]

Prentice, R. and Neve, G. de eds. 2017. *Unmaking the global sweatshop: health and safety of the world's garment workers*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

[215]

Que

nivet, N.N.R. and Dadomo, C. 2020. *European Union law*. Hall & Stott Publishing.

[216]

Rasmussen, H. 1984. The European Court's acte clair strategy in CILFIT. *European Law Review*. 9, (1984), 242–259.

[217]

Rawlings, R. *Legal politics: the United Kingdom and ratification of the Treaty on European Union: Part 1*. *Public Law*. 254–278.

[218]

Rawlings, R. *Legal politics: the United Kingdom and ratification of the Treaty on European Union: Part 2*. *Public Law*. 367–391.

[219]

Reich, Norbert Horizontal liability in EC law: Hybridization of remedies for compensation in case of breaches of EC rights. *Common Market Law Review*. 44, 3, 705–742.



[220]

Rittberger, B. Institutionalizing Representative Democracy in the European Union: The Case of the European Parliament. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 50, 18–37. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02225.x>.

[221]

Ross, M. 1993. Beyond Francovich. *The Modern Law Review*. 56, 1 (1993), 55–73.

[222]

Ross, M. 2006. Effectiveness in the European legal order(s): beyond supremacy to constitutional proportionality? *European Law Review*. 31, 4 (2006).

[223]

Ross, M. 2006. Effectiveness in the European legal order(s): beyond supremacy to constitutional proportionality? *European Law Review*. 31, 4 (2006).

[224]

Roy W. Davis 2006. Liability in damages for a breach of Community law: some reflections on the question of who to sue and the concept of 'the State'. *European Law Review*. 31, 1 (2006).

[225]

de Ruyter, R. and Neuhold, C. Why Is Fast Track the Way to Go? Justifications for Early Agreement in the Co-Decision Procedure and Their Effects. *European Law Journal*. 18, 4, 536–554. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2012.00617.x>.

[226]

Sabel, C.F. and Gerstenberg, O. Constitutionalising an Overlapping Consensus: The ECJ and the Emergence of a Coordinate Constitutional Order. *European Law Journal*. 16, 5, 511–550. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2009.00521.x>.

[227]

Sabel, C.F. and Zeitlin, J. Learning from Difference: The New Architecture of Experimentalist Governance in the EU. *European Law Journal*. 14, 3, 271–327.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2008.00415.x>.

[228]

Schütze, R. 2007. Dual federalism constitutionalised: the emergence of exclusive competences in the EC legal order. *European Law Review*. 32, 1 (2007).

[229]

Schu

tze, R. 2016. *European constitutional law*. Cambridge University Press.

[230]

Schütze, R. 2015. *European Union law*. Cambridge University Press.

[231]

Schütze, R. 2009. Subsidiarity after Lisbon: Reinforcing the Safeguards of Federalism? *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 68, 3 (2009), 525–536.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197309990183>.

[232]

Schütze, R. 2009. Subsidiarity after Lisbon: Reinforcing the Safeguards of Federalism? *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 68, 3 (2009), 525–536.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197309990183>.

[233]

Sciicluna, N. When Failure isn't Failure: European Union Constitutionalism after the Lisbon Treaty. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 50, 3, 441–456.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02239.x>.

[234]

Shore, C. 'European Governance' or Governmentality? The European Commission and the Future of Democratic Government. *European Law Journal*. 17, 3, 287–303.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00551.x>.

[235]

Shuibhne, N.N. 2009. Margins of appreciation: national values, fundamental rights and EC free movement law. *European Law Review*. 34, 2 (2009), 230–256.

[236]

Shuibhne, N.N. 2009. Margins of appreciation: national values, fundamental rights and EC free movement law. *European Law Review*. 34, 2 (2009), 230–256.

[237]

Shuibhne, N.N. 2009. The reality of rights: from rhetoric to opt-out. *European Law Review*. 34, 6 (2009), 815–816.

[238]

Solanke, I. 'Stop the ECJ'? An Empirical Analysis of Activism at the Court. *European Law Journal*. 17, 6, 764–784. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00561.x>.

[239]

Steering Committee for Human Rights (CDDH) 14AD. Report to the Committee of Ministers on the elaboration of legal instruments for the accession of the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights. *statewatch: monitoring the state and civil liberties in Europe*. Council of Europe.

[240]

Szyszczyk, E. Experimental Governance: The Open Method of Coordination. *European Law Journal*. 12, 4, 486–502. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2006.00329.x>.

[241]

Thüsing, G. and Horler, S. 2010. Case C-555/07, Seda Küçükdeveci v. Swedex, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 19 January 2010. *Common Market Law Review*. 47, 4 (2010), 1161–1172.

[242]

Thüsing, G. and Horler, S. 2010. Case C-555/07, Seda Küçükdeveci v. Swedex, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 19 January 2010. *Common Market Law Review*. 10, 4 (2010), 1161–1172.

[243]

Thym, D. 2009. In the Name of Sovereign Statehood: A Critical Introduction to the Lisbon judgment of the German Constitutional Court. *Common Market Law Review*. 46, Issue 6 (Dec. 2009), 1795–1822. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2009074>.

[244]

Tison, M. 2005. Do not attack the watchdog! Banking supervisor's liability after Peter Paul. *Common Market Law Review*. 42, Issue 3 (Jun. 2005), 639–675. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2005024>.

[245]

Toth, A.G. 1994. Is subsidiarity justiciable? *European Law Review*. 19, 3 (1994).

[246]

Triantafyllou, D. 2002. The European Charter of Fundamental Rights and the "Rule of Law": Restricting Fundamental Rights by Reference. *Common Market Law Review*. 39, 1 (2002), 53–64.

[247]

Tridimas, T. 2001. Black, White, and Shades of Grey: Horizontality of Directives Revisited.

Yearbook of European Law. 21, 1 (2001), 327–354.

[248]

Tridimas, T. 2001. Liability for Breach of Community Law: Growing Up and Mellowing Down? *Common Market Law Review*. 38, Issue 2 (Apr. 2001), 301–332.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/334301>.

[249]

Tridimas, T. 2015. *The general principles of EU law*. Oxford University Press.

[250]

Tridimas, T. 2006. *The general principles of EU law*. Oxford University Press.

[251]

Trubek, D.M. and Trubek, L.G. Hard and Soft Law in the Construction of Social Europe: the Role of the Open Method of Co-ordination. *European Law Journal*. 11, 3, 343–364.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2005.00263.x>.

[252]

Van Gerven, W. Bridging the Unbridgeable: Community and National Tort Laws after Francovich and Brasserie. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*. 45, 3, 507–544.

[253]

Von Bogdandy, A. et al. 2012. Reverse Solange—Protecting the essence of fundamental rights against EU Member States. *Common Market Law Review*. 49, 2 (2012), 489–519.

[254]

Vossestein, Gert-Jan Cross-Border Transfer of Seat and Conversion of Companies under the EC Treaty Provisions on Freedom of Establishment. *European Company Law*. 6, 3, 115–123.

[255]

de Waele, H. and Broeksteeg, H. 2012. The semi-permanent European Council Presidency: Some reflections on the law and early practice. *Common Market Law Review*. 49, Issue 3 (Jun. 2012), 1039–1074. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2012038>.

[256]

Walker, N. The Idea of Constitutional Pluralism. *Modern Law Review*. 65, 3, 317–359. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.00383>.

[257]

Ward, I. 2009. *A critical introduction to European law*. Cambridge University Press.

[258]

Wattel, P.J. 2004. Köbler , CILFIT and Welthgrove : We can't go on meeting like this. *Common Market Law Review*. 41, Issue 1 (Feb. 2004), 177–190. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2003075>.

[259]

Wattel, P.J. 2004. Köbler , CILFIT and Welthgrove : We can't go on meeting like this. *Common Market Law Review*. 41, Issue 1 (Feb. 2004), 177–190. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2003075>.

[260]

Wattel, P.J. 2008. National Procedural Autonomy and Effectiveness of EC Law: Challenge the Charge, File for Restitution, Sue for Damages? *Legal Issues of Economic Integration*. 35, 2 (2008), 109–132.

[261]

Weatherill, S. 2016. *Cases and materials on EU law*. Oxford University Press.

[262]

Weiler, J.H.H. Does Europe Need a Constitution? Demos, Telos and the German Maastricht Decision. *European Law Journal*. 1, 3, 219–258.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.1995.tb00030.x>.

[263]

Weiler, J.H.H. and Lockhart, N.J.S. 1995. "Taking rights seriously" seriously: The European Court and its fundamental rights jurisprudence – part I. *Common Market Law Review*. 32, 1 (1995), 51–94.

[264]

Woods, L. et al. 2017. *Steiner & Woods EU law*. Oxford University Press.

[265]

Young, A.L. 2005. The Charter, Constitution and Human Rights: is this the Beginning or the End for Human Rights Protections by Community Law? *European Public Law*. 11, 2 (2005), 219–240.

[266]

Zbiral, R. 2012. Czech Constitutional Court, judgment of 31 January 2012, Pl. ÚS 5/12. A Legal revolution or negligible episode? Court of Justice decision proclaimed ultra vires. *Common Market Law Review*. 49, Issue 4 (Aug. 2012), 1475–1491.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2012072>.

[267]

Ziller, J. 2010. The German Constitutional Court's Friendliness towards European Law: On the Judgment of Bundesverfassungsgericht over the Ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon. *European Public Law*. 16, Issue 1 (Mar. 2010), 53–73.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/EURO2010004>.

[268]

2011. Editorial Comments: Delivering justice: Small and bigger steps at the ECJ. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, Issue 4 (Aug. 2011), 987–993.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2011040>.

[269]

2012. Editorial Comments: Fundamental rights and EU membership: Do as I say, not as I do! *Common Market Law Review*. 49, Issue 2 (Apr. 2012), 481–488.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2012017>.

[270]

2006. Editorial Comments: Horizontal direct effect – A law of diminishing coherence? *Common Market Law Review*. 43, Issue 1 (Feb. 2006), 1–8.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2006001>.

[271]

2010. Editorial Comments: The post-Lisbon institutional package: Do old habits die hard? *Common Market Law Review*. 47, Issue 3 (Jun. 2010), 597–604.  
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/COLA2010027>.

[272]

*European Law Journal*. 14, 6: Special Issue.

[273]

2010. Knocking on Heaven's Door: Fragmentation, Efficiency and Defiance in the Preliminary Reference Procedure. *Common Market Law Review*. 40, Issue 1 (Jun. 2010), 9–50. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.54648/5115417>.

[274]

2010. The scope of application of the general principles of Union law: An ever expanding Union? *Common Market Law Review*. 47, 6 (2010), 1589–1596.



[275]

2010. The scope of application of the general principles of Union law: An ever expanding Union? *Common Market Law Review*. 47, 6 (2010), 1589–1596.