TRUNG TÂM PHÁP LUẬT ĐỨC / GERMAN LAW CENTRE Prof. Dr. Thomas Schmitz

Semester 2, 2013/14

EU INTERNAL MARKET LAW

concerning § 4 IV The concepts of sphere of protection, enroachment and limits of the fundamental freedoms

Diagram 6

Violation of a fundamental freedom

(general structure of examination)

I. Sphere/scope¹ of protection ["Schutzbereich"]

- = is the FF concerned?
- 1) Geographic and temporal sphere of protection
 - a) Measure having affect within the geographic field of application of the FEU Treaty
 - b) No temporary non-applicability of the FF due to special clauses in the treaty of accession (→ concerns new member states)
- *2) Personal sphere of protection*
 - a) Holder (entitled subject) of the FF
 - aa) Citizen of a member state
 - bb) Legal person ("company or firm") having its registered office, central administration or principle place of business in a member state (cf. art. 54 FEU Treaty)
 - wide concept of "companies or firms" (including partnerships and legal persons of public law)
 - cc) In some cases: citizen or legal person from a non-member state
 - protection according to the conception of the FF (→ free movement of goods, of capital and payments) or to international treaties (→ Switzerland, Turkey)
 - b) If necessary fulfillment of special personal requirements
- *3) Material sphere of protection*²
 - a) Situation of cross-border mobility (\rightarrow relevance of Union law)
 - b) Protected activity of the holder of the FF
 - see *diagram 5*; every FF includes the right to the necessary traveling and residence in other member states
 c) No excluded sector
 - cf. art. 45(4), 51 sub.-sect. 1 FEU Treaty

II. Encroachment/interference ["Beeinträchtigung"]³

- 1) Acting of an addressee (obliged subject) of the FF
 - \bullet can consist also in a failure to do something (\rightarrow duties of protection)
 - a) Acting of a member state
 - also of sub-national public authorities and private-law institutions dominated by public authorities
 - b) Acting of a Union institution
 - c) Only in exceptional cases: Acting of a private person with a position of special economic power
 - general regulations of private associations (eg on professional sports) which hinder the exercise of the FF (→ ECJ, Walrave and Koch; ECJ, Bosman)
 - collective agreements and collective actions of trade unions (\rightarrow ECJ, Laval)
 - general regulations of employers which hinder the exercise of the FF (\rightarrow ECJ, Angonese)

¹ In English, both terms and also the terms "area of protection" and "protected area" are common.

² In English, some authors also use the terms "substantive sphere", "substantive scope" or "subject matter of protection".

³ In English, both terms are common. Note that they do not necessarily mean "violation" (= "infringement"). Only an encroachment/interference that is not justified by the freedom's limits is considered as a violation of the freedom.

- Diagram 6 (EU Internal Market Law [Hanoi]), page 2 -

2) Acting to be qualified as discrimination or restriction

a) Discrimination

- aa) Open (direct) discrimination
 - formally different treatment of domestic and foreign goods/services/persons etc
- bb) Hidden (indirect) discrimination
- formally equal treatment, which however typically has a stronger effect on foreign goods/services/persons etc b) Restriction
- - aa) Rule capable of hindering, directly or indirectly, actually or potentially, intra-union economic exchange • original, very broad concept of restriction of the ECJ (since ECJ, Dassonville)
 - not the aim of the measure is decisive but the (potential) effect
 - bb) Product-related rules, not rules on general conditions of sale • corrective reduction of the concept of restriction by the ECJ (since ECJ, Keck)
 - cc) Comprehensible relation between measure and restrictive effect (rule of remoteness) • no restriction, if the effects are too vague or too indirect

III. Illegality of the encroachment/interference (no justification by the fundamental freedom's limits ["Schranken"])

- 1) Justification by explicit limits
 - see art. 36, 45(3), 52(1) (also read together with art. 62), 64 et seq. FEU Treaty
 - a) Fulfillment of the preconditions of the limitation clause • most important grounds of justification: public policy (= public order), public security, public health
 - b) Compliance with the *limits of limits* ["Schranken-Schranken"]
 - aa) Proportionality of the encroachment
 - α) Legitimate aim
 - β) Suitability (measure must be conducive to its purpose)
 - γ) Necessity (there must be no less intrusive act of intervention that is equally conducive)
 - δ) Proportionality in its strict sense (burden not out of proportion to the aim in view)
 - bb) No violation of fundamental rights
 - cc) No violation of other primary or secondary law of the Union
- 2) Justification by inherent limits ["immanente Schranken"]
 - a) Applicability of the inherent limits (only to restrictions and hidden discriminations)
 - b) Fulfillment of the preconditions of the inherent limits: pursuit of *imperative (overriding⁴) reasons of public* interest
 - only non-economic interests; eg protection of the environment, public health, consumer protection, safeguard of the national cultural heritage, efficient control in tax affairs, integrity of trade, free exercise of fundamental rights
 - c) Compliance with the limits of limits (see above)

Note: This diagram only presents the basic structure which is common to all fundamental freedoms, due to their convergence in the jurisdiction of the ECJ. When applied to the concrete case, it has to be adapted to the special features of the respective freedom.

Further reading: See for the general structure of examination and its dogmatic backgrounds Ehlers, in: Ehlers (editor), European Fundamental Rights and Freedoms, 2007, § 7; Frenz, Handbuch Europarecht, volume 1, 2004, no. 42 ff., 346 ff.; Jarass, A Unified Approach to the Fundamental Freedoms, in: Andenas/Roth (editors), Services and Free Movement in EU Law, 2002, p. 141 ff.; Kingreen, Fundamental Freedoms, in: von Bogdandy/Bast (editors), Principles of European Constitutional Law, 2006, p. 549 ff. A more detailed diagram can be found at http://home.lu.lv/~tschmit1/Downloads/Schmitz EC-IntML diagram2.pdf.

(Datei: Diagram 6 (EUIntML-HLU))

⁴ Misleading term often used in English translations (French: "exigences impératives", German: "zwingende Gründe").