

## INDEX

- Abortion, procedural review and, 137–138, 144, 147–148, 164
- Administrative decision-making, procedural review of  
 overview, 45–46, 158  
 arbitrariness, protection against, 137  
 ECHR, procedural requirements regarding under, 136–140  
 fundamental rights compared, 46–47  
 informed consent requirement, 137–138  
 ‘pick and choose’ approach, 159  
 procedural invalidity, 46  
 quality of decision-making, 150  
 supportive rather than decisive, procedural arguments as, 159  
 taking ECHR standards into account, 138–140  
 in United Kingdom  
 generally, 244, 251–252  
 under Human Rights Act 1998 (UK), 256–262, 267–268
- Adoption, procedural review and, 148, 151–152, 154–155
- Agreement on Preshipment Inspection, 220, 226, 230
- Agreement on Rules of Origin, 210–211, 228
- Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement), 210–211, 230
- Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), 210–211, 214, 216, 217, 219, 220, 226
- Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), 210–211, 214, 215–216, 219, 220, 225–226
- Agreement on Trade Facilitation, 214–215
- Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), 214, 215, 230, 231
- Alemanno, A., 80, 81, 82
- Allan, T.R.S., 267
- Allison, J.W.F., 50
- Anti-Dumping Agreement, 214, 226, 230
- Application of procedural review  
 overview, 10–12  
 administrative decision-making, procedural review of (*See* Administrative decision-making, procedural review of)  
 in CJEU (*See* Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU))  
 court perspective on procedural review in ECtHR (*See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR))  
 judicial decision-making, procedural review of (*See* Judicial decision-making, procedural review of)  
 legislation, procedural review of (*See* Legislation, procedural review of)  
 typology of procedural review in ECtHR, 10, 127–130, 158–160  
 in United Kingdom (*See* United Kingdom)  
 in WTO Appellate Body (*See* World Trade Organization (WTO) Appellate Body)
- Arbitrariness, protection against, 137
- Armed forces, procedural review and, 89
- Aronson, M., 46

- Arrest, procedural review and, 27, 118
- Assisted suicide, procedural review and, 169–170
- Asylum, procedural review and, 179–180
- Audiovisual Media Directive (EU), 195–196, 199–200
- Australia, judicial restraint in, 51
- Austria, evidence-based legislation in, 89
- Autonomous process value  
 overview, 7, 38–39  
 in administrative process, 27–28  
 Charter of Fundamental Rights and, 27–29  
 ECHR and, 27, 28–29  
 in judicial process, 27  
 in parliamentary process, 28  
 ranking of procedural review rationales, 32–34  
 rationale for, 27  
 role of procedural review in, 29  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural review’ and, 37–38  
 type of procedural review in, 28–29
- Auxiliary character of procedural arguments, 175–176
- Bar-Siman-Tov, I., 2
- Begum, Shabina, 64–66
- Begum v. Denbigh High School* (UK 2006), 64–74  
 generally, 245  
 background, 64–66  
 in Court of Appeal, 66, 68–70  
 deference in, 67–68  
 ECtHR compared, 72–74  
 in House of Lords, 66–70  
 Human Rights Act 1998 and, 64, 65, 69, 257–262  
 judicial restraint in, 67, 70–72  
 supranational courts compared, 72–74  
 tempered exercise of procedural review in, 70–72  
 traditional approach in, 66–67
- Bejer, Malu, 11, 13
- Belgium, evidence-based legislation in, 87, 91
- Benhabib, S., 44, 58
- Bentham, Jeremy, 49
- Besson, S., 186
- Better Lawmaking Programme (EU), 98–99
- Better Regulation Programme (EU)  
 overview, 9  
 CJEU and, 120–122  
 Data Retention Directive and, 112  
 ECtHR and, 120  
 evidence-based legislation and, 85, 86  
 responsiveness in EU legislation and, 97, 98–101  
 timing considerations, 118
- Boley, Bärbel, 166
- Brems, Eva, 7, 48
- Brighton Declaration, 62, 81, 172
- Canada  
 deference in, 52–53  
 substantive review in, 1
- Charter of Fundamental Rights (EU)  
 generally, 11, 181, 207–208  
 autonomous process value and, 27–29  
 CJEU and, 184  
 disability discrimination under, 192, 197–198, 204, 206–207  
 effective remedy, right to, 184  
 evidence-based legislation and, 85  
 gender discrimination under, 193  
 good administration, right to, 184  
 privacy under, 194  
 proportionality under, 199–200, 206
- Chief Scientific Adviser (EU), 119
- Child abuse, procedural review and, 137–138
- Christoffersen, Jonas, 19
- Comity, ECtHR and, 61
- Comparative perspectives on procedural review  
 overview, 10–12  
 in CJEU (*See* Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU))

- Comparative perspectives (cont.)  
 court perspective on procedural review in ECtHR (*See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR))  
 in ECtHR (*See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR))  
 typology of procedural review in ECtHR, 10, 127–130, 158–160  
 in United Kingdom (*See* United Kingdom)  
 in WTO Appellate Body (*See* World Trade Organization (WTO) Appellate Body)
- Complementarity between ECtHR and United Kingdom, 270–271
- Council Framework Decision on PNR Data, 118, 122
- Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)  
 overview, 11, 177–178, 207–208  
*Afton Chemical* case (2010), 121  
 Better Regulation Programme and, 120–122  
 Charter of Fundamental Rights and, 184  
*Commission v. Kadi* (2013), 188–190, 202–203, 205  
*Corsten* case (2000), 186  
*Council/In 't Veld* case (2014), 114  
 Data Retention Directive and, 97, 108, 111, 112, 118, 121, 122, 123  
 deference in, 179–182  
 deportation and, 186  
*Digital Rights Ireland* case (2014), 97, 102, 108, 111, 112, 118, 122, 123, 190, 194, 196, 197, 198–199, 205  
 disability discrimination and, 192, 197–198, 204, 206–207  
*Dynamic Medien* case (2008), 187–188, 200–201  
 ECtHR compared, 180  
 effective remedy, right to, 184  
 EU legislation, procedural review of  
 overview, 190–200, 202–207  
 accessibility in, 193–196  
 foreseeability in, 193–196  
 judicial review, availability of, 196–197  
 procedural arguments in, 191–197  
 quality of legislative process in, 191–193  
 substantive review and, 197–200, 205–206  
 EU sanctions, procedural review of, 188–190  
 evaluation of, 200–207  
 evidence-based legislation and, 9, 85  
 evolution of procedural review in, 2  
 findings regarding, 13  
 fundamental rights in, 180–182  
 gender discrimination and, 192–193, 203–204  
*Glatzel* case (2014), 190, 192, 197–198, 204, 206–207  
 good administration, right to, 184  
 impact assessment and, 204–205  
 individualisation and, 206  
*J.N.* case (2016), 190  
*Kadi and Al Barakaat* case (2008), 188–190, 202–203, 205  
*Mangold* case (2005), 184  
 national authorities, procedural review of actions of  
 overview, 183–188, 200–202  
 procedural obligations in, 183–185  
 proportionality in, 185–188, 199–200, 206  
*Neptune Distribution* case (2015), 190  
*Omega* case (2014), 186  
 privacy and, 198–199  
 Roaming Regulation and, 120  
 sanctions, procedural review of, 188–190  
*Schmidberger* case (2003), 187  
*Schrems* case (2015), 102, 190, 194–195, 196–197, 199, 204–205  
*Schwarz* case (2013), 190, 195, 199, 204  
 scope of procedural review, 182–183  
*Sky Österreich* case (2013), 190, 195–196, 199–200, 206

- Spain v. Council* (2006),  
 120–121, 123  
 states, procedural obligations  
 imposed on, 3  
 subsidiarity in, 179–182  
 substantive review in, 1  
*Test-Achats* case (2011), 179, 190,  
 192–193, 197, 203–204,  
 205–206  
*UPC Telekabel Wien* case (2013), 185  
*Vodafone* case (2015), 120, 123  
*Volker and Markus Schecke* case  
 (2010), 121, 123, 179, 190–192,  
 198, 203, 204, 205–206  
*ZZ* case (2013), 184–185  
 Court perspective on procedural review  
 in ECtHR. *See* European Court  
 of Human Rights (ECtHR)  
 Custody of children, procedural review  
 and, 151–152  
 Customs Valuation Agreement,  
 226, 231
- Data Retention Directive (EU),  
 107–112  
 generally, 9  
 overview, 97  
 alternatives to, 108–109  
 Better Regulation Programme  
 and, 112  
 CJEU and, 97, 108, 111, 112, 118,  
 121, 122, 123  
 foreseeability and accessibility in  
 procedural review of EU  
 legislation, 194  
 impact assessment of, 108  
 judicial review, availability in  
 procedural review of EU  
 legislation, 196, 197  
 metadata, collection of, 107–108  
 Regulatory Scrutiny Board and, 112  
 Defamation, ‘substance-flavoured  
 procedural review’ and, 36–37  
 Deference  
 in *Begum* case, 67–68  
 in Canada, 52–53  
 in CJEU, 179–182  
 in ECtHR, 247  
 judicial restraint and, 52–53  
 in United Kingdom, 53  
 in United States, 52–53  
 Definition of procedural review,  
 47–48  
 Deliberation on fundamental rights  
 administrative law compared, 46–47  
 courts as proper forum for, 42  
 deliberative democracy theory and,  
 57–58  
 in ECtHR, 47–48  
 features of, 59  
 fundamental rights as procedural  
 rights, 45  
 incentivising, 56–60  
 judicialisation and, 60  
 moral and ethical principles versus  
 legal rights, 42–44  
 nature of, 41–45  
 public reason and, 43  
 quality of, 59  
 subsidiarity and, 44–45  
 uniformity and, 44–45  
 Deliberative democracy theory, 57–58  
 Denmark, positive procedural review of  
 legislation in, 143  
 Deportation  
 CJEU and, 186  
 judicial decision-making, procedural  
 review of, 151  
 margin of appreciation and, 174  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural  
 review’ and, 36–37  
 Design of human rights review, 41  
 Detention, procedural review and,  
 27, 118  
 ‘Dilemma’ cases, procedural review in  
 overview, 158  
 judicial decision-making, procedural  
 review of, 153  
 legislation, procedural review of,  
 147–148  
 Disability discrimination, procedural  
 review and, 192, 197–198, 204,  
 206–207  
 Disenfranchisement, procedural review  
 and, 173  
 Doha Declaration, 212–213

- Doha Development Round, 214  
 Domestic violence, procedural review  
   and, 137–138, 151–152  
 Douwma, W., 119  
 Due process  
   generally, 45  
   in ECtHR, 88  
   in WTO Appellate Body, 212,  
   224–225, 231–232, 237–238  
 Dworkin, Ronald, 43  
 Dyzenhaus, D., 55
- ECHR. *See* European Convention on  
 Human Rights (ECHR)  
 ECtHR. *See* European Court of Human  
 Rights (ECtHR)  
 Effective remedy, right to, 184  
 Elections, procedural requirements  
   regarding, 132–133  
 Estonia, judicial decision-making,  
   procedural review of, 152  
 Ethical principles versus legal rights,  
   42–44  
 European Anti-Poverty Network, 113  
 European Arrest Warrant, 103  
 European Commission  
   Better Regulation Programme  
   and, 121  
   Data Retention Directive and, 108  
   problem analysis, improving,  
   103–104  
   responsiveness in EU legislation and,  
   96, 99–101, 106–107  
   transparency of legislative preparatory  
   process and, 113–114  
 European Convention on Human  
 Rights (ECHR)  
   administrative decision-making,  
   procedural requirements  
   regarding, 136–140  
   autonomous process value and, 27,  
   28–29  
   fair trial and, 19–20, 27  
   Human Rights Act 1998 (UK) and,  
   251, 256–262  
   judicial decision-making, procedural  
   requirements regarding,  
   136–140  
   legislation, procedural requirements  
   regarding, 131–136  
   margin of appreciation and, 173–174  
   moral and ethical principles versus  
   legal rights, 43  
   overlap in interpretation of  
   provisions, 171–172  
   procedural requirements under,  
   130–131  
   process efficacy and, 17  
   religious freedom under, 64, 66–67,  
   68, 69, 70, 71, 166–167  
   subsidiarity and, 22, 270  
 European Council  
   Better Regulation Programme  
   and, 121  
   Council Framework Decision on  
   PNR Data, 118, 122  
   interaction between instruments  
   and, 116  
   responsiveness in EU legislation and,  
   96, 99  
   timing considerations, 117–118  
   transparency of legislative preparatory  
   process and, 113, 114  
 European Court of Auditors, 117  
 European Court of Human Rights  
 (ECtHR)  
   *A, B and C v. Ireland* (2010), 164  
   overview, 245–250  
   administrative decision-making,  
   procedural review of (*See*  
   Administrative decision-  
   making, procedural review of)  
   *Al Khawaja and Tahery v. United*  
   *Kingdom* (2011), 170  
   *Anchugov and Gladkov v. Russia*  
   (2013), 93  
   *Animal Defenders International v.*  
   *United Kingdom* (2013), 90–91,  
   92, 135, 248, 249–250  
   *Assenov and Others v. Bulgaria*  
   (2002), 175  
   autonomous process value and (*See*  
   Autonomous process value)  
   *Baio v. Denmark* (2014), 143  
   Better Regulation Programme  
   and, 120

- CJEU compared, 180  
 comity and, 61  
 complementarity and, 270–271  
 deference in, 247  
 deliberation on fundamental rights  
   in, 47–48  
 discretion regarding, 249–250  
 due process in, 88  
 elections, procedural requirements  
   regarding, 132–133  
*Evans v. United Kingdom* (2007),  
   134–135  
 evidence and, 246  
 evidence-based legislation and, 8–9,  
   80–81, 83–84, 85–86, 88–93, 94  
 evolution of procedural review in, 2  
*Fabris v. France* (2013), 139–140  
 fair trial and, 161  
 findings regarding, 13  
 freedom of expression, procedural  
   requirements regarding,  
   132–133  
*Frödl v. Austria* (2010), 173  
*Handyside v. United Kingdom*  
   (1976), 53  
*Hannover (No. 3) v. Germany*  
   (2013), 174  
*Hatton v. United Kingdom* (2001),  
   89, 91, 245  
*Hirst v. United Kingdom* (2005), 88,  
   90, 92, 143–144, 162–163, 167,  
   246–247  
 Human Rights Act 1998 (UK) and,  
   243, 245, 256  
 importance level, 130  
 individualisation in legislation and,  
   133–136  
 institutional capacity and, 61  
 interest in quality of domestic  
   process, 18  
 judicial decision-making, procedural  
   review of (See Judicial decision-  
   making, procedural review of)  
 judicial dialogue in, 23  
*Julin v. Estonia* (2012), 152  
*Konstantin Markin v. Russia* (2010),  
   91–92  
*Krivitska and Kryvitskyy v. Ukraine*  
   (2010), 91–92  
 legislation, procedural review of (See  
   Legislation, procedural  
   review of)  
 legitimacy and, 61  
*Lindheim v. Norway* (2006), 142–143  
 margin of appreciation in, 48, 53,  
   248–249  
*Markin v. Russian Federation* (2012),  
   162, 167  
*Martinez v. Spain* (2015), 245–246  
*Maurice v. France* (2005), 141–142,  
   145, 163–164  
*McCann v. United Kingdom*  
   (1995), 175  
 minority rights, procedural  
   requirements regarding  
   protection of, 133  
*National Union of RMT Workers v.*  
*United Kingdom* (2014), 93  
*Neulinger and Shuruk v. Switzerland*  
   (2010), 172–173  
*Nicklinson and Lamb v. United*  
*Kingdom* (2015), 247  
 perspective on procedural review  
   overview, 10  
   applicants' perspective on  
   procedural justice, 166–167  
   auxiliary character of procedural  
   arguments, 175–176  
   context of procedural turn in case  
   law, 172–173  
   difficulties in evaluating decision-  
   making procedure on national  
   level, 167–169  
   explicit versus implicit procedural  
   review, 163–164  
   margin of appreciation and,  
   173–175  
   ‘micro-justice,’ 169–170  
   minority rights, insufficient  
   protection of, 167  
   overlap in interpretation of ECHR  
   provisions, 171–172  
   parallel developments in national  
   law, 164–165

- European Court of Human (cont.)  
 procedure as key element in justice, 161  
 risks in procedural review, 162–163  
*Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra* (2004), 139  
 positive inferences in procedural review, 3–4  
*Pretty v. United Kingdom* (2002), 169–170  
 prisoner voting rights, procedural requirements regarding, 133–136  
 procedural fairness and (*See* Procedural fairness)  
 procedural turn in, 17  
 process efficacy and (*See* Process efficacy)  
 proportionality in, 245  
 responsiveness in EU legislation and, 95  
 rule of law and, 132  
*S.A.S. v. France* (2014), 145, 163–164, 167  
*Schiith v. Germany* (2010), 166–167  
*Scoppola (No. 3) v. Italy* (2012), 173  
*Shindler v. United Kingdom* (2013), 93  
 states, procedural obligations imposed on, 3  
 subsidiarity and, 61–63, 270–271 (*See also* Subsidiarity)  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural review’ and (*See* ‘Substance-flavoured procedural review’)  
 substantive review in, 1  
 supplementary nature of, 245–246  
*Tunç v. Turkey* (2013), 171–172  
 United Kingdom compared, 11–12, 242–245, 270–271  
 WTO Appellate Body compared, 210, 212  
*X. v. Austria* (2013), 148  
*X. v. Latvia* (2013), 165, 172–173  
 European Court of Justice (ECJ). *See* Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)  
 European Ombudsman, 114
- European Parliament  
 Better Regulation Programme and, 121  
 interaction between instruments and, 116  
 responsiveness in EU legislation and, 96, 99  
 timing considerations, 117–118  
 transparency of legislative preparatory process and, 113, 114  
 European Public Prosecutor’s Office, 105  
 European Union  
 accessibility in procedural review of legislation, 193–196  
 Audiovisual Media Directive, 195–196, 199–200  
 Better Regulation Programme (*See* Better Regulation Programme (EU))  
 Charter of Fundamental Rights (*See* Charter of Fundamental Rights (EU))  
 Chief Scientific Adviser, 119  
 CJEU (*See* Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU))  
 Data Retention Directive (*See* Data Retention Directive (EU))  
 foreseeability in procedural review of legislation, 193–196  
 General Data Protection Regulation, 106  
 judicial review, availability in procedural review of legislation, 196–197  
 legislation, procedural review of  
 accessibility in, 193–196  
 by CJEU, 190–200, 202–207  
 foreseeability in, 193–196  
 judicial review, availability of, 196–197  
 procedural arguments in, 191–197  
 quality of legislative process in, 191–193  
 substantive review and, 197–200, 205–206  
 procedural arguments in procedural review of legislation, 191–197



- quality of legislative process in  
 procedural review of legislation,  
 191–193
- regulatory equality requirement in,  
 98–101
- Regulatory Scrutiny Board (*See*  
 Regulatory Scrutiny  
 Board (EU))
- responsiveness in legislation (*See*  
 Responsiveness in EU  
 legislation)
- Returns Directive, 118
- Roaming Regulation, 120
- sanctions, procedural review of,  
 188–190
- substantive review of legislation,  
 197–200, 205–206
- Visa Information System, 118
- White Paper on European  
 Governance, 98, 116
- Euthanasia, procedural review and,  
 144, 147–148
- Evidence-based legislation  
 overview, 8–9, 79–81, 93–94  
 in Austria, 89  
 in Belgium, 87, 91  
 Better Regulation Programme and,  
 85, 86  
 Charter of Fundamental Rights  
 and, 85  
 CJEU and, 9, 85  
 ECtHR and, 8–9, 80–81, 83–84,  
 85–86, 88–93, 94  
 factors influencing, 86–88  
 in Finland, 87  
 in France, 87, 89  
 in Germany, 83  
 judicial mandate and, 82–83  
 judicial reflex and, 80, 81, 89  
 procedural review as trigger for,  
 84–86  
 rational policymaking and, 82  
 in Russia, 89, 91–92  
 as trigger for procedural review,  
 81–84  
 in United Kingdom, 83, 88, 93
- Evolution of procedural review, 2
- Explicit procedural review, 163–164
- Fair trial  
 generally, 45  
 in ECHR, 19–20, 27  
 in ECtHR, 161  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural  
 review’ and, 37–38
- Family law, 134, 151–152, 154–155, 156
- Feedback loop in procedural review,  
 4, 8
- Finland, evidence-based legislation  
 in, 87
- Foundations for procedural review  
 overview, 7–8  
 autonomous process value (*See*  
 Autonomous process value)  
 findings regarding, 12–13  
 modest promise of, 7–8, 40–41, 63,  
 74–76 (*See also specific topic*)  
 procedural fairness (*See* Procedural  
 fairness)  
 process efficacy (*See* Process efficacy)  
 subsidiarity (*See* Subsidiarity)
- France  
 evidence-based legislation in, 87, 89  
 Islamic garments in, 163–164  
 legislation, procedural review of, 145  
 positive procedural review of  
 legislation in, 141–142
- Frankfurter, Felix, 161
- Freedom of expression  
 ECHR procedural requirements  
 regarding, 132–133  
 judicial decision-making, procedural  
 review of, 151, 156
- Fuller, L.L., 50
- GATS. *See* General Agreement on  
 Trade in Services (GATS)
- GATT. *See* General Agreement on  
 Tariffs and Trade (GATT)
- Gender discrimination, procedural  
 review and, 192–193, 206
- General Agreement on Tariffs and  
 Trade (GATT)  
 generally, 210–211, 214, 215–216, 217  
 administration of measures and,  
 227–230  
 administrative review and, 230–232



- General Agreement on Tariffs (cont.)  
 Article X:1, 219–225, 228–229, 241  
 Article X:2, 220–221, 222  
 Article X:3, 227, 228–229, 230–232,  
 235, 237, 238–239, 241  
 Article XX, 232–239, 241  
 ‘chapeau’ of Article XX, 233,  
 234–239, 240  
 discrimination under, 233, 234–238  
 judicial review and, 230–232  
 restraint of trade under, 234–235  
 transparency under, 219–225  
 General Agreement on Trade in  
 Services (GATS), 214, 215, 226  
 General Data Protection Regulation  
 (EU), 106  
 Gerards, Janneke, 10, 13, 47, 48, 95, 120,  
 163, 173, 191, 197  
 Germany  
 evidence-based legislation in, 83  
 judicial dialogue in, 23  
 substantive review in, 1  
 Good administration, right to, 184  
 Groves, M., 46  
 Guardianship, 151–152  
  
 Habermas, Jürgen, 44  
 Hague Convention on International  
 Child Abduction, 172–173  
 Harlow, C., 46  
 Hooper, B., 134  
 Human Rights Act 1998 (UK),  
 procedural review under  
 generally, 83  
 overview, 11–12, 13, 250–251,  
 254–256  
 of administrative decision-making,  
 256–262, 267–268  
*Begum* case and, 64, 65, 69, 257–262  
*Belfast City Council v. Miss Behavin’  
 Ltd.* (2007), 257, 258, 259–260,  
 266–267  
*Doherty v. Birmingham City Council*  
 (2008), 262  
 ECHR and, 251, 256–262  
 ECtHR and, 243, 245, 256  
 Joint Parliamentary Committee on  
 Human Rights, 255  
 of legislation, 262–265, 268–270  
 moderated approach to, 265–270  
 obligations on public authorities,  
 avoiding, 256–262  
 proportionality and, 251, 266  
*R. (Quark Fishing) v. Secretary of  
 State for Foreign and  
 Commonwealth Affairs*  
 (2006), 259  
 self-restraint and, 51, 53  
 substantive review compared,  
 243–244  
 Human trafficking, procedural review  
 and, 137–138  
  
 Immigration, procedural review and,  
 29, 151, 156  
 Impact assessment  
 overview, 99–101  
 choice, providing decision-makers  
 with, 105–106  
 in CJEU, 204–205  
 Data Retention Directive and, 108  
*ex ante* versus *ex post* evaluation, 116  
 interaction between instruments  
 and, 116  
 methods of, 114–115  
 pitfalls involving, 106–107  
 problem analysis, improving, 102–104  
 timing considerations, 117–118  
 transparency of preparatory process,  
 113–114  
 unnecessary action, preventing,  
 104–105  
 use of evidence and, 118–119  
 Impact Assessment Board (EU). *See*  
 Regulatory Scrutiny Board (EU)  
 Implicit procedural review, 163–164  
 Informed consent requirement,  
 137–138  
 Institutional humility, 48–49, 54–55  
 Institutional value of procedural  
 review, 5  
 Inter-Institutional Agreement on  
 Better lawmaking (EU),  
 121, 123  
 International child abduction, 137–138,  
 172–173

- International Trade Organization (ITO), 220
- Ireland  
 abortion in, 164  
 judicial restraint in, 51
- Islamic garments, 64–66, 163–164, 257–262
- Jacob, K., 116
- Jilbab* (Islamic garment), 64–66
- Judicial decision-making, procedural review of  
 overview, 149–150, 158  
 arbitrariness, protection against, 137  
 deportation, 151  
 difficulties in evaluating decision-making procedure on national level, 167–169  
 in ‘dilemma’ cases, 153  
 ECHR, procedural requirements regarding under, 136–140  
 in Estonia, 152  
 freedom of expression, 151, 156  
 informed consent requirement, 137–138  
 negative procedural review of, 154–155  
 no procedural review of, 155–158  
 partnership concept, 149–150  
 ‘pick and choose’ approach, 159  
 positive procedural review of, 150–154  
 in socio-economic cases, 153  
 supportive rather than decisive, procedural arguments as, 159  
 taking ECHR standards into account, 138–140
- Judicialisation, 60
- Judicial minimalism, 52
- Judicial perspective on procedural review in ECtHR. *See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
- Judicial restraint  
 as advantage of procedural review, 4  
 attempts to limit, 51  
 in Australia, 51  
 in *Begum* case, 67, 70–72  
 deference and, 52–53  
 epistemic limitations on, 50  
 in fundamental rights adjudication, 49–53  
 institutional capacity and, 50  
 in Ireland, 51  
 judicial minimalism, 52  
 legitimacy and, 49–50  
 negative inferences and, 54–56  
 in New Zealand, 51  
 positive inferences and, 54  
 pragmatic limitations on, 50–51  
 procedural review as variant of, 54–56  
 remedial restraint, 52  
 self-restraint, 51–52  
 in United Kingdom, 51
- Judicial review  
 CJEU, availability in, 196  
 at common law, 250  
 EU legislation, availability of in procedural review of, 196–197  
 under GATT, 230–232  
 subsidiarity compared, 61–63  
 in WTO Appellate Body, 230–232
- Kartner, Fay, 9
- Kavanagh, A., 54, 73, 254, 264
- Keyaerts, D., 121
- Klug, Francesca, 60
- Kühling, J., 201
- Laeken Summit, 98
- Legislation, procedural review of  
 overview, 140–141, 149, 158  
 Denmark, positive procedural review of legislation in, 143  
 in ‘dilemma’ cases, 147–148  
 ECHR, procedural requirements under, 131–136  
 elections, procedural requirements regarding, 132–133  
 EU legislation  
 accessibility in, 193–196  
 by CJEU, 190–200, 202–207  
 foreseeability in, 193–196

- Legislation, procedural review (cont.)  
 judicial review, availability of, 196–197  
 procedural arguments in, 191–197  
 quality of legislative process in, 191–193  
 substantive review and, 197–200, 205–206  
 evidence-based legislation (*See* Evidence-based legislation)  
 France, positive procedural review of legislation in, 141–142  
 freedom of expression, procedural requirements regarding, 132–133  
 individualisation in, 133–136  
 minority rights, procedural requirements regarding protection of, 133  
 negative procedural review of, 143–144  
 Norway, positive procedural review of legislation in, 142–143  
 ‘pick and choose’ approach, 159  
 positive procedural review of, 141–143  
 prisoner voting rights, procedural requirements regarding, 133–136  
 procedural-type arguments, importance of in procedural review, 144–146  
 responsiveness in EU legislation (*See* Responsiveness in EU legislation)  
 rule of law and, 132  
 in socio-economic cases, 146–147  
 supportive rather than decisive, procedural arguments as, 159  
 types of cases in which procedural review applied, 146–148  
 in United Kingdom  
 generally, 244, 252–254  
 under Human Rights Act 1998 (UK), 262–265, 268–270  
 negative procedural review of legislation, 143–144
- Legitimacy  
 ECtHR and, 61  
 judicial restraint and, 49–50
- Legitimate expectations, doctrine of, 252  
 Lenaerts, Koen, 120, 121, 179, 240–241  
 Lisbon Summit, 98  
 Lisbon Treaty, 116
- Mandelkern Group, 98  
 Margin of appreciation in ECtHR, 48, 53, 173–175, 248–249  
 Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO Agreement), 213–214, 216  
 Masterman, Roger, 11–12, 13  
 Mead, D., 252  
 Messerschmidt, K., 84–85  
 Meuwese, Anne, 9  
 ‘Micro-justice,’ 169–170  
 Minority rights  
 insufficient protection of, 167  
 procedural requirements regarding protection of, 133  
 Minto, R., 101–102  
 Modest promise of procedural review, 7–8, 40–41, 63, 74–76. *See also specific topic*  
 Moral principles versus legal rights, 42–44  
 Morijn, J., 181
- Negative procedural review  
 ECtHR, negative inferences in, 246–247  
 of judicial decision-making, 154–155  
 judicial restraint and, 54–56  
 of legislation, 143–144  
 New Zealand, judicial restraint in, 51  
 Non-intervention as advantage of procedural review, 4  
 Norway, positive procedural review of legislation in, 142–143  
 Nussberger, Angelika, 10, 48
- Open remedies, 52  
 Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), evidence-based legislation and, 82, 86, 87

- Paternity, procedural review and, 151–152, 154–155
- Political science perspectives on procedural review  
 overview, 8–9  
 Better Regulation Programme (*See* Better Regulation Programme (EU))  
 evidence-based legislation (*See* Evidence-based legislation)
- Popelier, Patricia, 8–9, 13, 47, 129, 180
- Positive procedural review  
 of judicial decision-making, 150–154  
 of legislation, 141–143  
 positive inferences in procedural review, 3–4
- Potential value of procedural review  
 overview, 8–9  
 Better Regulation Programme (*See* Better Regulation Programme (EU))  
 evidence-based legislation (*See* Evidence-based legislation)
- Pragmatic value of procedural review, 5
- Prisoner voting rights  
 procedural requirements regarding, 133–136, 146  
 in United Kingdom, 246–247
- Privacy  
 under Charter of Fundamental Rights, 194  
 CJEU and, 198–199  
 Data Retention Directive and, 107–112 (*See also* Data Retention Directive (EU))  
 EU legislation, procedural review of, 193–196
- Procedural fairness  
 overview, 7, 38–39  
 in administrative process, 30–31  
 as advantage of procedural review, 4–5  
 in judicial process, 30–31  
 in parliamentary process, 30–31  
 ranking of procedural review rationales, 32–34  
 rationale for, 29–30  
 role of procedural review in, 32
- ‘substance-flavoured procedural review’ and, 37–38  
 type of procedural review in, 32
- Procedural invalidity, 46
- Process efficacy  
 overview, 7, 38–39  
 in administrative process, 20  
 ECHR and, 17  
 in judicial process, 19–20  
 in parliamentary process, 20  
 ranking of procedural review rationales, 32–34  
 rationale for, 19  
 role of procedural review in, 21–22  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural review’ and, 35  
 type of procedural review in, 21
- Promise of procedural review, 7–8, 40–41, 63, 74–76. *See also specific topic*
- Proportionality  
 under Charter of Fundamental Rights, 199–200, 206  
 CJEU, in procedural review of actions of national authorities in, 185–188, 199–200, 206  
 in ECtHR procedural review, 245  
 Human Rights Act 1998 (UK) and, 251, 266  
 national authorities, in procedural review of actions of, 185–188  
 ‘substance-flavoured procedural review,’ 35–36
- Public reason, 43
- Rationales for procedural review  
 overview, 7–8  
 autonomous process value (*See* Autonomous process value)  
 findings regarding, 12–13  
 modest promise of, 7–8, 40–41, 63, 74–76 (*See also specific topic*)  
 procedural fairness (*See* Procedural fairness)  
 process efficacy (*See* Process efficacy)  
 subsidiarity (*See* Subsidiarity)
- Rawls, John, 43

- Regulatory Scrutiny Board (EU)  
 overview, 9  
 choice, providing decision-makers with, 105–106  
 Data Retention Directive and, 112  
 pitfalls involving, 106–107  
 problem analysis, improving, 102–103  
 responsiveness in EU legislation and, 97, 100–101, 122  
 timing considerations, 117  
 unnecessary action, preventing, 104–105
- Religious freedom  
 generally, 47  
*Begum* case and, 64–74, 257–262 (*See also Begum v. Denbigh High School* (UK 2006))  
 ‘dilemma’ cases, 147–148  
 under ECHR, 64, 66–67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 166–167
- Religious garments, 64–66, 163–164, 257–262
- Remedial restraint, 52
- Responsiveness in EU legislation  
 overview, 95–98, 122–123  
 Better Regulation Programme and, 97, 98–101  
 choice, providing decision-makers with, 105–106  
 Data Retention Directive and, 107–112 (*See also Data Retention Directive* (EU))  
 defined, 96  
 ECtHR and, 95  
 impact assessment, 99–101 (*See also Impact assessment*)  
 interaction between instruments, 116  
 pitfalls involving, 106–107  
 problem analysis, improving, 102–104  
 regulatory equality requirement and, 98–101  
 Regulatory Scrutiny Board and, 97, 100–101, 122  
 timing considerations, 117–118  
 transparency of preparatory process, 113–114  
 unnecessary action, preventing, 104–105  
 use of evidence, 118–119
- Returns Directive (EU), 118
- Roaming Regulation (EU), 120
- Roma peoples, 36
- Rose-Ackerman, S., 82, 85, 88
- Russia  
 Constitutional Court, 162  
 evidence-based legislation in, 89, 91–92
- Sales, P., 134
- Same-sex couples, procedural review and, 89, 148
- Sanctions, procedural review of, 188–190
- Sathanpally, Aruna, 7–8
- School uniforms, 64–66
- Schütze, R., 116
- SCM Agreement. *See* Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement)
- Sen, Amartya, 42
- Sentencing, procedural review and, 133–136
- Shelton, Dinah, 52
- Smismans, S., 101–102
- Socio-economic cases, procedural review in  
 overview, 158  
 judicial decision-making, procedural review of, 153  
 legislation, procedural review of, 146–147
- Souto-Otero, M., 115
- SPS Agreement. *See* Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement)
- States, procedural obligations imposed on, 3
- Stone Sweet, Alec, 61
- Strasbourg Court. *See* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
- Subsidiarity  
 overview, 7, 38–39

- in administrative process, 24
- in CJEU, 179–182
- deliberation on fundamental rights and, 44–45
- ECHR and, 22, 270
- ECtHR and, 61–63, 270–271
- between ECtHR and United Kingdom, 270–271
- in judicial process, 24–25
- judicial review compared, 61–63
- negative subsidiarity, 22, 23–24, 25–26
- in parliamentary process, 23–24
- positive subsidiarity, 22–23, 24–25, 26
- ranking of procedural review rationales, 32–34
- rationale for, 22–23
- role of procedural review in, 26
- ‘substance-flavoured procedural review’ and, 35
- type of procedural review in, 25–26
- in United Kingdom, 270–271
- ‘Substance-flavoured procedural review’
  - overview, 38–39
  - autonomous process value and, 37–38
  - broad approach, 35
  - checklists, 36–37
  - defamation and, 36–37
  - deportation and, 36–37
  - fair trial and, 37–38
  - procedural fairness and, 37–38
  - process efficacy and, 35
  - proportionality analysis, 35–36
  - relevant substantive elements approach, 36
  - subsidiarity and, 35
  - weighing of interests, 35–36
- Substantive review
  - generally, 1
  - of EU legislation, 197–200, 205–206
  - Human Rights Act 1998 (UK), procedural review under compared, 243–244
- Sunstein, Cass, 58
- Taxation, procedural review and, 29
- TBT Agreement. *See* Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement)
- Timmermans, Frans, 114
- Toner, H., 118
- Transparency
  - of EU legislative preparatory process, 113–114
  - under GATT, 219–225
  - in WTO Appellate Body procedural review, 218–226
- Treaty on European Union (TEU), 203–204
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), 203–204
- TRIPS Agreement. *See* Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement)
- Tushnet, Mark, 51
- Typology of procedural review in ECtHR
  - overview, 10, 127–130, 158–160
  - administrative decision-making, procedural review of (*See* Administrative decision-making, procedural review of)
  - judicial decision-making, procedural review of (*See* Judicial decision-making, procedural review of)
  - legislation, procedural review of (*See* Legislation, procedural review of)
  - negative procedural review (*See* Negative procedural review)
  - positive procedural review (*See* Positive procedural review)
- United Kingdom
  - administrative decision-making, procedural review of generally, 244, 251–252
  - under Human Rights Act 1998, 256–262, 267–268
  - assisted suicide in, 169–170

- United Kingdom (cont.)  
*Belfast City Council v. Miss Behavin' Ltd.* (2007), 257, 258, 259–260, 266–267  
 Bill of Rights 1688, 252–254, 268  
*British Railways Board v. Pickin* (1974), 253  
 deference in, 53  
*Doherty v. Birmingham City Council* (2008), 262  
*Edinburgh and Dalkeith Railway Co. v. Wauchope* (1842), 253  
 evidence-based legislation in, 83, 88, 93  
*Ghaidan v. Godin Mendoza* (2004), 263  
 Islamic garments in, 64–66, 257–262  
 Joint Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights, 255  
 judicial dialogue in, 23  
 judicial restraint in, 51  
 legislation, procedural review of  
   generally, 244, 252–254  
   under Human Rights Act 1998, 262–265, 268–270  
   negative procedural review of  
   legislation, 143–144  
 parliamentary sovereignty in, 252–254  
*Pepper v. Hart* (1992), 254  
 prisoner voting rights in, 246–247  
 procedural review in  
   overview, 11–12, 250–251  
   of administrative decision-making, 244, 251–252, 256–262, 267–268  
   *Begum* case, 64–74 (See also *Begum v. Denbigh High School* (UK 2006))  
   complementarity and, 270–271  
   ECtHR compared, 11–12, 242–245, 270–271  
   findings regarding, 13  
   Human Rights Act 1998 (See Human Rights Act 1998 (UK), procedural review under)  
   of legislation, 244, 252–254  
   moderated approach to, 265–270  
   negative procedural review of  
   legislation in, 143–144  
   subsidiarity and, 270–271  
   unreasonableness and, 244  
*R. (HS2) v. Secretary of State for Transport* (2014), 268  
*R. (Quark Fishing) v. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs* (2006), 259  
*R. (Williamson) v. Secretary of State for Education and Employment* (2005), 263  
*Stockdale v. Hansard* (1839), 254, 263, 264–265  
*Wilson v. First Country Trust* (2002), 263, 264–265
- United States  
 Administrative Procedure Act, 79  
 Chevron principle, 53  
 deference in, 52–53  
 political question doctrine, 52  
 procedural review in, 2  
 substantive review in, 1  
 Uruguay Round, 215
- Value of procedural review  
 overview, 8–9  
 Better Regulation Programme (EU) (See Better Regulation Programme (EU))  
 evidence-based legislation (See Evidence-based legislation)
- Vanberg, G., 82–83, 85  
 Van Damme, Isabelle, 11, 13  
 Vandenbruwaene, W., 82  
 Venice Commission, 168  
 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 217  
 Visa Information System (EU), 118
- Waldron, Jeremy, 50, 56  
 White Paper on European Governance (EU), 98, 116  
 World Bank, evidence-based legislation and, 86



- World Trade Organization (WTO)  
 Appellate Body. *See also specific agreement*  
 overview, 11, 209–212, 239–241  
 administration of measures, 227–230  
 administrative review, 230–232  
 Agreement on Agriculture, 225  
 Annex 1a agreements, 214–215, 216  
 Annex 1 agreements, 214  
 Annex 2 agreements, 214  
 Annex 3 agreements, 214, 219  
 ‘as applied’ claims, 211  
 ‘as such’ claims, 211  
 Committee on Agriculture, 225  
 compliance with procedural obligations, 217–218, 232  
 Council for Trade in Goods, 225  
 discrimination and, 233, 234–238  
*Dominican Republic – Import and Sale of Cigarettes* case (2005), 221–222  
 due process in, 212, 224–225, 231–232, 237–238  
*EC – IT Products* case (2010), 221  
*EC – Seals* case (2014), 233, 234, 235, 238  
*EC – Tariff Preferences* case (2004), 237  
 ECtHR compared, 210, 212  
 findings regarding, 13  
 GATT (*See* General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT))  
 judicial review, 230–232  
 restraint of trade and, 234–235  
 sources of law, 213–217  
 terminology, 212–213  
*Thailand – Cigarettes* case (2011), 221, 222–223, 224  
 Trade Policy Review Board, 219  
 Trade Policy Review Mechanism, 210, 214, 219  
 transparency in, 218–226  
 Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU), 210–211, 214, 232–239  
*US – Shrimp* case (1998), 233, 236–238  
*US – Tuna II* case (2012), 217  
 Zorkin, Valeri, 162