

c.	Disapplication of National Legal Provisions Contrary to EU Law	26
(1)	Principle and Limits of Primacy.....	26
(2)	Manifest Infringement of the Disapplication Obligation	28
d.	Conforming Interpretation of the National Rule with EU Law	29
(1)	Principle and Limits of Conforming Interpretation	29
(2)	Manifest Infringement of the Consistent Interpretation Obligation	32
e.	Obligation to Give a Correct Interpretation to the Substantive Norm or Rule.....	33
(1)	Obligation and Limits of the Correct Interpretation Principle	33
(2)	Manifest Infringement of the Correct Interpretation Obligation	33
f.	Interim Conclusions Regarding the Gravity of the Violation of the Procedural Obligations.....	34
g.	Obligation to Submit a Request for a Preliminary Ruling to the ECJ	35
(1)	Preliminary Remarks.....	35
(2)	Obligation to Make a Reference for a Preliminary Ruling	35
(3)	Simple or a Serious Breach of the Referral Duty	38
(4)	Development of the ECJ Case-Law on the Violation of the Referral Duty and the Consequences Thereof	38
(5)	Conclusion on the Violation of the Referral Duty	40
iii.	Manifest Infringement of the Applicable Law and Impact of a Breach of the Referral Duty.....	41
a.	Analysis	41
(1)	Manifest Breach of the Applicable Law.....	41
(2)	Impact of the Violation of the Referral Duty on the Gravity of the Breach.....	44
b.	Conclusion on the Impact of the Breach of the Referral Duty on the Infringement	45
iv.	Case-Law of the Member State Courts.....	46
a.	Unsuccessful Liability Claims	46
(1)	Absence of Manifest Infringement as a Result of the Ambiguity of the EU Law Provision.....	46
(2)	Absence of Violation of the Referral Duty	48

	(3) Absence of Violation of Substantive EU Law	50
	(4) Absence of Violation of the Referral Obligation as well as of the Substantive EU Law	52
b.	Successful Liability Claims	53
	(1) Infringement of EU Law by Several Branches of Government.....	54
	(2) Liability Established Following the ECJ Preliminary Ruling in the Case	55
	(3) Specific National Rules Favourable to the Establishment of Judicial Liability	56
	(4) Establishment of Liability by a Lower-Instance Court.....	57
v.	Conclusion on the Manifest Infringement.....	58
B.	Difficulties in Establishing Causality	59
	i. Concurrent Liability of Several Branches of Government.....	60
	ii. Causation in the Case of Multiple Breaches.....	62
	a. Theory.....	62
	b. ECJ Case-Law on Multiple Breaches: The <i>Commission v Italy</i> Case	63
	c. Tendency to Avoid the Inculpation of the Judiciary	64
iii.	The Principle of Mitigation of Damages	64
	a. Duty of Mitigation.....	64
	b. ECJ Case-Law on the Effectiveness Principle: The <i>Metallgesellschaft</i> and <i>Fuß</i> Cases.....	65
	c. ECJ Case-Law on the Equivalence Principle: The <i>Transportes Urbanos</i> Case	67
	d. Principle of National Procedural Autonomy	67
	e. ECJ Case-Law on the National Procedural Autonomy Principle: The <i>Tomášová</i> Case	68
iv.	National Case-Law on Liability Claims for Breach of Rights under the VAT Directives	69
	a. Liability Actions Based on Legislative Omission.....	70
	b. Liability Actions Based on a Breach by the Tax Administration.....	72
	c. Liability Actions Based on a Breach by the Judiciary	73
	d. Liability Action Based on a Breach by Several Branches of Government	75
	e. Conclusion on the Allocation of the Responsibility	76

v.	The Situation of Sole Breach by one Member	
	State Body	77
a.	Liability of the Legislature.....	77
b.	Liability of the Administration	78
c.	Liability of the Judicature.....	78
	(1) ECJ Judgment on Purely Judicial Violation	
	of Substantive EU Law: The <i>Commission</i>	
	<i>v Spain</i> Case	79
	(2) ECJ Judgment on Purely Judicial Violation	
	of the Referral Duty: The <i>Commission</i>	
	<i>v France</i> Case.....	79
	(3) ECJ Judgment on Purely Judicial Violation	
	of the Charter: The <i>EU v Gascogne e.a.</i> Cases....	80
vi.	Conclusion on Concurrent Liability of Several	
	Breaches of Government	80
III.	National Legislative Restrictions and Recognition of the	
	Principle by National Courts	81
A.	Overview of the National Legislative Restrictions	82
B.	National Case-Law.....	83
	i. Regimes Compatible with EU Law	83
	a. Denmark.....	83
	b. Latvia	84
	c. Spain	84
	d. Sweden	87
	ii. Acknowledgement of the <i>Köbler</i> Principle Through	
	National Case-Law	87
	a. Belgium.....	88
	b. Bulgaria	90
	c. Germany.....	92
	d. France.....	93
	e. Lithuania	96
	f. The Netherlands	97
	g. Austria.....	99
	h. Portugal.....	100
	i. Finland	102
	j. United Kingdom.....	103
	iii. Acknowledgement of the <i>Köbler</i> Principle Through	
	Legislation.....	104
	a. Italy	104
	b. Poland	105
	iv. Member States Refusing the Application of the	
	<i>Köbler</i> Principle.....	108
	a. Czech Republic.....	109
	b. Hungary	110
	c. Ireland	112

v.	Member States Without any Sign of Accommodation or Refusal	113
a.	Cyprus	113
b.	Croatia	114
c.	Estonia.....	114
d.	Greece.....	114
e.	Luxembourg	115
f.	Malta.....	115
g.	Romania	115
h.	Slovakia	116
i.	Slovenia.....	116
C.	Consequences of the Köbler Judgment on National Rules.....	117
i.	Duplication of Liability Regimes and Spill-Over Effect.....	117
ii.	Conclusion on National Restrictions.....	118
IV.	Alternative Remedies in Use in the Member States.....	119
A.	Retrial on the Ground of Violation of EU Law	119
i.	Theory on Retrial	119
ii.	ECJ Case-Law on Retrial	120
iii.	Judgment of the ECtHR in the <i>Dangeville</i> Case.....	124
iv.	Member States' Positions	125
a.	Overview of the Legislative Provisions	125
b.	Retrial Available in Extraordinary Situations.....	127
(1)	Denmark	127
(2)	Cyprus.....	127
(3)	Lithuania	127
(4)	Malta	129
(5)	Finland	129
(6)	Sweden	131
c.	Retrial Available Based on Violation of EU Law under Certain Circumstances.....	131
(1)	Bulgaria.....	131
(2)	Poland	132
(3)	Romania	133
(4)	Slovakia	134
(5)	United Kingdom	135
(d)	Retrial not Available Based on Violation of EU Law.....	136
(1)	Belgium	136
(2)	Czech Republic	136
(3)	Germany.....	137
(4)	Estonia	137
(5)	Ireland	138
(6)	Greece	138
(7)	Spain	138

	(8) France.....	139
	(9) Croatia	139
	(10) Italy.....	139
	(11) Latvia	140
	(12) Luxembourg	140
	(13) Hungary	140
	(14) The Netherlands	141
	(15) Austria.....	142
	(16) Portugal.....	142
	(17) Slovenia	142
	e. Conclusion on the Remedy of Retrial.....	143
	(1) Comparative Analysis of National Rules	143
	(2) Relationship between State Liability and Retrial.....	145
	(3) Prior or Subsequent Judgment	147
B.	Constitutional Complaint on the Ground of Infringement of the Lawful Judge Principle.....	148
	i. Right to One’s Lawful Judge and the Obligation to Make a Preliminary Reference to the ECJ	148
	ii. ECtHR Case-Law on the Obligation to Make a Preliminary Reference	151
	iii. Lawful Judge Cases Before the Member State Courts.....	156
	a. Czech Republic.....	156
	b. Germany.....	157
	c. Austria	162
	d. Slovenia.....	164
	e. Slovakia	165
	f. Spain	166
	iv. Member States Reluctant to Apply the Lawful Judge Principle to the ECJ	167
	a. Hungary	168
	v. Conclusion on the Remedy of Constitutional Complaint	169
C.	Special Remedies	171
	i. <i>Amtshaftungsanspruch</i> under Austrian Law	171
	ii. <i>Anhörungsriüge</i> under German Law	172
	iii. <i>Domvilla</i> under Swedish Law	172
	iv. <i>Vollstreckungsabwehrklage</i> and <i>Drittwiderrspruchsklage</i> under German Law	172
	v. <i>Recours dans l’intérêt de la loi</i> under French Law.....	173
	vi. <i>Wytyk</i> under Polish Law.....	173
	vii. Recovery of Tax Declared Incompatible with EU Law....	173
D.	Conclusion on Alternative Remedies	174
V.	Conclusions on the History of the Köbler Liability	175

3. Perspectives for the Future.....	177
I. Adequate Liability Standard Instead of Manifest Infringement	177
II. Effective Remedial System Instead of Effective Remedies	179
A. Foundations of the State Liability Principle	180
B. Effectiveness and Effective Judicial Protection	181
C. ECJ Case-Law on Alternative Remedies	182
D. Doctrinal Views on Alternative Remedies	188
E. ECtHR Case-Law on Effective Judicial Protection	189
F. Conclusion on the Effective Remedial System	189
III. Violation of the Referral Duty as a Separate Ground for Liability	191
A. ECJ Case-Law and the Doctrine.....	191
i. ECJ Case-Law on the Violation of the Referral Duty	191
ii. Doctrinal Views	193
iii. National Case-Law	194
B. Analysis	195
i. Referral Duty as a Procedural Obligation Imposed on the National Courts.....	196
ii. Referral Duty as a Substantive Norm of the Treaty	197
a. Right to Have a Request for a Preliminary Ruling Submitted to the ECJ.....	198
(1) ECtHR Case-Law	198
(2) National Case-Law	199
(3) ECJ Case-Law Developments	200
IV. Damages Liability on the Grounds of Violation of the Charter.....	201
A. Referral Duty and the Charter	201
i. Right to Statements of Reasons for a Refusal to Submit a Referral to Preliminary Ruling	203
a. ECtHR Case-Law.....	203
b. National Case-Law.....	204
c. Case-Law and Doctrine	205
ii. Right to an Effective Judicial Protection	208
a. Case-Law and Doctrine	208
B. Undue Delay in Proceedings.....	208
C. Conclusion on Liability for Violation of the Referral Duty and of the Charter.....	211
4. Findings	213
I. Conclusions from the Past	213
A. Genuine Life of <i>Köbler</i> Doctrine Before National Courts.....	213
B. Impact and Importance of the <i>Köbler</i> Principle	215
C. Other Means of Remedies in Use	215

II. Perspectives for the Future	216
A. Harmonisation of National Remedies at EU Level.....	216
B. Effective Judicial Protection in the Event of Violation of EU law by Member State Courts.....	217
C. Violation of the Duty to Refer a Preliminary Question to the ECJ as a Ground for a Liability Claim	218
<i>Annex</i>	220
<i>Bibliography</i>	222
<i>Index</i>	239