

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
PART A INTRODUCTION	1
I. The quest for and expansion of basic procedural rules in a heterogenic administrative “system”	2
II. Judicial procedural review as the catalyst for constitutionalising process principles	8
PART B PROCEDURAL “GOOD ADMINISTRATION” IN EC LAW	13
1. Introduction	15
2. The significance of “good administration” with regard to procedural rules	17
a. “Good administration” as an indeterminate notion	17
b. Procedural “good administration”: the dichotomy of functions underlying process rules	20
3. The principle of good administration in the case law of the Community Courts	27
a. The “principle of good administration” and access to information: the <i>Tradax</i> case	28
b. The “principle of good administration” and the right to be heard	31
c. The “principle of good administration” and the principle of care: the <i>IAZ</i> case	32
d. The absence of the “principle of good administration” in EC law?	35
PART C EXPANSION: ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND THE RIGHT TO BE HEARD	39
4. Introduction	41
5. The right of access to information	43
a. Competition law as the origin of the Community right of access to information	43
b. The dynamic mutation of “access to information” into a fundamental process right in competition proceedings	45
(i) The early case law: the right of access to the file as an inherent part of the right to be heard	45

(ii)	The Commission's "access to file" policy as the basis for further expansion	46
(iii)	Developing a fundamental procedural right of access to information: the <i>Cement</i> and <i>Soda-Ash</i> cases	50
(a)	The <i>Cement</i> judgment and the Commission's reaction	50
(b)	The <i>Soda-Ash</i> judgments: access to the file as a basic process right	51
(c)	The enhancement of judicial review on procedural grounds	53
(d)	The Commission Notice on access to the file	54
(iv)	Some speculative remarks on the reasons for "constitutionalising" access to information	55
(a)	EC competition proceedings as criminal in nature?	56
(b)	Democracy and transparency: a new legal basis for procedural participation and access to information?	57
(c)	The democratisation of EC administrative process?	62
c.	The case law on the right of access to information in anti-dumping proceedings	64
d.	Outlook	68
6.	The right to be heard (the <i>audi alteram partem</i> rule)	70
a.	Competition law	71
b.	Anti-dumping law	73
(i)	The "human rights" jurisprudence of the ECJ in <i>Al-Jubail</i>	73
(ii)	The more restrictive approach of the CFI in <i>Nölle II</i>	76
c.	Customs law	77
(i)	The ECJ's judgment in <i>Technische Universität München</i>	77
(ii)	The CFI's concept established in <i>France-Aviation</i>	78
(iii)	A decisive step towards "horizontal convergence"	80
(iv)	First signs of a move towards "vertical convergence"?	80
d.	Administration of the European Social Fund	82
(i)	The judgments in <i>Lisrestal</i>	82
(ii)	Federalising EC administrative process?	87
e.	More recent jurisprudence and outlook	91
(i)	The CFI's judgment in <i>Air Inter</i>	91
(ii)	Outlook	94
(a)	The difficulty in defining the adequate degree of protection afforded to "third parties"	94
(b)	The definite "constitutionalisation" of the right to be heard in EC law	96

PART D EXPANSION: THE PRINCIPLE OF CARE (DILIGENCE)	101
7. Introduction	103
8. The foundations of the principle of care	106
a. A cursory conceptualisation of the principle of care in the early case law	106
b. A process principle with a strong connotation of substantive legality	107
c. The relationship between “care” and administrative investigatory powers	109
(i) The inquisitorial principle and “care”	109
(ii) The obligation to use investigatory powers in the interest of the citizen	110
(iii) Investigatory powers and the burden of proof	111
(a) The administration’s duty to collect evidence	111
(b) The duty of individuals to co-operate and to provide evidence	113
d. The core justification for the concept of care: administrative discretionary powers	115
(i) Care as a counterbalance to discretion	116
(ii) The duty of care as the promotor of an intrusive style of judicial review with respect to discretion	117
e. The relationship between the principle of care and the duty to give reasons	119
(i) Giving reasons and care as tandem requirements	119
(ii) Towards a “dialogue requirement”?	121
(a) The potential for developing a dialogue duty	121
(b) Dialogue, transparency, participatory democracy and the rule of law	123
(c) The principle of care and the potential conflict between dialogue and time limits	124
9. The case law on the principle of care	127
a. Anti-dumping matters: the <i>Nölle</i> cases	127
(i) The ECJ’s judgment in <i>Nölle I</i>	127
(ii) The CFI’s judgment in <i>Nölle II</i>	129
b. General customs matters: the <i>Technische Universität München</i> and <i>France-Aviation</i> Cases	132
(i) The ECJ’s judgment in <i>Technische Universität München</i>	134
(ii) The CFI’s judgment in <i>France-Aviation</i>	135
c. Complainants in competition proceedings: the <i>Automec II</i> and <i>Asia Motor France II</i> cases	137
(i) The different facets of the principle of care in “tripartite” procedures	138

(ii) The duty of care <i>vis-à-vis</i> complainants in the recent case law	140
(iii) <i>Asia Motor France II</i> : the twin concepts of care and giving reasons as means of substantive control of discretion	142
d. Complainants in State aids proceedings: from <i>Cook</i> to <i>Sytraval</i>	149
(i) The principle of care and its significance in the two-stage investigation procedure under Article 93 of the EC Treaty	149
(ii) The tentative recognition of the duty of care: <i>Cook</i> and <i>Matra</i>	152
(iii) Developing a “dialogue requirement”: <i>SIDE</i> and <i>Sytraval</i>	155
(a) The CFI’s judgments in <i>SIDE</i> and <i>Sytraval I</i>	156
(b) The ECJ’s judgment (on appeal) in <i>Sytraval II</i>	160
e. Outlook	163
 PART E CONCLUSION	 167
 <i>Bibliography</i>	 171
<i>Index</i>	195