

# JUDICIAL LAW-MAKING IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN COURTS



JUDICIAL LAW-MAKING IN  
ENGLISH AND GERMAN COURTS

Techniques and Limits of Statutory  
Interpretation

Martin BRENNCKE



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Chicago

Intersentia Ltd  
Sheraton House | Castle Park  
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom  
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Fax: +44 1223 370 169  
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk  
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

*Distribution for the UK and Ireland:*

NBN International  
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road  
Plymouth, PL6 7PP  
United Kingdom  
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331  
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

*Distribution for Europe and all other countries:*

Intersentia Publishing nv  
Groenstraat 31  
2640 Mortsel  
Belgium  
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21  
Email: mail@intersentia.be

*Distribution for the USA and Canada:*

Independent Publishers Group  
Order Department  
814 North Franklin Street  
Chicago, IL 60610  
USA  
Tel.: +1 800 888 4741 (toll free) | Fax: +1 312 337 5985  
Email: orders@ipgbook.com

**Judicial Law-Making in English and German Courts. Techniques and Limits of  
Statutory Interpretation**

© Martin Brenncke 2018

The author has asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as author of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

Artwork on cover: © Praveetha Patalay, Flags

ISBN 978-1-78068-269-3  
D/2018/7849/94  
NUR 820

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

*For Praveetha*



## FOREWORD

In Western democracies like Germany and the United Kingdom, the legal product of the democratic process is legislation. Legislation has to be read, understood and applied by a wide range of people. These include individual citizens, legal advisers, administrators and judges. When disputes arise, it is judges in courts who produce the authoritative final reading. But in doing that they have regard to how others are likely to have understood a statute. They also try to make sense of the legislation in the context of a range of other norms and values. Because legislation is everywhere and intrudes upon almost every legal relationship, statutory interpretation makes up a large part of what judges do and is one of the most important aspects of their work.

Working from the inside as a judge, the exercise of interpretation often feels more like an art than a science, even though one often feels a strong implicit sense of how to proceed. Yet the desirability of predictability in the application of law, which is inherent in the ideal of the rule of law, seems to demand that an objective science of interpretation be articulated and applied. Every legal system has to address the gap between the abstract statement of a law laid down in advance and its application to the facts of a particular case. There is no simple metric for weighing the relative normative force of different factors which may be relevant to giving determinate meaning to a statutory provision in its application to specific facts. Values of justice and reasonableness can operate as rather vague guides for how that gap is to be bridged. So can constitutional principles or a sense of hierarchy between norms bearing on the same subject matter as is addressed in the statute. Courts have to face up to the tension between positive statements of law in legislation and the pull of natural justice in spelling out the precise content of the legislative norm which they will identify as applicable to determine the dispute before them.

In the final analysis, it is the legal culture in a jurisdiction, generated within that jurisdiction's political and constitutional structures, which constrains judges in how far they feel able to go in imaginative interpretation of legislation. The ability of judges to give persuasive reasons for adopting one interpretation in preference to another is critical to the legitimacy of what they do. So some articulation of principle is required alongside the practice of interpretation, or as an inherent part of it. As Dr Brenncke explains, the use of determinate interpretative limits and techniques are important for reasons of legal certainty, upholding the proper separation of powers between judiciary and legislature

and for the maintenance of public confidence in the judiciary. His book makes an important and sophisticated contribution to this endeavour, showing where lessons might be learned across the jurisdictional divide.

This book is a valuable study of how two jurisdictions approach the task of statutory interpretation in a complex and multivalent constitutional environment. It is the product of considerable scholarship across the two jurisdictions and a fine sensitivity to the various factors and different theoretical dimensions which inform the interpretative exercise. The exposition is clear. The argument is forceful. As with all the best works of comparative law, one reads this book and learns as much about one's own legal system as about the system with which it is compared.

As someone familiar with the English part of the comparison, I can attest that Dr Brenncke has a fine in-depth understanding of the processes of statutory interpretation used in the English courts. The detail of his exposition of the position in Germany shows that he has no lesser understanding of such processes in that jurisdiction. This makes him a guide to be listened to with attention.

Dr Brenncke's important theme is judicial law-making inherent in the process of statutory interpretation, and in particular the outer limits of what courts regard themselves as authorised to do in that regard. He rightly locates the practice of statutory interpretation in its constitutional setting in each jurisdiction. This important theoretical underpinning for what happens in judicial practice on the ground is sometimes obscured. The comparative approach reminds us of its importance and brings it to the fore. In Dr Brenncke's penetrating discussion, the practice of statutory interpretation becomes the basis for insights about the constitutional environment in both jurisdictions. Exploration of the outer boundaries of permissible judicial interpretations of legislation is a powerful way of tracing the practical implications of constitutional principles.

By comparing Germany and the United Kingdom (in particular, England & Wales) using his detailed methodology, Dr Brenncke moves beyond the abstract platitudes one often finds in works which compare and emphasise the contrasts between civilian and common law jurisdictions. He reveals that there is a considerable degree of similarity in the approach of English and German judges to the practice of statutory interpretation.

That is especially so where important norms exterior to a statute have to be brought into account when reading the statute, in relation to the production of rights-consistent interpretations which take due account of specified human rights and interpretations which are required to conform, so far as possible, with EU law under the *Marleasing*<sup>1</sup> principle. As Dr Brenncke points out, these interpretative obligations operate in tension with the desideratum of legal

---

<sup>1</sup> Case C-106/89, *Marleasing*, ECLI:EU:C:1990:395.



certainty in giving meaning to legislation; but if that value is given undue weight it would undermine the values which are served by those obligations and would reduce the effectiveness of human rights norms and of EU Directives. As he also observes, both approaches are likely to remain significant in English law after Brexit, notwithstanding the uncertainty as we write regarding the details of the post-Brexit settlement.

Rights-consistent statutory interpretation and interpretation in conformity with EU law are areas in which the constitutional settings in Germany and the United Kingdom have converged. The shift has been more marked for the United Kingdom, as a simple model of parliamentary sovereignty (with its own, relatively simple interpretative practice) has been replaced by a much more modulated model, which allows for the intrusion of different and competing constitutional values to a significant degree. Statutory interpretation in the United Kingdom has become more constitutionalised. The balance between will and reason, which is inherent in constitutional law and in the practice of statutory interpretation, has moved in the direction of reason. The simple statement of democratic will in the text of a statute has increasingly come to be read through the prism of constitutional reason. Nowadays, statutory meaning is derived less so by reference to simple textual analysis of what the legislating Parliament said, and increasingly by reference to an objective conception of meaning achieved through purposive interpretation and standards of reasonableness. Going still further beyond this, in relation to human rights and EU law the meaning of a statute is often the product of the judges' integration of the statutory text with human rights and EU norms. As Dr Brenncke says, the approach to interpretation becomes more result-driven (to identify what is the best rights- or EU law-compatible meaning which can be given to a statute) rather than process-driven (focusing on the process by which the statute came into existence). This is an intellectual process with which German courts have long been familiar through their own experience of the practice of statutory interpretation through integration with binding higher norms set out in Germany's constitutional Basic Law. It is fascinating to see how close interpretative practices have become in the two jurisdictions. Dr Brenncke's account bears out the impression I have obtained from discussion with German judges.

However, significant differences of approach remain, as Dr Brenncke is careful to acknowledge. Ordinary, conventional statutory interpretation is not so closely aligned in the two jurisdictions: see the discussion in Chapter 2. Again, I think he is right to trace the differences back to the respective constitutional contexts and the associated legal cultures in the two jurisdictions. The roots of the difference go back very far, reflecting the long parliamentary tradition in the United Kingdom. Franz Neumann, writing in the 1930s, observed that in the British doctrine of the Rule of Law associated with Dicey "the centre of gravity lies in the determination of the content of the laws by Parliament", while the German theory of the Rechtsstaat as developed in the 19th century

“is uninterested in the genesis of the law, and is immediately concerned with the interpretation of a positive law, somehow and somewhere arisen”; “The German theory is liberal-constitutional; the English, democratic-constitutional.”<sup>2</sup> No doubt the German approach has now become more interested in the democratic genesis of the law, as Dr Brenncke explains. But British statutory interpretation remains primarily concerned with identifying the meaning of legislation as intended by the enacting Parliament, while the German conception of “objectivised intention” looks more to giving sense to legislation as read in the light of the current function it is taken to fulfil and of values at the time of its application in the present. The British doctrine of treating a statute as “always speaking” is not the same. As Dr Brenncke observes, this doctrine operates to help identify the intention of the legislating Parliament; it does not justify a court in departing from that intention.

This book reveals how German and British judges in many ways think in similar legal categories and engage in similar interpretative practices, participating in a real sense in a common European legal culture. It also shows how the openness and flexibility of the English common law and parliamentary tradition, with both its positive and its negative aspects, still remains distinct from the civilian tradition and the German approach to legal science and interpretation in important respects.

Philip Sales  
Lord Justice of Appeal,  
England & Wales

---

<sup>2</sup> F. NEUMANN, *The Rule of Law: Political Theory and the Legal System in Modern Society*, [1935–], Berg, Leamington Spa 1986, p. 185.

## PREFACE

*Judicial Law-Making in English and German Courts* addresses the often neglected relationship between statutory interpretation and constitutional law. The book is concerned with the limits of judicial power in a legal system. Judicial law-making occurs when judges restrict or extend the scope of application of a provision beyond or against the possible semantic meanings of the statutory language. How far do contemporary English and German judges go when they interpret national legislation? Where are the limits of statutory interpretation when judges venture outside the constraints of the text? Do these limits converge or diverge in both jurisdictions? The book critically analyses, reconstructs and compares judicial law-making in English and German courts from comparative, methodological and constitutional perspectives. It maps the differences and commonalities in both jurisdictions and then offers explanatory accounts for these differences and similarities based on constitutional, institutional, political, historical, cultural and international factors.

This book is addressed to a wide audience. It mainly appeals to an academic readership interested in the fields of statutory interpretation, legal methodology, constitutional law and comparative law. Practitioners in either jurisdiction will find it to be an accessible source of reference as this book reconstructs the fragmentary material on conventional, rights-consistent and EU-conforming judicial law-making in judicial opinions in English and German courts into a rational, coherent and systematic whole. Students of legal skills, constitutional law and comparative law will also find it a useful source of reference.

With regard to terminology, I use the term “case law” in a broad sense, meaning rulings of courts. The term “legislation” is solely used in this book to mean enacted law. “English courts” refers to the courts of England and Wales, and “English law” refers to the law applicable in England and Wales. The term “UK constitutional law” is used to refer to the constitutional law applicable in England. The term “provision” in this book refers to a specific section or part of a section either in primary or delegated legislation. “Construction” and “interpretation” are used interchangeably. All translations from German judgments are my own. Citations of German judgments do not link to the official reports as these are not available online, but rather to law journals where the judgments are published in full (these are available online via Beck-Online). Case law and literature are included up to 30 April 2018; Brexit-related legislation and legislative materials are included up to 1 August 2018.

I am immensely indebted to Rolf Sethe, Jens Scherpe and Matthias Lehmann, who have provided support and guidance since the initial stages of my career and of this book. My particular thanks go to colleagues who have read and provided helpful comments on full chapters of this book, Frances Burton, Ryan Murphy and Gayatri Patel, and to colleagues who have provided helpful feedback on specific parts of this book, James Brown, Andrea Dolcetti, Binesh Hass, Pieter Koornhof, Kristie Thomas and Stephen Weatherill. I owe a special debt to Binesh Hass and Pradeep Patalay. Both of them shouldered the arduous task of checking the language in the manuscript. I am very grateful to the team at Intersentia, especially Ann-Christin Maak-Scherpe for her help, encouragement and lots of patience and Rebecca Moffat for an excellent job in seeing the book through production.

I want to thank the universities where I was based while working on this book: the University of Zurich, the University of Oxford and Aston University. I am also grateful to the universities and institutes where I held visiting positions during this period: the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, the University of Cambridge, the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law. Special thanks are due to the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaftsförderung and the Deutsch-Britische Juristenvereinigung for funding my visiting fellowship at the British Institute of International and Comparative Law.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge the immense patience and support shown by my family and friends while I worked on this book.

Martin Brenncke  
June 2018

# CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i> . . . . .	vii
<i>Preface</i> . . . . .	xi
<i>List of Cases</i> . . . . .	xvii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i> . . . . .	xxxii

## Chapter 1. Introduction . . . . . 1

1. The Neglected Comparative Constitutional Law Perspective. . . . .	3
2. Key Findings . . . . .	10
2.1. Conventional Judicial Law-Making. . . . .	12
2.2. Rights-Consistent Judicial Law-Making . . . . .	15
2.3. The European Legal Duty of Conforming Interpretation. . . . .	20
2.4. The New Legal Duty of Conforming Interpretation after Brexit . . . . .	26
2.5. Trends and Convergence in Judicial Law-Making. . . . .	26
3. (Ir)relevance of Limits and Techniques of Interpretation . . . . .	28
4. Method and Scope of the Book. . . . .	41

## Chapter 2. Conventional Canons of Statutory Interpretation . . . . . 49

1. Aim of Statutory Interpretation . . . . .	49
2. The Interpretative Criteria and Their Weighing. . . . .	54
2.1. Interpretation in a Narrow Sense ( <i>Auslegung</i> ) . . . . .	54
2.2. Canons of Interpretation in England. . . . .	58
2.3. Comparative Analysis . . . . .	66
3. Gap-Filling in Germany. . . . .	68
3.1. Judicial Law-Making <i>Praeter Legem</i> . . . . .	72
3.2. Judicial Law-Making <i>Extra Legem</i> . . . . .	78
3.3. Constitutionalising the Limits of Statutory Interpretation. . . . .	86
3.3.1. Common Limits, Different Application. . . . .	87
3.3.2. The Recognised Methods of Statutory Interpretation . . . . .	91
3.3.3. The Standard of Constitutional Review: Reasonableness . . . . .	94
3.3.4. Towards a Stricter Understanding of the Constitutional Limits of Interpretation . . . . .	96
4. Reading In, Out or Down of Words in Legislation in England . . . . .	102
4.1. Literal Rule and the Doctrine of Parliamentary Sovereignty . . . . .	103
4.2. From Literalism to Purposivism . . . . .	106

4.3. Saving Statutes from Absurdity . . . . .	114
4.4. Correcting Obvious Drafting Errors . . . . .	115
4.5. Updating Interpretation . . . . .	119
5. Comparative Analysis . . . . .	125
<b>Chapter 3. Rights-Consistent Interpretation . . . . .</b>	<b>139</b>
1. Introduction . . . . .	142
1.1. Constitution-Consistent Interpretation . . . . .	142
1.2. Section 3(1) Human Rights Act . . . . .	144
2. Aim of Rights-Consistent Interpretation. . . . .	151
3. Relationship with Conventional Canons of Interpretation. . . . .	154
4. Interpretative Priority. . . . .	158
5. Presumption of Compliance . . . . .	159
6. Techniques of Judicial Law-Making. . . . .	165
6.1. Gap-Filling . . . . .	165
6.2. Reading In, Out or Down of Words in Legislation . . . . .	166
6.3. Comparative Analysis . . . . .	173
7. Outer Interpretative Limits . . . . .	179
7.1. Constitution-Consistent Interpretation . . . . .	179
7.2. Section 3(1) Human Rights Act . . . . .	188
7.2.1. Statutory Language . . . . .	189
7.2.2. Intention of Parliament and Purpose of the Legislation . . . . .	197
7.2.3. Fundamental Features of the Legislation. . . . .	208
7.2.4. Scheme, Grain and Thrust of the Legislation . . . . .	213
7.2.5. Policy Choices and Issues Calling for Legislative Deliberation . . . . .	216
7.3. Comparative Analysis . . . . .	223
7.3.1. Wide Powers of Rights-Consistent Judicial Law-Making . . . . .	225
7.3.2. High Level of Congruence. . . . .	228
7.3.3. The Constitutional Law Perspective. . . . .	234
7.3.4. Formalism . . . . .	235
7.3.5. Evaluative Arguments. . . . .	237
7.3.6. Legal (Un)certainty. . . . .	242
7.3.7. Convergence of Judicial Reasoning . . . . .	245
8. A Look into the Future: A UK Bill of Rights? . . . . .	246
<b>Chapter 4. The European Legal Duty of Conforming Interpretation . . . . .</b>	<b>257</b>
1. The European Dimension . . . . .	260
1.1. Scope of the EU Legal Duty of Conforming Interpretation. . . . .	261
1.2. Functions of Conforming Interpretation . . . . .	265
1.3. Principle of Equivalence . . . . .	269

1.4.	European Methodological Rules . . . . .	270
1.4.1.	Interpretative Priority of the Conforming Meaning . . . . .	272
1.4.2.	Presumption of Compliance . . . . .	272
1.4.3.	Relationship with National Legal Methodologies. . . . .	275
1.5.	The <i>Contra Legem</i> Limit . . . . .	277
2.	Aim of Conforming Interpretation . . . . .	279
3.	Relationship with Other National Canons of Interpretation . . . . .	288
3.1.	Interpretative Structure . . . . .	288
3.2.	Conventional Limits of Judicial Law-Making . . . . .	291
3.2.1.	Rejection of a “Europeanisation from the Inside” in Germany . . . . .	292
3.2.2.	Endorsement of a “Europeanisation from the Inside” in England . . . . .	295
3.2.3.	Comparative Analysis. . . . .	309
3.3.	Analogy to Rights-Consistent Interpretation. . . . .	311
3.3.1.	Constitution-Consistent Interpretation in Germany. . . . .	311
3.3.2.	Section 3(1) Human Rights Act in England . . . . .	313
3.3.3.	Comparative Analysis. . . . .	316
4.	Interpretative Priority in National Courts. . . . .	318
5.	Presumption of Compliance in National Courts . . . . .	319
5.1.	The Presumption Rule in German Courts . . . . .	319
5.2.	The Presumption Rule in English Courts . . . . .	322
5.3.	Comparative Analysis . . . . .	331
6.	Techniques of Judicial Law-Making . . . . .	332
6.1.	Gap-Filling . . . . .	332
6.1.1.	Legislation Adopted for the Purpose of Transposing a Directive . . . . .	332
6.1.2.	Non-Implementing Legislation that Precedes a Directive . . . . .	338
6.2.	Reading In, Out or Down of Words in Legislation . . . . .	343
6.3.	Comparative Analysis . . . . .	345
7.	Outer Interpretative Limits . . . . .	347
7.1.	Limits of Conforming Judicial Law-Making in Germany . . . . .	348
7.2.	Limits of Conforming Judicial Law-Making in England . . . . .	358
7.2.1.	Intention of the Enacting Parliament. . . . .	359
7.2.2.	Statutory Language . . . . .	368
7.2.3.	Scheme and Fundamental Features of the Legislation. . . . .	372
7.2.4.	Unsettled Outer Limits of Conforming Interpretation . . . . .	374
7.3.	Comparative Analysis . . . . .	380
7.3.1.	Development Towards Converging Outer Limits of Conforming Judicial Law-Making . . . . .	381
7.3.2.	Evaluative Arguments and Judicial Discretion . . . . .	385
7.3.3.	Judicial Attitudes and the Stretching of the Outer Interpretative Limits. . . . .	387

7.3.4. Adaptability of the Outer Interpretative Limits . . . . .	392
7.3.5. Legal (Un)certainty. . . . .	393
8. A Look into the Future: Brexit . . . . .	396
8.1. Retained EU Law . . . . .	398
8.2. The Principle of the Supremacy of EU Law . . . . .	401
8.3. The New Legal Duty of Conforming Interpretation . . . . .	406
8.4. Interpretation of Retained EU Law . . . . .	413
8.5. Transition Period . . . . .	420
<b>Chapter 5. Conclusion . . . . .</b>	<b>423</b>
<i>Index. . . . .</i>	<i>433</i>
<i>About the Author. . . . .</i>	<i>437</i>



# LIST OF CASES

## COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION\*

Case 11/70, <i>Internationale Handelsgesellschaft</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1970:114	361
Case 43/75, <i>Defrenne v. Sabena</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1976:56	305
Case 33/76, <i>Rewe-Zentralfinanz eG and Rewe-Zentral AG v. Landwirtschaftskammer für das Saarland</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1976:188	311
Case 106/77, <i>Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v. Simmenthal</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1978:49	361
Case 148/78, <i>Ratti</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1979:110	262
Case 61/81, <i>Commission v. United Kingdom</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1982:258	295
Case 14/83, <i>von Colson and Kamann v. Land Nordrhein- Westfalen</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1984:153	260, 263, 304
Case 79/83, <i>Harz v. Deutsche Tradax</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1984:155	263, 304
Case 143/83, <i>European Commission v. Denmark</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1985:34	395
Case 152/84, <i>Marshall v. Southampton and South West Hampshire AHA</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1986:84	262, 283, 312
Case C-106/89, <i>Marleasing v. La Comercial Internacional de Alimentación</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1990:395	257, 261, 277, 285, 303–304
Case C-91/92, <i>Faccini Dori v. Recreb Srl</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1994:292	261–262, 313
Case C-334/92, <i>Wagner Miret v. Fondo de Garantía Salarial</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1993:945	261, 272–274, 330
Case C-421/92, <i>Habermann-Beltermann v. Arbeiterwohlfahrt</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1994:187	263
Case C-31/93, <i>Webb v. EMO Air Cargo (UK) Ltd</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1994:300	284
Case C-63/93, <i>Duff v. Minister for Agriculture and Food and Attorney General</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:51	394
Case C-74/95, <i>Criminal proceedings against X</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:491	264, 396
Case C-168/95, <i>Criminal proceedings against Arcaro</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1996:363	262, 264, 396
Case C-129/96, <i>Inter-Environnement Wallonie</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1997:628	265
Case C-197/96, <i>Commission v. France</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1997:155	267
Case C-111/97, <i>EvoBus Austria v. Niederösterreichische Verkehrsorganisations Gesellschaft mbH</i> , ECLI:EU:C:1998:434	260
Case C-78/98, <i>Preston v. Wolverhampton Healthcare NHS Trust</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2000:247	311
Case C-240/98, <i>Océano Grupo Editorial v. Roció Murciano Quintero</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2000:346	261, 263, 272
Case C-443/98, <i>Unilever Italia v. Central Food</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2000:496	262
Case C-456/98, <i>Centrosteeel Srl v. Adipol GmbH</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2000:402	261

\* Cases arranged chronologically.

Case C-144/99, <i>Commission v. Netherlands</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2001:257 . . . . .	267
Case C-481/99, <i>Heininger v. Bayerische Hypo- und Vereinsbank AG</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2001:684 . . . . .	294, 341
Case C-62/00, <i>Marks &amp; Spencer plc. v. Commissioners of Customs and Excise</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2002:435 . . . . .	261
Case C-397/01, <i>Pfeiffer v. Deutsches Rotes Kreuz</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2004:584. . . . .	257, 261–262, 266, 269, 272–273, 300, 386, 412
Case C-371/02, <i>Björnekulla Fruktindustrier v. Procordia Food</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2004:275 . . . . .	257, 261, 274
Case C-235/03, <i>QDQ Media v. Alejandro Omedas Lecha</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2005:147. . . . .	277
Case C-144/04, <i>Mangold v. Helm</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2005:709. . . . .	262, 265
Case C-212/04, <i>Adeneler et al. v. Ellinikos Organismos Galaktos</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2006:443 . . . . .	257, 261–262, 264–266, 272, 276–277, 300
Case C-268/06, <i>Impact v. Minister for Agriculture and Food and others</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:223 . . . . .	262, 276–277, 394
Case C-308/06, <i>Intertanko v. Secretary of State for Transport</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:312 . . . . .	394
Case C-350/06, <i>Schultz-Hoff v. Deutsche Rentenversicherung Bund</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2009:18 . . . . .	341
Case C-404/06, <i>Quelle v. Bundesverband der Verbraucherzentralen und Verbraucherverbände</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:231 . . . . .	293, 341–342
Case C-237/07, <i>Janecek v. Freistaat Bayern</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:447 . . . . .	262, 268
Case C-378/07, <i>Angelidaki and Others v. Organismos Nomarkhiaki Aftodiikisi Rethimnis</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2009:250 . . . . .	261, 264–265, 276–277
Case C-414/07, <i>Magoora v. Dyrektor Izby Skarbowej w Krakowie</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2008:766 . . . . .	257, 272
Case C-555/07, <i>Kücükdeveci v. Swedex</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:21. . . . .	257
Case C-12/08, <i>Mono Car Styling v. Dervis Odemis</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2009:466 . . . . .	257, 262, 269, 276–277, 394
Case C-63/08, <i>Pontin v. T-Comalux</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2009:666 . . . . .	311
Case C-201/08, <i>Planatol v. Hauptzollamt Darmstadt</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2009:539 . . . . .	394
Case C-305/08, <i>CoNISMa v. Regione Marche</i> , ECLI:EU:2009:807 . . . . .	257, 272
Cases C-403/08 and C-429/08, <i>Football Association Premier League Ltd. et al. v. QC Leisure et al.</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:631 . . . . .	327
Opinion 1/09, <i>European Patent Court</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:123 . . . . .	386
Case C-65/09, <i>Gebr. Weber GmbH v. Wittmer</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:396. . . . .	334
Case C-429/09, <i>Fuß v. Stadt Halle</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2010:717 . . . . .	312
Case C-53/10, <i>Land Hessen v. Franz Müksch OHG</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:585. . . . .	264
Case C-214/10, <i>KHS AG v. Schulte</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:761 . . . . .	355
Case C-282/10, <i>Dominguez v. Centre informatique du Centre Ouest Atlantique</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:33 . . . . .	262–263, 266–267
Case C-621/10, <i>Balkan and Sea Properties v. Direktor na Direktsia “Obzhalvane i upravljenie na izpalnenieto”</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:248 . . . . .	263
Case C-7/11, <i>Criminal proceedings against Caronna</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:396 . . . . .	257
Case C-61/11 PPU, <i>Hassen El Dridi</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2011:268 . . . . .	312
Case C-97/11, <i>Amia v. Provincia Regionale di Palermo</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2012:306 . . . . .	263, 266
Cases C-359/11 and C-400/11, <i>Schulz and Egbringhoff</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2317 . . . . .	356
Case C-124/12, <i>AES-3C Maritza East 1 EOOD v. Direktor na Direktsia “Obzhalvane i upravljenie na izpalnenieto” pri Tsentralno upravljenie na Natsionalnata agentsia za prihodite, Plovdiv</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:488 . . . . .	263

Case C-142/12, <i>Marinov v. Direktor na Direktsia "Obzhalvane i upravlennie na izpalnenieto"</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:292	263
Case C-176/12, <i>Association de médiation sociale v. Union locale des syndicats CGT</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:2	278
Case C-209/12, <i>Endress v. Allianz</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:864	321, 351
Case C-306/12, <i>Spedition Welter v. Avanssur</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:650	257, 263, 278, 393
Case C-539/12, <i>Lock v. British Gas Trading Ltd.</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2014:351	325
Case C-404/13, <i>ClientEarth v. Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2013:805	262, 268
Case C-395/14, <i>Vodafone GmbH v. Bundesrepublik Deutschland</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:9	337
Case C-441/14, <i>Dansk Industri (DI) v. Estate of Karsten Eigil Rasmussen</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:278	262
Case C-46/15, <i>Ambisig v. AICP</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:530	263, 267
Case C-64/15, <i>BP Europa v. Hauptzollamt Hamburg-Stadt</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:62	269, 358, 386
Case C-187/15, <i>Pöppel v. Land Nordrhein-Westfalen</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:550	263
Case C-231/15, <i>Prezes Urzędu Komunikacji Elektronicznej and Petrotel v. Polkomtel</i> , ECLI:EU:C:2016:769	394

## GERMANY

BAG, <i>EuZW</i> 2009, 465 ( <i>Schultz-Hoff</i> )	54, 86, 262, 279, 289, 311, 319, 340–341, 348–349, 387
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 1970, 725	142
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 2003, 2473	55, 72, 75
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 2006, 3161	349, 353
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 2010, 557	352
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 2012, 3529	355
BAG, <i>NJW</i> 2014, 956	72–73, 75, 354
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2003, 742	39, 261, 311, 318, 347, 352, 393
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2004, 375	342, 393
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2005, 420	54, 69, 75
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2006, 862	262, 289, 311, 318, 349, 352
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2007, 751	72–73
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2009, 378	262
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2009, 1020	273
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2010, 227	186
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2010, 1020 ( <i>Urlaubsentgelt</i> )	54–55, 174, 262, 268, 276, 280, 339–340, 342
BAG, <i>NZA</i> 2012, 514	355
BAG, <i>NZA-RR</i> 2013, 515	54, 71
BGH, <i>BeckRS</i> 2012, 16505	230
BGH, <i>GRUR</i> 2002, 238	72
BGH, <i>NJW</i> 1952, 337	68
BGH, <i>NJW</i> 1953, 780	77–78
BGH, <i>NJW</i> 1954, 1153	68
BGH, <i>NJW</i> 1955, 1276 ( <i>Tonband</i> )	58, 68, 73, 75, 92–93

BGH, NJW 1955, 1433 ( <i>Fotokopie</i> )	58, 73–74, 92
BGH, NJW 1958, 827 ( <i>Herrenreiter</i> )	80
BGH, NJW 1963, 902 ( <i>Fernsehansagerin</i> )	58, 73, 79–81
BGH, NJW 1967, 343	49, 51, 56–58
BGH, NJW 1969, 98	222
BGH, NJW 1970, 2017	222
BGH, NJW 1975, 213	279, 319
BGH, NJW 1981, 1726	55, 73
BGH, NJW 1988, 2109	72, 78, 85
BGH, NJW 1994, 457	58
BGH, NJW 2000, 521 ( <i>Heininger I</i> )	294, 341
BGH, NJW 2002, 1881 ( <i>Heininger II</i> )	294, 341
BGH, NJW 2003, 1032 ( <i>Macrotron</i> )	77
BGH, NJW 2006, 2997	75
BGH, NJW 2006, 3200 ( <i>Quelle I</i> )	292, 341, 352
BGH, NJW 2007, 992	78, 85
BGH, NJW 2007, 2419 ( <i>Rügeverkümmern</i> )	82
BGH, NJW 2008, 2257	72, 75
BGH, NJW 2008, 3213 ( <i>Dreiteilungsmethode</i> )	96
BGH, NJW 2009, 427 ( <i>Quelle II</i> )	54, 57, 71, 261, 279, 292–293, 310, 319, 332, 334, 342, 347, 348–350, 353, 393
BGH, NJW 2009, 1962 ( <i>Schiedsfähigkeit II</i> )	30, 188
BGH, NJW 2012, 1073 ( <i>Weber II</i> )	71, 261, 279, 292, 310, 319, 321, 334–335, 349–350, 393
BGH, NJW 2012, 2422	265
BGH, NJW 2013, 2674 ( <i>Interprofessionelle Sozietät</i> )	49, 51, 55–56, 230, 273, 280, 289, 292, 338, 342, 352
BGH, NJW 2014, 146 ( <i>FRoSTA</i> )	77
BGH, NJW 2014, 2646 ( <i>Lebensversicherung II</i> )	99, 238, 272, 279, 290, 292, 321–322, 327, 335–336, 349, 353
BGH, NJW 2015, 1023 ( <i>Lebensversicherung im Antragsmodell</i> )	351
BGH, NJW 2015, 3511 ( <i>Elektronische Leseplätze II</i> )	338
BGH, NJW 2016, 1718 ( <i>Gasversorgung II</i> )	71, 99, 349, 356–357
BGH, NJW 2017, 1093	57, 319, 349–350
BGH, NJW 2017, 2123	68
BGH, NJW 2017, 2842	238
BGH, NJW 2017, 3387	342
BGH, NVwZ 2014, 1111	45, 87
BGH, ZUM 2010, 429 ( <i>Bob Dylan (No. 2)</i> )	292, 338, 349
BVerfG, BeckRS 2016, 47202	68, 231
BVerfG, BeckRS 2017, 136546	318
BVerfG, BeckRS 2018, 11032	57
BVerfG, decision of 16.2.2012, no. 1 BvR 127/10	94
BVerfG, FamRZ 2015, 1263	140
BVerfG, judgment of 31.20.2016, no. 1 BvR 871/13	46

BVerfG, NJW 1953, 1057.....	143
BVerfG, NJW 1954, 65.....	70
BVerfG, NJW 1958, 257 ( <i>Lüth</i> ).....	161
BVerfG, NJW 1958, 1227.....	87, 158, 180, 184
BVerfG, NJW 1958, 1388.....	142
BVerfG, NJW 1958, 2059.....	86, 183
BVerfG, NJW 1959, 1123.....	158, 179–180
BVerfG, NJW 1960, 1563.....	49, 51–53, 56, 58
BVerfG, NJW 1962, 1715.....	55, 68
BVerfG, NJW 1964, 1563.....	183
BVerfG, NJW 1965, 1427.....	142, 158, 161
BVerfG, NJW 1966, 243.....	166
BVerfG, NJW 1972, 25.....	160
BVerfG, NJW 1972, 1123.....	158
BVerfG, NJW 1972, 1934.....	179
BVerfG, NJW 1973, 1221 ( <i>Soraya</i> ).....	31, 58, 69, 73, 78–79, 81–82, 84, 86, 88, 222, 238
BVerfG, NJW 1973, 1491.....	55–56, 68, 86–87, 142, 155, 158, 160
BVerfG, NJW 1975, 1355.....	86, 158
BVerfG, NJW 1978, 2499.....	86, 87
BVerfG, NJW 1979, 151.....	35, 37, 143, 158, 180
BVerfG, NJW 1979, 305 ( <i>Sachverständigenhaftung</i> ).....	36, 68, 87–88, 126
BVerfG, NJW 1979, 534.....	161
BVerfG, NJW 1979, 1925.....	37
BVerfG, NJW 1980, 2179.....	143
BVerfG, NJW 1981, 39.....	57, 87, 183
BVerfG, NJW 1982, 1375.....	179–180
BVerfG, NJW 1982, 1509.....	180
BVerfG, NJW 1983, 735.....	52
BVerfG, NJW 1983, 2811.....	158
BVerfG, NJW 1984, 475 ( <i>Sozialplan</i> ).....	55, 69, 85, 101
BVerfG, NJW 1985, 1519.....	143, 180
BVerfG, NJW 1985, 2315.....	142, 179, 183
BVerfG, NJW 1985, 2395.....	86
BVerfG, NJW 1985, 2939.....	69
BVerfG, NJW 1986, 1672.....	87
BVerfG, NJW 1987, 2427.....	140
BVerfG, NJW 1988, 125.....	142
BVerfG, NJW 1988, 1902.....	87
BVerfG, NJW 1990, 1593.....	3–4, 31, 35, 58, 69, 73–75, 81, 87, 90, 94–95, 126, 226, 238
BVerfG, NJW 1991, 1807.....	143
BVerfG, NJW 1991, 2549.....	41, 79, 89
BVerfG, NJW 1992, 890 ( <i>Eilversammlungen</i> ).....	180–181, 184
BVerfG, NJW 1992, 1219.....	92
BVerfG, NJW 1992, 2947.....	143, 158
BVerfG, NJW 1993, 996.....	79, 94
BVerfG, NJW 1993, 1379 ( <i>Streikeinsatz von Beamten</i> ).....	89

BVerfG, NJW 1993, 2861.....	55, 72–73, 75, 91, 142–143, 158, 165, 179
BVerfG, NJW 1994, 2475.....	87, 143, 183
BVerfG, NJW 1995, 1141.....	88
BVerfG, NJW 1997, 386.....	30
BVerfG, NJW 1998, 519 ( <i>Kind als Schaden</i> ).....	6, 49, 58, 73, 81, 86–87, 91, 109, 383
BVerfG, NJW 1998, 1478.....	55, 142
BVerfG, NJW 1998, 1699.....	143
BVerfG, NJW 1998, 2269.....	71, 73, 88
BVerfG, NJW 1998, 3033.....	183
BVerfG, NJW 1999, 1853.....	183, 348
BVerfG, NJW 2000, 55.....	179
BVerfG, NJW 2000, 347.....	86, 98, 158, 179, 183
BVerfG, NJW 2000, 1175.....	179
BVerfG, NJW 2002, 1779.....	44, 51, 56, 68, 88
BVerfG, NJW 2003, 2520.....	88–89
BVerfG, NJW 2004, 750.....	57, 87, 126
BVerfG, NJW 2004, 1305 ( <i>Geldwäsche durch Strafverteidiger</i> ).....	142–143, 160, 165, 179, 183
BVerfG, NJW 2004, 3407 ( <i>Görgülü</i> ).....	140
BVerfG, NJW 2005, 126.....	35–37, 58
BVerfG, NJW 2005, 1923.....	158
BVerfG, NJW 2006, 3340.....	87, 126
BVerfG, NJW 2006, 3409 ( <i>Marlene Dietrich</i> ).....	31, 73–74, 86–87, 91–92, 101, 230, 238
BVerfG, NJW 2007, 2977 ( <i>Strafzumessung durch Revisionsgerichte</i> ).....	87, 98, 143, 183
BVerfG, NJW 2008, 2409.....	70
BVerfG, NJW 2009, 499.....	98
BVerfG, NJW 2009, 1469 ( <i>Rügeverkümmern</i> ).....	6, 41, 58, 79, 83, 86–88, 90–91, 94, 96, 100, 136
BVerfG, NJW 2011, 819.....	96
BVerfG, NJW 2011, 842 ( <i>Dreiteilungsmethode</i> ).....	6, 57, 86–87, 91, 96–99, 101, 348
BVerfG, NJW 2011, 1723.....	73, 87, 94, 98
BVerfG, NJW 2012, 669.....	35, 39, 45, 94, 294, 311, 318–319, 347–350, 393
BVerfG, NJW 2012, 2639.....	88–89
BVerfG, NJW 2012, 3081 ( <i>Delisting</i> ).....	49, 55, 57, 73, 77, 86–87, 91, 94–95, 98–99, 348
BVerfG, NJW 2013, 1058 ( <i>Deal im Strafprozess</i> ).....	49, 51, 56, 58, 68, 87, 90
BVerfG, NJW 2014, 1874 ( <i>Flashmob</i> ).....	78
BVerfG, NJW 2015, 1294.....	342
BVerfG, NJW 2015, 1359 ( <i>Kopftuch</i> ).....	58, 140, 155, 183, 185–186, 188
BVerfG, NJW 2015, 1506 ( <i>Scheinvater</i> ).....	88–89
BVerfG, NJW 2015, 2549.....	44
BVerfG, NJW 2015, 2949.....	94, 158, 160
BVerfG, NJW-RR 2016, 1366.....	6, 35, 49, 86–87, 91, 94, 98–99, 101, 136, 261, 294, 319, 336, 347, 350, 393

BVerfG, NVwZ 1996, 574	91, 158, 180
BVerfG, NVwZ 2009, 1484	89
BVerfG, NVwZ 2010, 373	92
BVerfG, NVwZ 2015, 510	57–58, 142, 165, 179, 183–184
BVerfG, NVwZ 2017, 617	70
BVerfG, NZA 2015, 375	294
BVerfG, NZA 2015, 1117	79
BVerfG, NZS 2011, 18	94, 96
BVerfG, NZS 2011, 895	89
BVerfG, NZS 2015, 502	73, 89
BVerfG, WM 2017, 154, 155	86
BVerwG, BeckRS 2017, 103948	45, 322, 337–338, 353
BVerwG, DVBl 2004, 1379	45
BVerwG, judgment of 29.1.2004, no. 3 C 39.03	261, 291, 318
BVerwG, judgment of 10.08.2016, no. 1 B 82/16 (1 PKH 76.16)	87
BVerwG, NJW 1964, 1586	142
BVerwG, NJW 2005, 1293	73
BVerwG, NVwZ 1997, 384	142, 161
BVerwG, NVwZ 1998, 60	184
BVerwG, NVwZ 2002, 858	318
BVerwG, NVwZ 2003, 986	88
BVerwG, NVwZ 2014, 1586	292, 337
LG Hamburg, decision of 1.2.1988, no. 11 S 398/87	74

## UNITED KINGDOM

<i>9 Cornwall Crescent London Ltd. v. Kensington and Chelsea RLBC</i>	
[2005] EWCA Civ 324	60
<i>A v. BBC</i> [2014] UKSC 25	156
<i>Abley v. Dale</i> (1851) 11 Common Bench Reports 378	106
<i>Adler v. George</i> [1964] 2 QB 7 (CA)	114
<i>Advocate General for Scotland v. MacDonald</i> [2003] UKHL 34	53
<i>Ahmed and others v. HM Treasury</i> [2010] UKSC 2	153, 190, 201, 248, 250
<i>Airtours Holidays Transport v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i>	
[2016] UKSC 21	282, 348
<i>Alderson v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1767	300, 318
<i>Anisminic v. Foreign Compensation Commission</i> [1969] 2 AC 147 (HL)	251, 255
<i>AS (Somalia) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] UKHL 32	193, 196
<i>Assange v. Swedish Prosecution Authority</i> [2012] UKSC 22	65, 299, 314, 323, 372, 374
<i>Associated Newspapers Ltd. v. Wilson</i> [1995] 2 AC 454 (HL)	62, 104
<i>Attorney General's Reference (No. 4 of 2002)</i> [2004] UKHL 43	144, 153, 169, 172, 197–198
<i>Attorney-General v. Prince Ernest Augustus of Hanover</i> [1957] AC 436 (HL)	52, 63, 273
<i>Attorney-General v. Sillem</i> (1864) 2 H & C 431	106

<i>Austin v. Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Southwark</i> [2010] UKSC 28 . . . . .	417
<i>AXA General Insurance Ltd. v. Lord Advocate</i> [2011] UKSC 46 . . . . .	110, 125, 248, 256
<i>Axa UK Plc. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2011] EWCA Civ 1607 . . . . .	322
<i>B (a child) v. DPP</i> [2000] 2 AC 428 (HL) . . . . .	4
<i>B (Algeria) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2018] UKSC 5 . . . . .	251
<i>B v. Auckland District Law Society</i> [2003] UKPC 38 . . . . .	200
<i>Bear Scotland Ltd. v. Fulton</i> [2015] ICR 221 . . . . .	322
<i>Bearmans Ltd. v. Metropolitan Police District Receiver</i> [1961] 1 WLR 634 (CA) . . . . .	60
<i>Bellinger v. Bellinger</i> [2003] UKHL 21 . . . . .	188, 218–219
<i>Benkharbouche v. Embassy of Sudan</i> [2014] ICR 169 . . . . .	223
<i>Benkharbouche v. Embassy of Sudan</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 33 . . . . .	145, 210, 223, 373
<i>Birmingham City Council v. Doherty</i> [2008] UKHL 57 . . . . .	191
<i>Birmingham Hippodrome Theatre Trust Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2014] EWCA Civ 684 . . . . .	285, 345
<i>Black-Clawson International v. Papierwerke Waldhof-Aschaffenburg</i> [1975] AC 591 (HL) . . . . .	35, 51–52, 68, 99, 103–104, 132, 134
<i>Blackwood v. Birmingham and Solihull Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 607 . . . . .	45, 290, 359, 373
<i>Bloomsbury International Ltd. v. Sea Fish Industry Authority</i> [2011] UKSC 25 . . . . .	60, 62
<i>Bogdanic v. The Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2014] EWHC 2872 (QB) . . . . .	44, 102
<i>Brent LBC v. Risk Management Partners Ltd.</i> [2011] UKSC 7 . . . . .	323
<i>British Airways plc. v. Williams</i> [2012] UKSC 43 . . . . .	323
<i>British Gas Trading Ltd. v. Lock</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 983 . . . . .	258, 261, 274, 290, 314, 323, 325–326, 344, 348, 363–364, 374–375
<i>Cachia v. Faluyi</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 998 . . . . .	156
<i>Carter v. Bradbeer</i> [1975] 1 WLR 1204 (HL) . . . . .	61, 63, 106
<i>Cartier International AG v. British Sky Broadcasting Ltd.</i> [2014] EWHC 3354 . . . . .	281
<i>Cartier International AG v. British Sky Broadcasting Ltd.</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 658 . . . . .	290, 299
<i>Cheng v. Governor of Pentonville Prison</i> [1973] AC 931 (HL) . . . . .	61–62
<i>Churchill Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Fitzgerald &amp; Wilkinson</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 1166 . . . . .	45, 189, 201, 215–216, 285, 299, 314, 323, 345, 368, 370, 372–374
<i>Clark &amp; Tokeley Ltd. (t/a Spellbrook) v. Oakes</i> [1999] ICR 276 (CA) . . . . .	60
<i>Clarke v. Kato</i> [1998] 1 WLR 1647 (HL) . . . . .	102, 289, 308
<i>Cooper v. HM Attorney General</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 464 . . . . .	347
<i>Crook v. Edmondson</i> [1966] 2 QB 81 (CA) . . . . .	128
<i>Cutler v. Wandsworth Stadium Ltd.</i> [1949] AC 398 (HL) . . . . .	108
<i>Dabas v. High Court of Justice in Madrid</i> [2007] UKHL 6 . . . . .	314
<i>Day v. Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust</i> [2017] EWCA Civ 329 . . . . .	113
<i>Digital Satellite Warranty Cover Ltd. v. The Financial Services Authority</i> [2011] EWCA Civ 1413 . . . . .	45, 314
<i>Dingmar v. Dingmar</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 942 . . . . .	59, 108, 114
<i>Director of the Serious Fraud Office v. B</i> [2012] EWCA Crim 901 . . . . .	118
<i>DPP of Jamaica v. Mollison</i> [2003] UKPC 6 . . . . .	6



<i>Duke v. GEC Reliance Ltd.</i> [1988] AC 618 (HL) . . . . .	52, 271, 307, 283, 347, 367
<i>Duport Steels Ltd. v. Sirs</i> [1980] 1 All ER 529 (HL) . . . . .	6, 32, 51, 61, 104, 238–239
<i>EB Central Services Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 486. . . . .	322, 343, 373, 377
<i>EBR Attridge Law LLP v. Coleman</i> [2010] ICR 242 . . . . .	265, 343
<i>Ellen Street Estates v. Minister of Health</i> [1934] 1 KB 590 (CA) . . . . .	5, 204
<i>EN (Serbia) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 630. . . . .	280, 290, 323
<i>English v. Thomas Sanderson Blinds Ltd.</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1421 . . . . .	374
<i>F Hoffmann-La Roche &amp; Co. v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry</i> [1975] AC 295 (HL) . . . . .	306
<i>Finnegan v. Clowney Youth Training Programme Ltd.</i> [1990] 2 AC 407 (HL) . . . . .	304
<i>Fitzpatrick v. Sterling Housing Association Ltd.</i> [2001] 1 AC 27 (HL) . . . . .	2–3, 52, 120–122, 124, 126, 167, 190
<i>Fleming (t/a Bodycraft) v. Customs and Excise Commissioners</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 70 . . . . .	34, 177, 343, 345, 369
<i>Fleming (t/a Bodycraft) v. Customs and Excise Commissioners</i> [2008] UKHL 2 . . . . .	378
<i>Football Association Premier League Ltd. v. QC Leisure</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 1708. . . . .	282, 327, 369
<i>Football Association Premier League Ltd. v. QC Leisure</i> [2012] EWHC 108 (Ch) . . . . .	45, 327, 329
<i>Fothergill v. Monarch Airlines Ltd.</i> [1981] AC 251 (HL) . . . . .	108, 134
<i>Garland v. British Rail Engineering Ltd.</i> [1983] 2 AC 751 (HL) . . . . .	65, 106, 281, 367
<i>Ghaidan v. Godin-Mendoza</i> [2004] UKHL 30 . . . . .	3–4, 39, 144–147, 152–153, 155–156, 159, 162, 167–170, 172, 178, 181, 188–195, 197–198, 200, 202–203, 205, 208, 210–211, 213–217, 220–221, 227, 229, 299, 313, 343
<i>Ghany v. Attorney General of Trinidad and Tobago</i> [2015] UKPC 12 . . . . .	117–118
<i>Gladstone v. Bower</i> [1960] 2 QB 384 (CA) . . . . .	102–103, 134
<i>Goode v. Martin</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 1899 . . . . .	169
<i>Google Inc. v. Vidal-Hall</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 311 . . . . .	45, 314, 343, 347, 372, 375–377
<i>Greenweb Ltd. v. London Borough of Wandsworth</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 910 . . . . .	113, 118, 128
<i>H. v. Lord Advocate</i> [2012] UKSC 24. . . . .	110, 203
<i>Hamnett v. Essex County Council</i> [2017] EWCA Civ 6 . . . . .	5
<i>Hampshire v. Board of the Pension Protection Fund</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 786 . . . . .	45, 372
<i>Hemming (t/a Simply Pleasure Ltd) v. Westminster City Council</i> [2013] EWCA Civ 591. . . . .	298–299
<i>Hill v. East and West India Dock Co.</i> (1884) 9 AC 448 (HL) . . . . .	106
<i>Holden &amp; Co v. Crown Prosecution Service (No. 2)</i> [1994] 1 AC 22 (HL) . . . . .	112, 128
<i>Holmes v. Bradfield Rural District Council</i> [1949] 2 KB 1 . . . . .	61
<i>Horton v. Sadler</i> [2006] UKHL 27 . . . . .	65
<i>Hounslow London Borough Council v. Powell</i> [2011] UKSC 8 . . . . .	210
<i>Howe v. Motor Insurers' Bureau</i> [2017] EWCA Civ 932 . . . . .	258, 299, 374
<i>In re S (Minors)</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 757 . . . . .	209
<i>In re S (Minors)</i> [2002] UKHL 10. . . . .	145, 147, 156, 169, 188, 194, 208–209, 218
<i>Inco Europe Ltd. v. First Choice Distribution</i> [2000] 1 WLR 586 (HL) . . . . .	102, 115–116, 118

<i>Inland Revenue Commissioners v. Hinchy</i> [1960] AC 748 (HL) . . . . .	53
<i>Inland Revenue Commissioners v. McGuckian</i> [1997] 1 WLR 991 (HL) . . . . .	106
<i>ITV Broadcasting Ltd. v. TV Catchup Ltd.</i> (No. 2) [2011] EWHC 1874 . . . . .	260, 299, 323, 343
<i>ITV Broadcasting Ltd. v. TV Catchup Ltd.</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 204 . . . . .	45, 324, 343, 347, 372, 374, 384
<i>Johnson v. Medical Defence Union Ltd.</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 262 . . . . .	383
<i>Johnson v. Moreton</i> [1980] AC 37 (HL) . . . . .	103, 106
<i>Jones v. Director of Public Prosecutions</i> [1962] AC 635 (HL) . . . . .	103
<i>Jones v. Secretary of State for Social Services</i> [1972] AC 944 (HL) . . . . .	61
<i>Jones v. Wrotham Park Settled Estates</i> [1980] AC 74 (HL) . . . . .	103, 108, 116–117, 119, 123, 129
<i>Kammins Ballrooms Co Ltd. v. Zenith Investments (Torquay) Ltd.</i> [1971] AC 850 (HL) . . . . .	103, 117
<i>Kay Green v. Twinsectra Ltd.</i> [1996] 1 WLR 1587 (CA) . . . . .	113
<i>Kennedy v. The Charity Commission</i> [2014] UKSC 20 . . . . .	197, 210, 215, 249
<i>Kirkness (Inspector of Taxes) v. John Hudson &amp; Co. Ltd.</i> [1955] AC 696 (HL) . . . . .	63, 273
<i>Lehman Brothers International (Europe) (In Administration), Re</i> [2012] UKSC 6 . . . . .	285, 299, 343–344, 368
<i>Leicester v. Pearson</i> [1952] 2 QB 668 . . . . .	113
<i>Litster v. Forth Dry Dock &amp; Engineering Co Ltd.</i> [1990] 1 AC 546 (HL) . . . . .	261, 280, 282, 289–290, 296, 298, 300, 306, 322, 344, 387
<i>Littlewoods Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 515 . . . . .	374
<i>Littlewoods Retail Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2010] EWHC 1071 . . . . .	359
<i>Macarthy's Ltd. v. Smith</i> [1979] ICR 785 (CA) . . . . .	363
<i>Macarthy's Ltd. v. Smith</i> [1981] QB 180 (CA) . . . . .	63, 305
<i>Madzimbamuto v. Lardner Burke</i> [1969] 1 AC 645 (PC) . . . . .	5
<i>Magor and St Mellons Rural DC v. Newport Corporation</i> [1950] 2 All ER 1226 (CA) . . . . .	129
<i>Magor and St Mellons Rural DC v. Newport Corporation</i> [1952] AC 189 (HL) . . . . .	102–103, 106, 129, 175
<i>Manchester City Council v. Pinnock</i> [2010] UKSC 45 . . . . .	155, 176, 198, 315
<i>Maunsell v. Olins</i> [1975] AC 373 (HL) . . . . .	53, 60–62
<i>McCartan Turkington Breen v. Times Newspapers Ltd.</i> [2001] 2 AC 277 (HL) . . . . .	52, 124
<i>McDonald v. McDonald</i> [2016] UKSC 28 . . . . .	194, 214
<i>McE v. Prison Service of Northern Ireland</i> [2009] UKHL 15 . . . . .	248
<i>McMonagle v. Westminster City Council</i> [1990] 2 AC 716 (HL) . . . . .	114–115, 131
<i>Monro v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 306 . . . . .	105
<i>Moohan v. Lord Advocate</i> [2014] UKSC 67 . . . . .	110
<i>Moreno v. The Motor Insurers' Bureau</i> [2016] UKSC 52 . . . . .	282, 324
<i>Nairn v. University of St Andrews</i> [1909] AC 147 (HL) . . . . .	249
<i>NHS Leeds v. Lerner</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 1034 . . . . .	343
<i>O'Brien v. Ministry of Justice</i> [2010] UKSC 34 . . . . .	378
<i>O'Brien v. Ministry of Justice</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 1000 . . . . .	347, 368, 374
<i>Oakley Inc. v. Animal Ltd.</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 1191 . . . . .	260, 323
<i>Oliver Ashworth (Holdings) Ltd. v. Ballard (Kent) Ltd.</i> [2000] Ch. 12 (CA) . . . . .	58, 60, 62–63
<i>Pepper v. Hart</i> [1993] AC 593 (HL) . . . . .	60, 62, 64
<i>Perceval-Price v. Department of Economic Development</i> [2000] IRLR 380 . . . . .	378, 399
<i>Percy v. Church of Scotland Board of National Mission</i> [2005] UKHL 73 . . . . .	378

<i>Pham v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2015] UKSC 19	4, 280
<i>Pickstone v. Freemans Plc</i> [1987] 3 WLR 811 (CA)	296, 298, 302, 323, 367
<i>Pickstone v. Freemans Plc</i> [1989] AC 66 (HL)	282, 285–286, 295–296, 301, 305, 322–323, 344–345
<i>Pinner v. Everett</i> [1969] 1 WLR 1266 (HL)	59
<i>Pomieczowski v. District Court of Legnica</i> [2012] UKSC 20	194
<i>Poplar Housing and Regeneration Community Association Ltd.</i> v. <i>Donaghue</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 595	144, 152, 156–157, 188
<i>Post Office v. Estuary Radio Ltd.</i> [1968] 2 QB 740 (CA)	66
<i>Principal Reporter v. K</i> [2010] UKSC 56	169, 176
<i>Prudential Assurance Co Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2013] EWHC 3249	281, 370
<i>Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 376	345, 372, 374
<i>R. v. A (No. 2)</i> [2001] UKHL 25	136, 145, 152–153, 155–156, 163, 169, 171–172, 187, 190, 194, 198, 200, 203
<i>R. v. D</i> [2011] EWCA Crim 2082	116
<i>R. v. Holding</i> [2005] EWCA Crim 3185	169
<i>R. v. Horncastle</i> [2009] UKSC 14	315
<i>R. v. Ireland</i> [1998] AC 147 (HL)	52
<i>R. v. Johnstone</i> [2003] UKHL 28	282, 322
<i>R. v. Kirkup</i> [1993] 1 WLR 774 (CA)	128
<i>R. v. Lambert</i> [2001] UKHL 37	147, 169, 173, 194, 200
<i>R. v. Montila</i> [2004] UKHL 50	65
<i>R. v. Moore</i> [1995] QB 353 (CA)	102
<i>R. v. Registrar General ex p. Smith</i> [1991] 2 QB 393 (CA)	62
<i>R. v. T</i> [2009] UKHL 20	60
<i>R. v. Waya</i> [2012] UKSC 51	169, 215, 374
<i>R. (Allensway Recycling Ltd) v. Environment Agency</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 1289	118
<i>R. (Anderson) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2002] UKHL 46	4, 6, 188, 194, 200
<i>R. (Animal Defenders International) v. Secretary of State for culture, media and sport</i> [2008] UKHL 15	147
<i>R. (Anufrijeva) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] UKHL 36	37, 250
<i>R. (Brind) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1991] 1 AC 696 (HL)	66
<i>R. (Cart) v. Upper Tribunal</i> [2011] UKSC 28	37, 253
<i>R. (Chester) v. Secretary of State for Justice</i> [2013] UKSC 63	326
<i>R. (Chief Constable of Staffordshire) v. Stafford Crown Court</i> [1999] 1 WLR 398 (QB)	113
<i>R. (Confederation of Passenger Transport UK) v. Humber Bridge Board</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 842	115
<i>R. (Countryside Alliance) v. Attorney General</i> [2005] EWHC 1677 (Admin)	193
<i>R. (Doody) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1994] 1 AC 531 (HL)	239
<i>R. (Edison First Power Ltd.) v. Central Valuation Officer</i> [2003] UKHL 20	32
<i>R. (Equal Opportunities) v. Secretary of State for Employment</i> [1992] ICR 341 (CA)	363
<i>R. (Evans) v. Attorney General</i> [2015] UKSC 21	111, 248, 255
<i>R. (Factortame (No. 1)) v. Secretary of State for Transport</i> [1990] 2 AC 85 (HL)	364, 367
<i>R. (Factortame (No. 2)) v. Secretary of State for Transport</i> [1991] 1 AC 603 (HL)	301, 305, 361–362, 365

<i>R. (Fire Brigades Union) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1995] 2 AC 513 (HL) .....	5–6
<i>R. (Francis &amp; Francis) v. Central Criminal Court</i> [1989] AC 346 (HL) .....	61, 102–103
<i>R. (GC) v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> [2011] UKSC 21 .....	163, 188, 202–203, 210–215, 221
<i>R. (Gillan) v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> [2006] UKHL 12 .....	250
<i>R. (Gujra) v. Crown Prosecution Service</i> [2012] UKSC 52 .....	251
<i>R. (Hammond) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWHC 2753 (Admin) .....	231
<i>R. (Hammond) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] UKHL 69 .....	148
<i>R. (Haw) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 532 .....	113–114
<i>R. (HS2 Action Alliance Ltd) v. Secretary of State for Transport</i> [2014] UKSC 3 .....	110, 139, 203, 361, 363
<i>R. (Hurst) v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> [2007] UKHL 13 .....	155, 190, 290, 314
<i>R. (Irving) v. Secretary of State for Transport</i> [2008] EWHC 1200 .....	359
<i>R. (Jackson) v. Attorney General</i> [2005] UKHL 56 .....	4, 37, 59, 110–112, 125, 197, 204–205, 256, 362
<i>R. (JS) v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2015] UKSC 16 .....	65, 153, 204, 280
<i>R. (Kebilene) v. Director of Public Prosecutions</i> [2000] 2 AC 326 (HL) .....	146
<i>R. (Kelly) v. Secretary of State for Justice</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 177 .....	107, 112, 115, 118
<i>R. (M) v. Hackney London Borough Council</i> [2011] EWCA Civ 4 .....	169
<i>R. (M) v. Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Council</i> (1998) 30 HLR 10 (CA) .....	53
<i>R. (Miller) v. Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union</i> [2016] EWHC 2768 (Admin) .....	4, 110–111, 204, 206, 249, 254, 362–363
<i>R. (Miller) v. Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union</i> [2017] UKSC 51 .....	104, 110–111, 139, 203, 249, 254, 280, 361–363, 365–366, 406
<i>R. (Morgan Grenfell) v. Special Commissioners of Income Tax</i> [2002] UKHL 21 .....	200, 249
<i>R. (Nicklinson) v. Ministry of Justice</i> [2013] EWCA Civ 961 .....	249–252
<i>R. (Nicklinson) v. Ministry of Justice</i> [2014] UKSC 38 .....	11, 146, 189, 217, 220, 238
<i>R. (Noone) v. Governor of Drake Hall Prison</i> [2010] UKSC 30 .....	115, 119, 123
<i>R. (Nutricia Ltd.) v. Secretary of State for Health</i> [2015] EWHC 2285 .....	267, 300
<i>R. (Osborn) v. Parole Board</i> [2013] UKSC 61 .....	249
<i>R. (Pierson) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1998] AC 539 (HL) .....	31, 249
<i>R. (Plantagenet Alliance Ltd) v. Secretary of State for Justice</i> [2014] EWHC 1662 (QB) .....	31, 109
<i>R. (Privacy International) v. Investigatory Powers Tribunal</i> [2017] EWCA Civ 1868 .....	249, 254
<i>R. (Public Law Project) v. Lord Chancellor</i> [2016] UKSC 39 .....	110, 125, 305–306
<i>R. (Quintavalle) v. Secretary of State for Health</i> [2003] UKHL 13 .....	46, 51–52, 60, 62–63, 107, 119–122, 124
<i>R. (Reilly) v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 413 .....	193
<i>R. (Risk Management Partners Ltd.) v. Brent London Borough Council</i> <i>and Harrow London Borough Council</i> [2011] UKSC 7 .....	324
<i>R. (Roszkowski) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2017] EWCA Civ 1893 .....	250
<i>R. (Shah) v. Barnet LBC</i> [1983] 2 AC 309 (HL) .....	126

<i>R. (Simms) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2000] 2 AC 115 (HL) . . . . .	149, 163, 201, 248–250, 315
<i>R. (Spath Holme) v. Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions</i> [2001] 2 AC 349 (HL) . . . . .	35, 37, 51–52, 58–60, 62–65, 134, 198
<i>R. (Unison) v. Lord Chancellor</i> [2017] UKSC 51 . . . . .	35
<i>R. (Westminster City Council) v. NASS</i> [2002] UKHL 38 . . . . .	63–64, 67–68
<i>R. (Wilkinson) v. Inland Revenue Commissioners</i> [2005] UKHL 30 . . . . .	51, 162, 193–194, 198, 208, 230
<i>R. (Wright) v. Secretary of State for Health</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 999 . . . . .	152, 282
<i>R. (Wright) v. Secretary of State for Health</i> [2009] UKHL 3 . . . . .	214
<i>R. (ZYN) v. Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council</i> [2014] EWHC 1918 . . . . .	123
<i>Revenue and Customs Commissioners v. IDT Card Services Ireland Ltd.</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 29 . . . . .	34–35, 39, 44, 261, 278, 280–281, 285, 291, 299, 309, 314, 343–345, 347–348, 359–360, 363–364, 368, 370, 372–373, 393
<i>Rhys-Harper v. Relaxion</i> [2003] UKHL 33 . . . . .	299
<i>River Wear Commissioners v. Adamson</i> (1887) 2 App. Cas. 743 . . . . .	62
<i>Robertson v. Swift</i> [2014] UKSC 50 . . . . .	45, 60, 261, 280, 314
<i>Ropaigealach v. Barclays Bank plc.</i> [2000] QB 263 (CA) . . . . .	112
<i>Rowstock Ltd. v. Jessemey</i> [2014] EWCA Civ 185 . . . . .	115, 118, 170, 290, 299
<i>Royal College of Nursing of the United Kingdom v. Department of Health and Social Security</i> [1981] AC 800 (HL) . . . . .	120–124
<i>Russell v. TransOcean International Resources Ltd.</i> [2011] UKSC 57 . . . . .	282
<i>S v. L</i> [2012] UKSC 30 . . . . .	52, 152–153, 155–156, 197
<i>Salomon v. Commissioners of Customs and Excise</i> [1967] 2 QB 116 (CA) . . . . .	60, 65–66, 280
<i>Seaford Court Estates Ltd. v. Asher</i> [1949] 2 KB 481 (CA) . . . . .	129
<i>Secretary of State for Defence v. Guardian Newspaper Ltd.</i> [1985] AC 339 (HL) . . . . .	128
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. AF</i> [2009] UKHL 28 . . . . .	146, 148, 194, 196
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. GG</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 786 . . . . .	248
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. JJ</i> [2007] UKHL 45 . . . . .	146
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. MB</i> [2007] UKHL 46 . . . . .	196
<i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v. Hourigan</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 1890 . . . . .	62
<i>Serious Organised Crime Agency v. Gale</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 759 . . . . .	193
<i>Shanning International Ltd. v. Lloyds TSB Bank plc</i> [2001] UKHL 31 . . . . .	128
<i>Sheldon v. RHM Outhwaite (Underwriting Agencies) Ltd.</i> [1996] AC 102 (HL) . . . . .	60
<i>Simms v. Registrar of Probates</i> [1900] AC 323 (PC) . . . . .	61
<i>Steele Ford &amp; Newton v. Crown Prosecution Service (No. 2)</i> [1994] 1 AC 22 (HL) . . . . .	128
<i>Stevenson v. Rogers</i> [1999] QB 1028 (CA) . . . . .	60
<i>Stock v. Frank Jones (Tipton) Ltd.</i> [1978] 1 WLR 231 (HL) . . . . .	35, 53, 59–60, 102, 112, 134
<i>Test Claimants in the FII Group Litigation v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 103 . . . . .	299, 326
<i>Test Claimants in the FII Group Litigation v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 1180 . . . . .	299, 368
<i>The United States of America v. Nolan</i> [2014] EWCA Civ 71 . . . . .	336
<i>The United States of America v. Nolan</i> [2015] UKSC 63 . . . . .	374
<i>Thoburn v. Sunderland City Council</i> [2002] EWHC 195 (Admin) . . . . .	5, 110, 139, 203–205, 260, 363, 365–366

<i>TV Broadcasting Ltd. v. TV Catchup Ltd.</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 204 . . . . .	299
<i>Unilin Beheer BV v. Berry Floor NV</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 1021. . . . .	282
<i>Vacher &amp; Sons v. London society of composers</i> [1913] AC 107 (HL) . . . . .	59, 103
<i>Victor Chandler International Ltd. v. Customs and Excise Commissioners</i> [2000] 1 WLR 1296 (CA) . . . . .	124
<i>Vodafone 2 v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2008] EWHC 1569 . . . . .	359, 373–374
<i>Vodafone 2 v. Revenue and Customs Commissioners</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 446 . . . . .	45, 189, 201, 215–216, 285, 299, 314, 316, 344–345, 368, 370–374
<i>Watkins v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] UKHL 17 . . . . .	139, 249
<i>Webb v. EMO Air Cargo (UK) Ltd. (No. 2)</i> [1995] 4 All ER 577 (HL) . . . . .	284
<i>Webb v. EMO Air Cargo (UK) Ltd.</i> [1992] 2 All ER 43 (CA) . . . . .	284
<i>Webb v. EMO Air Cargo (UK) Ltd.</i> [1992] 4 All ER 929 (HL) . . . . .	284
<i>West Mercia Constabulary v. Wagener</i> [1982] 1 WLR 127 . . . . .	113
<i>White v. White</i> [2001] UKHL 9 . . . . .	281
<i>Wilson v. First County Trust Ltd. (No. 2)</i> [2003] UKHL 40. . . . .	51, 53, 58, 63, 65, 67–68, 145–146, 152, 163, 192
<i>Yarl's Wood Immigration Ltd. v. Bedfordshire Police Authority</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 1110. . . . .	128
<i>Yemshaw v. London Borough of Hounslow</i> [2011] UKSC 3. . . . .	52, 122, 124–125
<i>YL v. Birmingham City Council</i> [2007] UKHL 27 . . . . .	30, 61

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AcP	Archiv für die civilistische Praxis
AG	Advocate General
AJCL	American Journal of Comparative Law
All ER	All England Law Reports
AöR	Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts
AP	Arbeitsrechtliche Praxis
art.	article
BAG	Bundesarbeitsgericht (German Federal Labour Court)
BeckRS	Beck online Rechtsprechung
BGB	Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (German Civil Code)
BGH	Bundesgerichtshof (German Federal Court of Justice)
BSG	Bundessozialgericht (German Federal Social Court)
BVerfG	Bundesverfassungsgericht (German Federal Constitutional Court)
BVerfGG	Bundesverfassungsgerichtsgesetz (Act on the German Federal Constitutional Court)
BVerwG	Bundesverwaltungsgericht (German Federal Administrative Court)
CA	Court of Appeal of England and Wales
Cf.	Compare
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CLJ	Cambridge Law Journal
CMLR	Common Market Law Review
CUP	Cambridge University Press
Deb.	Debates
DöV	Die öffentliche Verwaltung
DVBl	Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt
EBLR	European Business Law Review
ECA	European Communities Act 1972
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEC	(Treaty establishing the) European Economic Community
EHRLR	European Human Rights Law Review
EHRR	European Human Rights Reports
EJIL	European Journal of International Law
ELJ	European Law Journal
ELR	European Law Review
EU	European Union

EuGRZ	Europäische Grundrechte-Zeitschrift
EuR	Europarecht
EU(W) Act	European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018
EuZW	Europäische Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsrecht
FamRZ	Zeitschrift für das gesamte Familienrecht
GG	Grundgesetz (German Basic Law)
GRUR	Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht
HC	House of Commons
HL	House of Lords
HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
ICLQ	International and Comparative Law Quarterly
I-CON	International Journal of Constitutional Law
IRLR	Industrial Relations Law Reports
JBl	Juristische Blätter
JR	Judicial Review
JuS	Juristische Schulung
JZ	JuristenZeitung
KG	Kammergericht (Berlin Appellate Court)
LG	Landgericht (German Regional Court)
LJ	Lady Justice of Appeal or Lord Justice of Appeal
LQR	Law Quarterly Review
MJ	Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law
MLR	Modern Law Review
MR	Master of the Rolls
n.	note
NJW	Neue Juristische Wochenschrift
NVwZ	Neue Zeitschrift für Verwaltungsrecht
NVwZ-RR	Neue Zeitschrift für Verwaltungsrecht, Rechtsprechungs-Report
NZA	Neue Zeitschrift für Arbeitsrecht
NZA-RR	Neue Zeitschrift für Arbeitsrecht, Rechtsprechungs-Report
NZS	Neue Zeitschrift für Sozialrecht
OJLS	Oxford Journal of Legal Studies
OLG	Oberlandesgericht (German Higher Regional Court)
OUP	Oxford University Press
QB	Queen's Bench Division of the High Court
PC	Privy Council of the United Kingdom
PL	Public Law
RabelsZ	Rabels Zeitschrift für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht
RdA	Recht der Arbeit
RIW	Recht der internationalen Wirtschaft
s.	section
Sch.	Schedule
ss.	sections



SSRN	Social Science Research Network
StGB	Strafgesetzbuch (German Criminal Code)
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UKSC	Supreme Court of the United Kingdom
Vol.	Volume
WLR	The Weekly Law Reports
WM	Wertpapier-Mitteilungen, Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Bankrecht
ZaöRV	Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht
ZEuP	Zeitschrift für Europäisches Privatrecht
ZfPW	Zeitschrift für die gesamte Privatrechtswissenschaft
ZfRV	Zeitschrift für Europarecht, Internationales Privatrecht und Rechtsvergleichung
ZJS	Zeitschrift für das Juristische Studium
ZRP	Zeitschrift für Rechtspolitik
ZUM	Zeitschrift für Urheber- und Medienrecht

