

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>List of tables</i> | xi |
| <i>Table of cases</i> | xii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 Judicial dissent: what is it and why does it matter? | 5 |
| 1 <i>Judicial dissent and dissenting opinions: a definition</i> | 5 |
| 2 <i>Dissenting opinions in legal research: an object or a tool?</i> | 7 |
| 3 <i>The sui generis nature of constitutional courts</i> | 10 |
| 2 The decision-making process in constitutional courts | 17 |
| 1 <i>Internal court structure in comparative perspective</i> | 18 |
| 2 <i>The prominent figures of the decision-making process</i> | 29 |
| 2.1 <i>The president of the court</i> | 29 |
| 2.2 <i>The most prominent member of the decision-making panel: the rapporteur judge and the opinion-writer</i> | 39 |
| 2.3 <i>Non-judicial offices: law clerks and the secretary general</i> | 45 |
| 3 <i>The style of constitutional court decisions</i> | 49 |
| 3 Judicial dissent in the common law tradition | 52 |
| 1 <i>Introductory remarks</i> | 52 |
| 2 <i>The origins of the dissenting opinion</i> | 52 |
| 2.1 <i>The historical roots: England</i> | 52 |
| 2.2 <i>The ‘institutionalisation’ of judicial dissent in the United States</i> | 58 |
| 2.3 <i>The first ‘Great Dissenters’ in the history of the US Supreme Court: from Johnson to Holmes</i> | 63 |

- 3 *The practice of dissenting opinions in the common law tradition: the United Kingdom and the United States compared* 66
 - 3.1 *The decision-making process: two common law supreme courts compared* 66
 - 3.2 *The role of law clerks in the decision-making process* 71
 - 3.3 *Separate opinions and the doctrine of binding precedent: the problematic issue of plurality opinions* 74
 - 3.4 *Dissent rates and judicial style in the US and the UK Supreme Courts* 76

4 Judicial dissent in the civil law tradition

78

- 1 *Judicial decision-making in the civil law tradition: founded on secrecy?* 78
- 2 *Dissenting opinions in three Western European legal systems* 83
 - 2.1 *Dissenting opinions in the German Federal Constitutional Court* 83
 - 2.1.1 *The history of dissenting opinions in German constitutional justice* 83
 - 2.1.2 *The practice of dissenting opinions in the Bundesverfassungsgericht* 86
 - 2.2 *Dissenting opinions in the Spanish legal tradition* 89
 - 2.2.1 *Votos reservados and votos particulares: the history of judicial dissent in Spain* 89
 - 2.2.2 *The practice of dissenting opinions in the Tribunal Constitucional* 92
 - 2.3 *Attempts at introducing dissenting opinions in Italian constitutional justice* 95
- 3 *Judicial dissent in the European courts* 102
 - 3.1 *Dissenting opinions in Strasbourg: the practice of the European Court of Human Rights* 104
 - 3.2 *The absence of dissenting opinions in Luxembourg: the practice of the Court of Justice of the European Union* 107
 - 3.3 *Excursus – dissenting opinions in The Hague: the practice of the International Court of Justice* 113
 - 3.4 *Comparative remarks* 116
- 4 *Judicial dissent in East-Central European constitutional courts* 120

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 4.1 | <i>A new generation of constitutional courts: why treat them separately?</i> | 120 |
| 4.2 | <i>Law in the books: the rules concerning judicial dissent</i> | 121 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>The Baltic story: three degrees of openness</i> | 125 |
| 4.2.2 | <i>The Slovak story: precedent becomes law</i> | 127 |
| 4.2.3 | <i>The Yugoslav story: a separate way</i> | 128 |
| 4.3 | <i>The law in action: the use of dissenting opinions</i> | 128 |
| 4.3.1 | <i>What do the numbers show?</i> | 128 |
| 4.3.2 | <i>The role of dissenting opinions in the development of constitutional law</i> | 132 |
| 5 | <i>A country study: separate opinions in the Hungarian Constitutional Court (1990–2010)</i> | 134 |
| 5.1 | <i>The challenges of a quantitative analysis</i> | 136 |
| 5.2 | <i>The data on separate opinions from 1990–2010</i> | 141 |
| 5.3 | <i>The two forms of separate opinion: dissents and concurrences</i> | 141 |
| 5.4 | <i>Why does a judge decide to write separately?</i> | 144 |
| 5.5 | <i>The style of separate opinions</i> | 147 |
| 5.6 | <i>The internal dynamics of decision-making</i> | 150 |
| 5.7 | <i>When a separate opinion becomes precedent</i> | 154 |
| 5.8 | <i>Conclusion</i> | 157 |
| 5 | Comparative reflections | 158 |
| 1 | <i>The publication of dissenting opinions: pros and cons</i> | 158 |
| 2 | <i>Independence vs. transparency: a difficult balance</i> | 162 |
| 2.1 | <i>Dissenting opinions and judicial independence</i> | 163 |
| 2.2 | <i>Dissenting opinions and transparency of decision-making</i> | 164 |
| 3 | <i>Judicial dissent and legal certainty</i> | 168 |
| 3.1 | <i>Legitimacy, the majority principle and the ‘consistency’ element of legal certainty</i> | 169 |
| 3.2 | <i>The ‘predictability’ element of legal certainty</i> | 170 |
| 3.3 | <i>Legal certainty and legal positivism</i> | 172 |
| 3.4 | <i>A brief remark on the indeterminacy of constitutional law</i> | 174 |
| 4 | <i>The judges’ point of view</i> | 175 |
| 4.1 | <i>The personal dimension of separate opinions</i> | 175 |
| 4.2 | <i>Judicial dissent and the freedom of expression</i> | 177 |

x *Contents*

- 5 *The role of dissenting opinions in the development of constitutional case-law* 179
- 6 *Conclusive remarks: judicial dissent and the civil law tradition* 181

Appendix: List of Western and East-Central European Constitutions, Constitutional Court Acts and Rules of Procedure of the respective constitutional courts

Bibliography

Index

185

192

205