

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | xii |
| <i>Table of figures and diagrams</i> | xiii |
| <i>Table of abbreviations</i> | xiv |
| <i>Notes on contributors</i> | xv |

1 Proportionality crossing borders: why it is still difficult to recognise sparrows and cannons 1

SOFIA RANCHORDÁS AND BOUDEWIJN DE WAARD

- 1.1 Introduction 1
- 1.2 Proportionality in administrative law 4
- 1.3 Proportionality: controversies and mysteries 5
- 1.4 Comparing proportionality tests in administrative law 6
 - 1.4.1 Proportionality: a high-value product ‘made in Germany’ 6
 - 1.4.2 Implicit-explicit proportionality: the French touch 7
 - 1.4.3 More to proportionality than Wednesbury in England? 7
 - 1.4.4 Proportionality in the Netherlands: Dutch sobriety 9
 - 1.4.5 Proportionality, human rights and the European project 9
 - 1.4.6 No need for proportionality: just take a hard look 10
- 1.5 Conclusions 10

2 The principle of proportionality in German administrative law 13

NIKOLAUS MARSCH AND VANESSA TÜNSMEYER

- 2.1 Introduction 13
- 2.2 Judicial review of administrative action in Germany 15
 - 2.2.1 Effective judicial review of administrative action as a constitutional obligation 15
 - 2.2.2 Proportionality as a boundary to legislative and administrative discretion 17

- 2.3 Historical background and evolution 22
 - 2.3.1 Overview 22
 - 2.3.2 The eighteenth century 23
 - 2.3.3 The nineteenth century 25
 - 2.3.4 Academic discussion and development of the specific criteria 27
 - 2.3.5 Case law 27
 - 2.3.6 The first half of the twentieth century 28
 - 2.3.7 Since 1949: proportionality and the constitutionalisation of administrative law 29
- 2.4 The proportionality test – actual meaning and practice 30
 - 2.4.1 The four-step test and the varying intensity of control 30
 - 2.4.2 The German ‘export hit’ and the European influence on German law 34
- 2.5 The status quo and recent developments in the literature and case law 36
 - 2.5.1 A core element of German public law 36
 - 2.5.2 ‘Bound decisions’ and the principle of proportionality 37
- 2.6 Conclusion 39

3 Proportionality in French administrative law

43

YOAN SANCHEZ

- 3.1 Introduction 43
- 3.2 History and overview of the use of the proportionality review by the Council of State 45
 - 3.2.1 An unacknowledged control 45
 - 3.2.2 Acknowledging the control 46
- 3.3 Scope of the proportionality test 50
 - 3.3.1 The traditional field: the protection of rights and freedoms 50
 - 3.3.2 New areas: urban planning and disciplinary sanctions 52
 - 3.3.3 Disciplinary sanctions 56
- 3.4 Proportionality test and modulation of the effects of annulment 59
- 3.5 Intensity of the proportionality test 61
 - 3.5.1 The two degrees of the proportionality test 61
 - 3.5.2 Factors affecting the intensity of the proportionality test 63
- 3.6 Interesting thoughts and food for thought on the proportionality test 65
 - 3.6.1 Thoughts on the control of proportionality 66

- 3.6.2 The shortcomings of the literature on proportionality 68
- 3.6.3 Food for thought and reflections on the proportionality test 69

4 Proportionality in English Law 73

A.C.L. DAVIES AND J.R. WILLIAMS

- 4.1 Introduction 73
- 4.2 Background 74
 - 4.2.1 Judicial review 74
 - 4.2.2 The *Wednesbury* test and its progeny 75
 - 4.2.3 The proportionality test 77
 - 4.2.4 The *Wednesbury*/proportionality split 79
- 4.3 Proportionality and *Wednesbury* compared 81
 - 4.3.1 The problems with *Wednesbury* review 81
 - 4.3.2 The advantages of proportionality 83
- 4.4 The incommensurability objection 95
- 4.5 The application of proportionality and the deference debate 97
 - 4.5.1 Definition and application 97
 - 4.5.2 Deference as a doctrine? 103
- 4.6 Conclusion 106

5 Proportionality in Dutch administrative law 109

BOUDEWIJN DE WAARD

- 5.1 Introduction 109
- 5.2 Towards a definition: a brief history of judicial review 109
 - 5.2.1 Control of administrative action in the first half of the twentieth century 109
 - 5.2.2 Introduction of the GALA in 1994 114
 - 5.2.3 Case law after the introduction of Article 3:4, Section 2, GALA 115
 - 5.2.4 Approach to proportionality in the literature 120
 - 5.2.5 Conclusion on the definition of proportionality 121
- 5.3 Marginal control: a method of testing 122
- 5.4 Interim conclusion 124
- 5.5 Elements of proportionality permeating other legal principles 124
 - 5.5.1 Unreasonableness: *ultimum remedium* 127
- 5.6 Margin of appreciation, discretion and judicial control 127
 - 5.6.1 Distinction between 'margin of appreciation' and 'discretion (in a narrow sense)' 127

- 5.6.2 Leaving a margin of appreciation: within and beyond the separation of powers 130
- 5.7 In what circumstances is the proportionality test used? 133
 - 5.7.1 The field of law: EU law or national law? 133
 - 5.7.2 The field of law: human rights? 134
 - 5.7.3 Control of regulation or of individual decisions? 135
- 5.8 How is the test on arbitrariness applied? 137
 - 5.8.1 Does the intensity of review vary depending on the type of case? 137
 - 5.8.2 What factors make the judicial review more or less intense? 138
 - 5.8.3 The prohibition of arbitrariness in the case-law and the literature 138
- 5.9 Conclusions 139

6 The principle of proportionality in European law

142

CATHERINE HAGUENAU-MOIZARD, YOAN SANCHEZ

- 6.1 Introduction 142
- 6.2 The proportionality test in ECtHR case law 143
 - 6.2.1 The origins and diversity of expression of the proportionality test 143
 - 6.2.2 The application of the proportionality test 146
 - 6.2.3 The change in the intensity of the proportionality test 149
- 6.3 The test of proportionality in ECJ case law 151
 - 6.3.1 Introduction 151
 - 6.3.2 The scope of the proportionality test 154
 - 6.3.3 The change in the intensity of the supervision of the Court 156
- 6.4 Conclusion 158

7 Agency discretion, judicial review and ‘proportionality’ in US administrative law

160

JUD MATHEWS

- 7.1 Introduction 160
- 7.2 Judicial review in American administrative law: an overview 162
 - 7.2.1 The availability of review 162
 - 7.2.2 The scope of review 165
- 7.3 Arbitrary and capricious review 168
 - 7.3.1 The advent of ‘hard look’ review 169
 - 7.3.2 Hard look review in action: National Tire Dealers 171

- 7.3.3 A hard look from the Supreme Court: State Farm 174
- 7.3.4 The twilight of hard look? Fox Television 180
- 7.4 Agency discretion and statutory interpretation 183
 - 7.4.1 A convergence of standards? 185
- 7.5 Conclusion 187

8 Concluding remarks 191

SOFIA RANCHORDÁS AND BOUDEWIJN DE WAARD

- 8.1 Proportionality: indispensable criterion in administrative law 191
 - 8.1.1 A European proportionality? 192
- 8.2 A 'kind of proportionality' is needed 193
 - 8.2.1 Courts avoid taking over the role of the administration 194
- 8.3 Proportionality in the narrow sense 196
- 8.4 Proportionality, reasonableness and intensity of judicial control 200
- 8.5 Margin of appreciation and deference 201
- 8.6 Closing remarks 203

Index 205