

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	References	6
 Part I International and Comparative Case Law Regarding the Lawfulness of Multiple Sanctioning Systems Under the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>		
2	Case Law of the Supreme Court of the United States	11
2.1	Brief History of the Double Jeopardy Protection	12
2.2	Protections Afforded by the Double Jeopardy Clause and Underlying Policies	14
2.3	“Same Offence” Requirement	15
2.3.1	The Same Elements Test: <i>Blockburger v. United States</i>	15
2.3.2	Greater Inclusive Offence and Lesser Included Offence: <i>Brown v. Ohio</i>	18
2.3.3	“Same Offence” Requirement in Contexts of Multiple Prosecutions	20
2.4	The Dual Sovereignty Doctrine	26
2.4.1	The Evolution of the Dual Sovereignty Doctrine	26
2.4.2	Definition of Sovereign for the Purposes of Double Jeopardy	30
2.4.3	The Sham Exception	31
2.4.4	The Petite Policy	32
2.5	Protection Against Multiple Prosecutions for the Same Offence	33
2.5.1	The Moment from Which the Defendant Is in Jeopardy	34
2.5.2	Second Prosecution Following an Acquittal	35
2.5.3	Second Prosecution Following a Conviction	36

2.6	Protection Against Multiple Punishments for the Same Offence	37
2.6.1	Protection Against Multiple Punishments in a Single Prosecution	37
2.6.2	Parallel Criminal and Non-criminal Sanctions for the Same Facts	38
2.7	Issue Preclusion as a Constitutional Requirement of the Double Jeopardy Clause	54
2.7.1	General Remarks on Issue Preclusion	55
2.7.2	Issue Preclusion in Criminal Proceedings: Utilisation of a Judgment of Acquittal in Subsequent Criminal Proceedings	58
2.7.3	Issue Preclusion Between Criminal and Civil Proceedings: Utilisation of a Judgment of Acquittal in Subsequent Civil Proceedings	65
2.8	Summary of the Case Law of the Supreme Court of the United States	69
	References	70
3	Case Law of the Supreme Court of Canada	77
3.1	Charged with an Offence	78
3.1.1	Application of the Above Criteria to Disciplinary Proceedings	81
3.1.2	Application of the Above Criteria to Civil Monetary Sanctions	81
3.1.3	Application of the Above Criteria to Civil Forfeiture Mechanisms	85
3.2	“Same Offence” Requirement	86
3.3	Summary of the Case Law of the Supreme Court of Canada	91
	References	92
4	Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights	93
4.1	Criminal Nature of the Proceedings: The “Engel Criteria”	95
4.2	The “Same Offence” Requirement	98
4.2.1	The Different Approaches Before <i>Zolotukhin v. Russia</i>	98
4.2.2	<i>Zolotukhin v. Russia</i> and the Current Interpretation	99
4.3	The “Final Decision” Requirement	101
4.4	The “Duplication of Proceedings” Requirement	102
4.4.1	The Case Law Before <i>A and B v. Norway</i>	102
4.4.2	The Development of the “Sufficiently Close Connection in Substance and Time” Exception: <i>A and B v. Norway</i>	105
4.4.3	The Case Law After <i>A and B v. Norway</i>	108

4.5	The Exception of the Second Paragraph of Article 4 of Protocol 7	112
4.6	Summary of the Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights	114
	References	115
5	Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Union	119
5.1	Criminal Nature of the Proceedings	121
5.2	The “Same Offence” Requirement	122
5.3	The “Final Decision” Requirement	124
5.4	Duplication of Proceedings as a Legitimate Restriction of <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	125
5.5	Summary of the Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Union	127
	References	128
Part II	Critical Analysis of the Case Law of the ECtHR and the CJEU Regarding the Lawfulness of Multiple Sanctioning Systems Under the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	
6	Lawfulness of Multiple Sanctioning Systems Under the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>: Four Different Approaches to Resolve the Same Problem . . .	133
6.1	First Problem: Lack of Clarity Regarding the Rationale of the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	135
6.2	Second Problem: The Dead End of the Thesis of the Criminal Nature	139
6.2.1	Does the Current Approach of the Criminal Nature Thesis Produce Predictable Results?	142
6.2.2	The ‘All-or-Nothing’ Reasoning of the Current Approach	147
6.3	Third Problem: Incorporation of Criteria Unrelated to the Rationale of the Protection Against Multiple Prosecutions	149
6.3.1	Vagueness of the Factors Listed by the ECtHR and the CJEU	150
6.3.2	Duplications in the Collection and the Assessment of the Evidence	152
6.3.3	Overlap Between the Prohibition of Multiple Prosecutions and the Prohibition of Disproportionate Sanctions	154
	References	155

**Part III Reconceptualizing the Prohibition of Multiple Punishments
and the Prohibition of Multiple Prosecutions**

7	Understanding Multiple Sanctioning Systems: Models of Organisation	161
7.1	Subsidiary Model	162
7.2	Complementary Model	163
	References	165
8	Overcoming the Dead End of the Thesis of the Criminal Nature . . .	167
	References	170
9	Reconceptualising the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	171
9.1	Two Competing <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i> Models	171
9.1.1	First Model: Substantive <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	171
9.1.2	Second Model: Procedural <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	172
9.2	Analysis of the Protection Against Multiple Punishments and the Protection Against Multiple Prosecutions	173
9.2.1	Protection Against Multiple Punishments	173
9.2.2	Protection Against Multiple Prosecutions	180
9.3	Summary of the Proposed Alternative Interpretation	189
	References	191

**Part IV Looking Beyond the *Ne Bis in Idem*: Recalling the
Prohibition of Disproportionate Sanctions and the
Right to be Tried Within a Reasonable Time**

10	Looking Beyond the <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	197
10.1	The Prohibition of Disproportionate Sanctions	198
10.2	The Right to Be Tried Within a Reasonable Time	202
	References	205
11	Final Remarks	207
	Table of Cases	211