

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases of the European Court of Justice</i>	xvii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1. Problem Definition: Discrimination and Reverse Discrimination	1
1.1. Equality and Non-Discrimination	1
1.2. Reverse Discrimination	3
1.2.1. The Concept of Reverse Discrimination	3
1.2.1.1. Unexpected Group is Discriminated Against	3
1.2.1.2. The Origins of Reverse Discrimination	4
1.2.1.3. Purely Internal Situations versus Situations with a Connection with Union Law	5
1.2.1.4. Examples of Reverse Discrimination	6
1.2.2. Terminology	8
1.2.2.1. Reverse Discrimination and Positive Action	9
1.2.2.2. Renaming Reverse Discrimination?	10
2. Research Aim	10
2.1. Research Questions	10
2.2. Delineating the Scope of Research	11
2.3. Added Value to Previous Literature	12
3. Methodology	13
4. Structure	15
4.1. Reverse Discrimination from a Union Law Perspective (Part I)	15
4.2. Reverse Discrimination from a Variety of National Perspectives (Part II)	16
4.3. Reverse Discrimination in a Federal State Context (Part III)	16

PART I. REVERSE DISCRIMINATION FROM A UNION PERSPECTIVE

Chapter 2. The European Court of Justice's Approach to Reverse Discrimination	21
1. ECJ's Traditional Approach: Reverse Discrimination is Not Prohibited by Union Law	21
1.1. The Early Case Law on Purely Internal Situations	21
1.1.1. The Notion of a 'Purely Internal Situation'	21

1.1.2.	Definition of a 'Purely Internal Situation'	22
1.1.3.	Justification Put Forward by the ECJ for the Purely Internal Situation Rule	23
1.2.	Reverse Discrimination is not Prohibited by Union Law	25
1.2.1.	Purely Internal Situations Outside the Scope of Union Law – Reverse Discrimination Not Prohibited by Union Law	25
1.2.2.	Reverse Discrimination Should be Addressed at the National Level	27
1.2.3.	Confirmation of the ECJ's Traditional Approach on Reverse Discrimination Following the Introduction of Union Citizenship	28
2.	Proposals to Address Reverse Discrimination at Union Level	30
2.1.	In the Light of the Common and Internal Market	30
2.2.	In the Light of Freedom of Movement for Persons and Union Citizenship	32
2.2.1.	In the Light of Union Citizenship and EU Fundamental Rights Protection	32
2.2.2.	Reverse Discrimination Incompatible with the Union Principle of Equality	33
3.	The ECJ's Traditional Approach Towards Reverse Discrimination Remains Valid	38
3.1.	Reverse Discrimination as a Side Effect of the Limited Scope of Application of Union Law	39
3.2.	A General Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination at the Union Level is Unnecessary and Undesirable	43
3.3.	Interpretation of the Purely Internal Situation Rule	46
Chapter 3. Applicability and Interpretation of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine		47
1.	Applicability of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	48
1.1.	The Purely Internal Situation Doctrine is Applicable to Treaty Provisions on Free Movement and Citizenship	48
1.2.	Refinements of, and Exceptions to, the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	48
1.2.1.	Harmonisation of National Laws: No Need for the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine	49
1.2.1.1.	No Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine in the Case of Harmonisation of National Laws	49

1.2.1.2.	Not all Forms of Harmonisation Exclude Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine: Minimum Harmonisation with a Market Access Clause	51
1.2.2.	Internal Tariff Barriers: An Exception to the Purely Internal Situation Rule	53
1.2.2.1.	An Overview of the ECJ's Case Law on Internal Tariff Barriers	53
1.2.2.2.	Divergent Opinions on the ECJ's Cases on Internal Tariff Barriers	56
1.2.3.	<i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases: Indirect Exceptions to the Purely Internal Situation Rule via Article 267 TFEU	60
1.2.3.1.	<i>Dzodzi</i> and <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases	60
1.2.3.2.	Criticising the Justifications Put Forward in the <i>Dzodzi</i> and <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases	63
1.2.3.3.	ECJ Puts 'Limited' Limits on the <i>Guimont</i> Line of Cases	65
2.	The Purely Internal Situation versus Sufficient Connection with Union Law	68
2.1.	Traditional Interpretation of Sufficient Link with Union Law: Cross-Border Element as Actual Movement between Member States	69
2.1.1.	Treaty Provisions on the Freedom of Movement	69
2.1.1.1.	Treaty Provisions on Freedom of Movement: Cross-Border Element and Economic Activity	69
2.1.1.2.	Having Exercised His or Her Right of Free Movement	70
2.1.2.	Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship	71
2.1.2.1.	Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship: Cross-Border Element	71
2.1.2.2.	Justifications for the ECJ's Application of the Purely Internal Situation Doctrine to the Treaty Provisions on Union Citizenship	75
2.2.	Ever More Generous Interpretation of a Sufficient Connection with Union Law by the ECJ?	79
2.2.1.	As a Preliminary Remark: Criteria of Evaluation	80
2.2.2.	Precise Indications on How Much Movement and (Re)introduction of Causal Link	81
2.2.2.1.	Sufficient Connection with Union Law: How Much 'Movement' is Necessary?	82

2.2.2.2.	Causal Link Between the Exercise of Free Movement and the Right Protected by Union Law	84
2.2.3.	The ECJ's Restrictions Approach	86
2.2.3.1.	<i>Dassonville</i> Case Law in the Area of Free Movement of Goods	86
2.2.3.2.	Extension of Restrictions Approach to Free Movement of Workers, Services and Establishment and to Union Citizenship	88
2.2.3.3.	Risks Implied in the Restrictions Approach – Confining the Concept of Restriction	93
2.2.4.	Stretching the Notion of Movement	99
2.2.4.1.	'Returning Citizens': Moving Back to Home Member State after Residing and Working in Another Member State	100
2.2.4.2.	Residing in Another Member State	106
2.2.4.3.	Exercise of Free Movement without Moving Residence	114
2.2.4.4.	Abuse of Union Law: A Stricter Notion of Movement and Real Causal Link	124
2.2.5.	Reducing the Importance of Movement in the Light of Union Citizenship	128
2.2.5.1.	External Element Other than Movement between Member States: Nationality of One Member State and Resident in Another Member State	128
2.2.5.2.	Intrinsic Connection with Union Law Introduced in <i>Rottmann</i> and <i>Ruiz Zambrano</i>	135
2.2.5.3.	In the Aftermath of <i>Ruiz Zambrano</i>	138
2.2.5.4.	The Clear Impact of Union Citizenship on the Connection Required with Union Law – Recent Limits	153

Conclusion Part I

1.	Reverse Discrimination as a Side Effect of the Scope of Application of Union Law	157
2.	The ECJ's Interpretation of a Purely Internal Situation	158
3.	Distinguishing Problematic and Unproblematic Cases of Reverse Discrimination – Redefining the Scope of Application of Union Law	160
3.1.	Proposals in Literature Distinguishing Problematic Cases from Unproblematic Cases of Reverse Discrimination	160

3.2.	Redefining the Scope of Application of the Treaty Provisions on Free Movement and Citizenship	164
3.3.	Working Hypothesis Based on Compensation/Overcompensation by Union Law	166
3.3.1.	The Distinction between Compensation and Overcompensation by Union Law	166
3.3.2.	Interpretation of '(Over)Compensation' and 'Disadvantage Resulting from Exercise of Free Movement'	168
3.3.3.	Illustration: Reverse Discrimination in the Area of Family Reunification	170
3.3.3.1.	Family Reunification Directive 2003/86 and Citizenship Directive 2004/38	170
3.3.3.2.	The Evolution from Compensation to Overcompensation by Union Law in the Area of Family Reunification	171

PART II. REVERSE DISCRIMINATION FROM NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Chapter 4. Reverse Discrimination with Respect to Goods

1.	Assessment by National Courts of Reverse Discrimination with Respect to Goods	184
1.1.	The French Council of State on Ethyl Alcohol	184
1.2.	The French Court of Cassation on Emmenthal	186
1.3.	The German Federal Administrative Court on the Purity Requirement for Beer	188
1.4.	The Italian Constitutional Court on Dried Pasta	191
2.	Reverse Discrimination of Goods: Rare Cases?	194

Chapter 5. Reverse Discrimination of Persons

1.	Classic Economic Free Movement Rights of Persons	197
1.1.	Professional Qualifications	198
1.1.1.	The Austrian Constitutional Court on the Exemption from Proof of Qualification on the Basis of Previous Professional Activity in Another EEA Member State	198
1.1.2.	The French Council of State on Tourist Guides and Architects	200
1.1.2.1.	The French Council of State on Proof of Good Behaviour for Tourist Guides	200

1.1.2.2.	The French Council of State on the Restoration of Classified Historic Monuments by a Specific Type of Architect	202
1.1.2.3.	The French Council of State on Attestation of Professional Qualifications for Tourist Guides	205
1.1.3.	The German Federal Constitutional Court on Skilled Trades Order	206
1.1.4.	<i>Intermezzo</i> : Compensation by Union Law: Assessment of a Purely Internal Situation in the Light of National Law, but Union Rules May be Inspiration.	211
1.2.	Acquiring Immovable Property: The Austrian Constitutional Court	214
1.3.	Employment Conditions	216
1.3.1.	Wage-Setting Mechanisms: Changing Approach of the French Court of Cassation's Social Chamber	216
1.3.2.	Duration of Contracts: Extensive Interpretation of Link with Union Law by the Italian Constitutional Court	219
2.	Family Reunification with a Union Citizen.	223
2.1.	Introduction	223
2.2.	Family Reunification: An Emotive and Politically Sensitive Subject	224
2.3.	Incomparable Situations According to French and German Courts	225
2.3.1.	The French Council of State on Family Reunification.	225
2.3.2.	German Administrative Courts on Family Reunification ...	226
2.3.2.1.	Administrative Appeal Court of Hesse 2006	226
2.3.2.2.	German Federal Administrative Court 2011	228
2.3.2.3.	Division of Competences Precedes Assessment in the Light of the Principle of Equality.	230
2.4.	A Change of Approach in Austria and Belgium	231
2.4.1.	Developments in Austrian Legislation on Family Reunification.	231
2.4.1.1.	Austrian Constitutional Court in 1997: Difference in Treatment is Discriminatory	231
2.4.1.2.	Austrian Constitutional Court in 2009: Autonomy of National Legislator to Treat Purely Internal Situations Differently	232
2.4.2.	Developments in Belgian Legislation on Family Reunification.	234
2.4.2.1.	Autonomous Legislative Alignment in the Area of Family Reunification	234

2.4.2.2.	<i>Intermezzo</i> : Problems Concerning the Scope and Interpretation of Autonomously Aligned Legislation.	236
2.4.2.3.	Introduction of Reverse Discrimination in the Field of Family Reunification in 2011	237
2.4.2.4.	The Judgments of the Belgian Constitutional Court of 26 September 2013	239
2.4.2.5.	The Constitutional Court's Judgments of 26 September 2013: Analysis.	241
2.5.	The Unique Italian Position: From a Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination in the Area of Family Reunification to a General Prohibition on Reverse Discrimination	251
2.5.1.	The Italian Council of State Regarding Family Reunification.	251
2.5.2.	The Italian Legislator: Autonomous Alignment.	252
2.5.2.1.	Legislative Autonomous Alignment in Family Reunification	252
2.5.2.2.	General Legislative Autonomous Alignment	253
2.5.2.3.	Extensive Implications of General Legislative Autonomous Alignment.	254

Conclusion Part II. 257

1.	Conclusion by Area?	257
2.	Application of the Working Hypothesis to the National Level.	258
2.1.	Interpretation of Compensation and Overcompensation at National Level.	258
2.2.	National Assessment in Cases of Compensation by Union Law	258
2.3.	National Assessment in Cases of Overcompensation by Union Law	259
3.	Evaluation of the Application of the Working Hypothesis to the National Level.	260
3.1.	Putting of Compensation and Overcompensation in Practice at National Level.	260
3.2.	Alternatives to the Application of the Working Hypothesis at National Level.	262
4.	Some Final Thoughts on Addressing Reverse Discrimination at the National Level.	264