



News@JNEU

ISSUE 12 - DECEMBER 2025

I.	Annual correspondents' meeting.....	2
II.	Members' activities.....	8
1.	The Dutch Council of State's use of the JNEU Forum.....	8
2.	New judicial appointments at the CJEU	10
III.	JNEU Activities.....	11
1.	Visit to Luxembourg.....	11
2.	Working Group Activities.....	13
a)	Legal research.....	13
b)	Legal terminology.....	14
c)	Informal Working Group on the role of correspondents.....	15
IV.	Collaboration with the EJTN	16
1.	Themis.....	16
2.	EJTN courses and seminars training opportunities.....	17
3.	Seminar on the Preliminary Ruling Procedure	18
4.	EJTN Conference of Directors, 14-15 October, Bordeaux (France).....	18
V.	Standing call for contributions.....	19

I. Annual correspondents' meeting

The seventh meeting of the correspondents of the Judicial Network of the European Union ('JNEU') was held in Lisbon on 20 and 21 November under the high patronage of the Portuguese Tribunal Constitucional (Constitutional Court), Supremo Tribunal de Justiça (Supreme Court) and Supremo Tribunal Administrativo (Supreme Administrative Court).

Representing forty-seven member courts and four observers, sixty correspondents participated, thirty in situ.



Musical interlude at the Supremo Tribunal Administrativo

The activities started in the evening of 20 November. A cocktail reception was organised at the **Supremo Tribunal Administrativo**, with participants being welcomed by Jorge Aragão Seia, the President of that court. After a musical interlude in the traditional fado style, a welcome dinner followed in the intimate setting of Café no Chiado.

.

The meeting itself took place on the morning of Friday 21 November in the Salão Nobre of the **Supremo Tribunal de Justiça**. Participants were welcomed first by Celestina Iannone, Director of the Research and Documentation Directorate of the CJEU, then by João Cura Mariano, President of the Supremo Tribunal de Justiça, Jorge Aragão Seia, President of the Supremo Tribunal Administrativo, and José João Abrantes, President of the Tribunal Constitucional. The hosts emphasised that the JNEU's successes in joint collaboration and mutual exchange were aptly reflected in the organisation of the annual correspondents' meeting being shared between the three apex courts of Portugal. Also, the JNEU was presented as a unique platform for fostering mutual understanding of national and EU law under the motto "EUUnited in diversity".



There were two parts to the meeting.

The first part was dedicated to the future of cooperation within the JNEU.

In his introductory remarks, Koen Lenaerts, President of the Court of Justice, stressed the importance of the annual meeting, organised for only the second time outside Luxembourg. He notably pointed out that the fact that national members of the Judicial Network of the European Union organised this meeting, demonstrates that the Network really is 'our Network, a common enterprise of all its

members'.

In a wide-ranging speech, President Lenaerts focused on the system of partial transfer of jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings to the General Court and the latest developments in AI now applied at the CJEU. In terms of communication strategy, he noted the introduction of 'video capsules', whereby a judge gives a brief explanation of a Court ruling in the language of the procedure of the case, subtitled in all languages. He also mentioned

the improved style of press releases, the greater use of social media by the Court, as well as the online-streaming of hearings and decisions.

As regards future developments at the CJEU, President Lenaerts alluded to the revamping of the CJEU's website and the introduction of a new more user-friendly search engine.

This introduction was followed by a presentation given by Ms Iannone, representing also Alfredo Calot Escobar, Registrar of the Court of Justice of the European Union. She gave an overview of JNEU activities and a perspective on future cooperation. She focused particularly on the internal platform and on the JNEU's visits programme.

As regards the platform, Ms Iannone noted that the case-law database now contains over 2400 national decisions, which have now been assigned Eurovoc keywords to facilitate multi-lingual searches. Another content-sharing space of the internal platform was also mentioned, the Forum, where members can ask one another legal questions. The success of the Forum continued in 2025 with 12 questions having been asked by member courts with each question receiving approximately 12 answers from other member courts.

Ms Iannone furthermore provided an overview of the JNEU visits to Austria and Luxembourg in 2025, as well as the forthcoming visit to Bulgaria. Finally, the activities of the JNEU's four thematic working groups were also presented, with new ones having been created on artificial intelligence and on the role of correspondents.

In concluding the first part of the meeting, Ingrid Derveaux, Secretary-General of the European Judicial Training Network presented the catalogue of training courses, seminars and work-shadowing programmes, that cement the cooperation between the EJTN and the JNEU.

The second part of the meeting was devoted to the scope of the obligation to refer a case to the CJEU.



Kari Kuusiniemi, President of the Korkein hallinto-oikeus (Supreme Administrative Court, Finland) introduced the topic, emphasising that, whilst Member States are United in Diversity, there is more unity than diversity. His speech also highlighted the thirst of apex courts for information on the case-law of their counterparts.

This introduction was followed by four presentations on the application of the principle by national courts. First, Rafael Sarazá Jimena, Judge at the Tribunal Supremo (Supreme Court, Spain), presented his court's interpretation of the obligation to refer seen through the prism of 'interés casacional' (a legitimate ground for bringing an appeal on a point of law), including how that notion is applied by different chambers of the court. He framed a decision not to refer also in terms of the right to an effective remedy and, in that regard, as a matter of national constitutional law.

Mr Sarazá Jimena also referred to tensions between the preliminary ruling procedure and the national hierarchy of courts. These were brought to the discussion by way of two examples. First, there is the potential for a request from a lower court to give an incorrect account of national (case-)law. Second, successive requests from lower courts can lead to delays at national level because cassation proceedings must be suspended to avoid the potential for divergent interpretations from the CJEU and a supreme court.

Next, Alice Guimaraes-Purokoski, Judge at the Korkein oikeus (Supreme Court, Finland) took the floor. In her presentation, she first outlined the particularities of the Finnish courts system, the Finnish system for granting leave to appeal and the mechanism of 'requests for precedent' from lower courts to the Korkein oikeus.

As regards refusal to grant leave to appeal, the Finnish practice for purely national law questions is to state that the procedural requirements are not met. In refusing applications raising interpretations of EU law, which the Korkein oikeus also examines ex officio, the practice is to state, in a standard formulation, which of the three legitimate reasons of EU law underlined its decision: irrelevance, *acte clair* or *acte éclairé*.

Tom Boeckestein, Legal Secretary at the Raad van State (Council of State, Netherlands) then spoke, reacting to the previous interventions by focussing on the specificities of the Dutch system for appeals on a point of law. Where leave to appeal is refused, the Raad van State typically delivers a summary judgment dismissing the appeal, explaining why the importance of the matter or its chance of success did not meet the requisite threshold.

Mr Boeckestein also referred to a recent development in judicial practice whereby an intermediate format between a full and a summary judgment has emerged. This new

practice consists of reproducing passages of settled case-law relevant to the case, thereby providing more detail than a summary judgment but not the full reasoning of a judgment proper.

Lastly, Bernard McCloskey, Judge at the Court of Appeal in Northern Ireland (United Kingdom) took a step back to consider the preliminary ruling system in its broader context, from its foundations onwards. In that light, the obligation to refer was presented as the duty incumbent on all national courts where real doubts arise as to the interpretation of EU law. He also outlined the legal framework applicable to requests for preliminary rulings from the CJEU following the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union and a recent request for a preliminary ruling from a UK court.

In the context of the debates which followed, participants had particularly rich and fruitful exchanges of opinions, bearing notably on the challenges posed by the obligation to refer, and the interest with which national courts anticipate the Court's judgment in the pending Remling case (C-767/23). Ms Iannone closed the meeting with a very special word of thanks to the JNEU team, the organisers and the correspondents for their indefatigable efforts in further strengthening the role of the JNEU as a central forum at the service of the rule of law and case-law consistency across the European Union.

The meeting was followed by a lunch held at the Supremo Tribunal de Justiça, which provided an opportunity to continue exchanges and strengthen links between member courts and their representatives.



The programme concluded with a guided tour of the **Tribunal Constitucional** (Constitutional Court), during which the role of this court was discussed, in addition to its similarities and differences with other constitutional court members of the JNEU.

The meeting as well as the previous and subsequent activities were highly appreciated by the participants:

- 'It was indeed a big success with very interesting presentations and fruitful discussions. Yet again it was demonstrated how important in person meetings are to further improve dialogue and strengthen cooperation.'
- 'Participation in the meeting was a good forum to gain experience and inspiration about the preliminary reference procedure from the presented national courts with the extended relevant practice. We agree that alive meetings are very successful as they are very convincing!'
- 'I consider JNEU annual correspondents' events essential for maintaining and strengthening contacts with representatives of courts in other Member States. I have gained many useful professional connections through JNEU events, and these have been very helpful in my work. Without the opportunity to meet in person, building and sustaining such contacts would have been considerably more difficult.'
- 'The opportunity to meet in person and get to know one another greatly enriched the sense of togetherness and mutual cooperation. I also truly valued learning about the upcoming plans of

the JNEU network and warmly welcome the new possibilities they will bring.'

- 'The meeting has been another time the confirmation of the importance of in-person meetings. The interpersonal exchange is a never-ending enrichment. It is truly desirable that these meetings continue and grow stronger, in the spirit of understanding and rapprochement between people and institutions that must characterise the European Union. The visit organised in a Member State's Capital added a special touch to the whole event!'
- 'It provided an opportunity to share viewpoints, good practices, dilemmas with colleagues from different Member States. It was an intense two-day event that gave us enough opportunity to network and learn from each other. Having the possibility to learn about the judicial system of the hosting member state was a much-appreciated added value.'
- 'The 2025 Annual JNEU Correspondents' Meeting in Lisbon was exceptionally well-organised and intellectually enriching. The programme struck a strong balance between high-level reflections and practical insights into the functioning of Article 267 TFEU, and it facilitated constructive exchanges among correspondents. The inclusion of multiple national perspectives on the Article 267 obligation, from Finland, Spain, the Netherlands, and Northern Ireland, greatly enhanced understanding of how other supreme and administrative courts approach the decision to refer. These comparative insights were enlightening.'

News@JNEU would like to thank all participants wholeheartedly for their collaboration and to invite correspondents to keep the debate alive on the topic of consistent interpretation by sharing any further views and experiences they may have on this subject.

II. Members' activities

1. The Dutch Council of State's use of the JNEU Forum



In November 2024, the Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State (Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State, Netherlands, 'the Administrative Division') submitted questions to the JNEU Forum regarding the interpretation of the terms "standard licensing contracts" and "standard applicable tariffs" as referred to in Article 21(1)(c) of [Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market](#).¹ Since the Administrative Division had not previously encountered similar cases, it was particularly interested in relevant national case-law from other Member States of the European Union.

The concrete questions asked were as follows:

- 1) Is there national case-law available in your State on the question of whether a contract that was negotiated between two parties can be considered as a 'standard licensing contract'?
 - a. If so, under what conditions?
 - b. If not, can such a contract become a 'standard licensing contract' if it is subsequently used as a template in contractual negotiations with third parties?
- 2) What role does the Directive's aims of transparency and non-discrimination play in this regard?

¹ OJ 2014 L 84, p. 72.

Within just over a month, no fewer than twelve Member States responded to the questions. Many of the answers were detailed, including references to academic literature and relevant excerpts from national case-law. In the case at hand, the main finding was that either most States did not yet have relevant case-law on this specific issue or that the administrative court in those States did not have jurisdiction in such matters. Nevertheless, the responses offered valuable insight into how Directive 2014/26 is implemented and applied across various EU Member States.

In June 2025, the Administrative Division delivered its judgment in the case. To interpret the terms “standard licensing contract” and “standard applicable tariff” under EU law, the Administrative Division compared different language versions of these terms. The responses received via the JNEU Forum played a meaningful role in this interpretation by shedding light on the variations in language versions and by offering arguments for potential interpretations. The Forum proved to be an effective tool for collecting and comparing these diverse insights. This helped the Administrative Division shape its reasoning in the case, particularly drawing on the arguments of the Spanish Supreme Court concerning the criteria for characterising a contract as a “standard licensing contract” and the relevance of the principles of transparency and non-discrimination.

The Dutch Council of State would therefore strongly encourage the supreme courts of other Member States to make use of the opportunity to consult with counterparts via the JNEU Forum when facing questions of comparative law. The Forum offers a valuable platform for judicial dialogue across Member States.

Tamar van de Gronden, trainee, Willem Hutten and Tom Boekestein, Legal Secretaries, Raad van State

2. New judicial appointments at the CJEU

Entry into office of new Members of the Court of Justice and the General Court of the European Union and partial renewal of the General Court

By decision of 23 July 2025, Alexander Kornezov (replacing Alexander Arabadjiev), was appointed as Judge at the Court of Justice for the period from 15 September 2025 to 6 October 2030.

By decisions of 2 October 2024, 26 March 2025 and 11 June 2025, the representatives of the governments of the Member States of the European Union renewed, for the period from 1 September 2025 to 31 August 2031, the term of office of 19 judges of the General Court, namely Suzanne Kingston, Colm Mac Eochaidh, José Martín y Pérez de Nanclares, Miguel Sampol Pucurull, Hervé Cassagnabère, Saulius Lukas Kalėda, Ulf Öberg, Tamara Perišin, David Petrлік, Inga Reine, Petra Škvařilová-Pelzl, Laurent Truchot, Pēteris Zilgalvis, Maja Brkan, Jörgen Hettne, Danutė Jočienė, Damjan Kukovec, Johannes Laitenberger and Gabriele Steinfatt.

By decisions of 26 March and 11 June 2025, Tanja Pavelin (replacing Vesna Tomljenović) together with Francesco Bestagno and Raffaella Pezzuto (replacing Roberto Mastroianni and Ornella Porchia) were appointed as Judges at the General Court for the period from 1 September 2025 to 31 August 2031.

On the occasion of, first, the departure from office of the former Members of the institution and, secondly, the taking of the oath and entry into office the new Members, a formal sitting took place at the Court of Justice of the European Union.

The formal sitting was broadcast live via [CURIA – Streaming](#)

Presentation of the new Members

Alexander Kornezov

Francesco Bestagno

Tanja Pavelin

Raffaella Pezzuto

Their curriculum vitae can be consulted [here](#).

III. JNEU Activities

1. Visit to Luxembourg

Each year, the JNEU organises visits of representatives of the CJEU to national member courts. Following earlier visits to Sweden, Ireland, Portugal, Bulgaria and Austria, a sixth visit took place to the participating courts from Luxembourg in December

A delegation of the CJEU crossed the red bridge to visit the two Luxembourg court members of the Network, namely the Cour supérieure de justice (Superior Court of Justice) and the Cour administrative (Administrative Court). The delegation was comprised of the two Members of the Court of Justice from Luxembourg (Judge François Biltgen and Advocate-General Dean Spielmann) and one of the Members of the General Court, Judge Marc Jaeger. Marc André Gaudissart, Deputy Registrar, Celestina Iannone, Director of the Research and Documentation Directorate (DRD), Pedro Cabral, Head of Unit at the DRD, and Carolina García Rato, administrator at the DRD, also participated in the visit.



The delegation was welcomed at the Cité judiciaire by Thierry Hoscheit, President of the Superior Court of Justice. About sixty participants attended the various presentations.

After words of welcome from Mr Hoscheit, Mr Biltgen took the floor to provide a general overview of the preliminary ruling procedure, focusing notably on its specific features, as well as on the principle of primacy and on the obligation to refer for courts deciding at last instance.

His presentation was followed by that of Advocate-General Spielmann, who presented the work of an Advocate-General, its origins and role in the proceedings.

The morning session was concluded by Judge Jaeger, who dealt notably with the establishment of the General Court and its development up until the year 2024, followed by a presentation of the partial transfer of jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings from the Court of Justice to the General Court.

During the subsequent debate, the linguistic regime applicable to the preliminary ruling proceedings was discussed, as well as recent case-law.

The afternoon session was opened by Mr Gaudissart, who covered the preliminary ruling proceedings seen from the point of view of the services of the Court, mainly the Registry and the translation units and provided some practical advice for referring courts. Afterwards, Ms Iannone set forth the origins, objectives and main lines of action of the JNEU (correspondents' meetings, communications, trainings, visits and working groups). Lastly, Mr Cabral and Ms García Rato presented the documentary resources available on the CVRIA web page, including the JNEU platform, and Infocuria, the search engine.

The presentations were followed by a debate which allowed participants to explore the issues raised in the presentations in greater depth.

The presentations were very appreciated by the participants:

- *The visit provided concrete insights into the preliminary ruling procedure and the role of the various European courts, while promoting a better understanding of the mechanisms of cooperation between the Court and national courts, which are essential for strengthening the consistency and quality of the decisions handed down.*
- *This meeting was extremely valuable, particularly thanks to the opportunity to talk directly with national judges at the Court of Justice of the European Union, which provided a very insightful overview of their work and how cases are handled at their level. The presentation by the Research and Documentation Directorate was also very informative: the information provided was very clear and the team was very helpful, answering all our questions and offering useful information for future research into European Union law.*

2. Working Group Activities

a) Legal research

The tenth meeting of the JNEU working group on legal research took place on 3 December



The main part of the meeting was devoted to a presentation by the Judicial Documentation Centre (CENDOJ). This body of the Spanish General Council of the Judiciary is responsible for the official publication of case-law and provides other documentation and knowledge management services. It selects,

handles, disseminates and publishes judicial information, as well as information concerning legislation, case-law and doctrine. It also offers support and information services to members of the judiciary, providing them with access to various types of useful sources when carrying out their judicial activity.

Edurne Uranga Mutuberría and Arantxa Arsuaga presented the KENDOJ suite of applications, a set of tools designed by CENDOJ specifically for professional use within the legal sphere and aimed at optimising access to legal information. After a general overview of the tool, the presentation focused on its use for pseudo-anonymisation, classification and citations of legislation and case-law.

b) Legal terminology

The sixth meeting of the Legal Terminology Group, coordinated by the Projects and Terminological Coordination Unit (PCT) of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), took place on 17 October



Several presentations were given in order to enable the group's members, particularly the new ones, to gain an insight into cooperation possibilities in this field.

The first presentation focused on the challenges of multilingualism at the CJEU, the methodology and objectives of comparative multilingual legal terminology. Numerous examples of terminology entries were presented in the interinstitutional database IATE (InterActive Terminology for Europe). The selected entries belong to the following major CJEU collections:

- "VJM" (Comparative Multilingual Legal Vocabulary) focusing on specific national legal concepts in various fields;
- "National Courts and Tribunals" focusing on explaining the position of courts and tribunals within the legal system and their jurisdiction in order to find the appropriate translation and ensure consistency; and
- "National Legal Acts", the most recent collection aiming at facilitating consistency in the translation of titles of national legislation.

A quick demonstration was then given on how to search in IATE and of the future IATE interface, which will soon be released.

Finally, PCT informed the participants of the possibility of organising new training and presentation sessions on the use of the IATE terminology database, on the methodology and best practices adopted by CJEU in the field of terminology, and on full-text search tools and techniques for finding linguistic solutions.

c) Informal Working Group on the role of correspondents

The first meeting of the informal working group on the role of the correspondents took place online on 1 October



12 correspondents representing 12 different member courts participated in the meeting. The aim of the meeting was to have an exchange of views between correspondents in order to identify the key issues to include in a best practices' guide, which all correspondents, and especially new correspondents, may apply in the future.

Various topics were identified by the participants as deserving to be explored in more detail in future meetings of the group.

I. Increasing JNEU awareness and dissemination of information

Some participants presented their internal systems for disseminating JNEU information. In this context, it was highlighted that dissemination should take place immediately and have as a target all judges. One participant mentioned that her department translates certain documents sent within the framework of the JNEU, such as the Monthly Case-Law Digest or Flash News, in order to allow them to be disseminated to judges. The question of selective dissemination of information was discussed, as some correspondents proceed to filter the communications and information received in order to forward only subject matter which is relevant to their courts. The possibility of introducing criteria in preparing communications specifically oriented to the areas of jurisdiction of member courts was mentioned. This was the case notably as regards questions asked in the Forum.

II. National decisions of interest

The central matter discussed was difficulties arising in identifying what constitutes a decision of interest for EU Law, and in particular which decisions have an added value for other members. In this regard, some courts shared the criteria they apply. One constitutional court emphasised that it focused on decisions for which EU law was a parameter of constitutionality. Another important question raised was that of the usefulness of uploading summaries of such decisions (accompanied, where possible, by an automatic translation in English). This was very favourably received, with several members mentioning, however, the need for a disclaimer mentioning the non-official character of the translation.

III. Optimising the use of the Forum

A number of correspondents expressed their views on the particularities of their respective courts regarding the answers they can propose in the framework of the questions posed in the Forum. In this respect, one participant highlighted the fact that the correspondents of her member State coordinated between themselves to prepare the answers to the questions asked.

IV. Increasing contacts between correspondents

It was pointed out that, in many cases, internal platform JNEU users' profiles do not indicate the position occupied by the person concerned. This makes it difficult to identify the right contact person for each area (research, documentation...).

If you wish to participate in this group, please let us know at rjue@curia.europa.eu

IV. Collaboration with the EJTN

1. Themis

The grand final of the EJTN's THEMIS competition was held this year at the CJEU from 9 to 12



The grand final of the THEMIS competition was hosted at the CJEU, where eight teams, each consisting of three judicial trainees accompanied by a tutor, coming from Italy, Greece, France (x2), Austria, Romania (x2) and Germany, competed against each other. Their performance was assessed based on their written submissions and mock-style debate before a panel of five jury members composed of Krystna Kowalik-Banczyk and Damian Kukovec, Judges at the General Court, Matylda Pogorzelska, legal researcher at the European Union Agency of Fundamental Rights, Conseulo Scerri Herrera, Judge of the Superior Courts of Malta and Herman van Harten, Judge of the Hague Court of Appeal.

President Lenaerts opened the competition on 9 December, followed by some opening words by the EJTN's Secretary General, Ms Derveaux and a recorded message from Anna Gallego, the Director-General for Justice and Consumers (DG JUST) of the European Commission. The 2025 THEMIS winners also connected remotely via weblink to offer their thoughts and encouragement.

The competition was a great success and all of the participants thoroughly enjoyed the experience. The closing ceremony on the 12th December was presided by Mr Calot Escobar, Registrar of the Court of Justice. The winning team was declared as being Romania 1, with second place awarded to team France 1 followed by team Romania 2 in third place.

Congratulations to all the participants!

2. EJTN courses and seminars | training opportunities



With application deadlines ending in January 2026

In the framework of the JNEU's collaboration with the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), we are delighted to propose to you below a selection of the EJTN's training courses and webinars which seem best suited to the JNEU's courts, their judges and their staff.

This list covers upcoming training opportunities whose application deadlines are ending in January 2026.

Please note that the application process for enrolling

on these training courses and webinars varies. In some instances, the application must be made through the relevant national member institution of the EJTN, a list of which may be found [here](#).

You may moreover consult the full training catalogue of the EJTN [here](#). We also invite you to consult the EJTN's list of lunchtime webinars, available [here](#).

Please note that a further list of training opportunities, whose application deadlines run from November through to the end of January, will be communicated to you in due course.

EJTN – Catalogue 2026

1. [Use of AI for Addressing Key Challenges in the Criminal Justice System: The Forensic Perspective- Introductory](#)

Start date	End date	Application deadline	Target Audience
21/4/2026	21/4/2026	20/3/2026	Judges and Prosecutors

2. [Change management in the digital era for judicial leaders](#)

Start date	End date	Application deadline	Target Audience
23/2/2026	24/2/2026	26/1/2026	Court Presidents, Chief Prosecutors, Court Staff Leaders

3. [Train the trainers to train on cognitive bias](#)

Start date	End date	Application deadline	Target Audience
26/3/2026	27/3/2026	26/1/2026	Judicial Trainers, Court Staff Trainers

4. [Applicability and effect of the EU charter of fundamental rights in national proceedings – Advanced](#)

Start date	End date	Application deadline	Target Audience
23/4/2026	24/4/2026	20/1/2026	Judges, Prosecutors and Court staff

3. Seminar on the Preliminary Ruling Procedure



On Thursday 23 and Friday 24 October, a seminar on the preliminary ruling procedure took place at the CJEU, organised in co-operation with the EJTN. The seminar began with warm welcome speeches by Ms Iannone, Director of Research and Documentation of the CJEU, Amelia Onisor, Judge at the Court of Appeal in Bucharest (Romania), and Nikolay Angelov, Judge at the Supreme Administrative Court of Bulgaria. Various presentations were given over the course of the two days, including, inter alia, a presentation by Laila

Medina, Advocate General at the CJEU, focusing on the judicial dialogue in preliminary ruling proceedings and another given by Matthew Radley, legal secretary in the Chambers of President Lenaerts, on the best practices in drafting a request for a preliminary ruling. The three workshops entitled 'To Refer or Not to Refer', 'The Position of the National Judge Before and After the Reference' and 'Making a Preliminary Reference and Formulating Questions to the CJEU' were led by Ms Onisor, Stanislas Adam, legal secretary in the Chambers of President Lenaerts, and Mr Angelov respectively. Other presentations included an overview of the preliminary ruling procedure, the work carried out in the course of the procedure by the Directorate for Multilingualism and the Registry. The seminar concluded with a presentation on the documentary resources available on the Curia website and the use of the InfoCuria search engine.

4. EJTN Conference of Directors, 14-15 October, Bordeaux (France)

The EJTN celebrated its 25th anniversary during its Conference of Directors, which took place in Bordeaux (France) between the 14 and 15 October, focusing on the rule of law. Ms Iannone attended and spoke of democracy and the rule of law, stressing, inter alia, the valuable role the EJTN plays in strengthening national judges' knowledge of EU law, which is of fundamental importance given that each national Member State judge is also a European judge. Ms Iannone also thanked Ms Derveaux for the fruitful collaboration between the JNEU and the EJTN.

V. Standing call for contributions

If you have a topic which your court would like to share with other member courts, please do not hesitate to let us know. You can contact the JNEU team at rjue@curia.europa.eu.



The Judicial Network of the European Union was created on the initiative of the President of the Court of Justice of the European Union and the Presidents of the Constitutional and Supreme Courts of the Member States.

President of the Court of Justice of the European Union and the Presidents of the Constitutional and Supreme Courts of the Member States.

One of the objectives of the JNEU is to share and centralise information and documents relevant to the application, dissemination and study of EU law, as interpreted and applied not only by the Court of Justice of the European Union but also by national courts and tribunals.

It also aims to promote mutual knowledge and understanding of the laws and systems of the Member States from a comparative law perspective.

Share with us

Email: rjue@curia.europa.eu

Court of Justice of the European
Union L - 2925 Luxembourg

Telephone switchboard: (+352) 4303.1
Fax: (+352) 4303.2600