



News@JNEU

ISSUE 9 - DECEMBER 2024

I.	Annual correspondents' meeting	2
II.	Members' activities	6
1.	New member court: Supreme Constitutional Court of Cyprus.....	6
2.	Transfer of jurisdiction from the Court of Justice to the General Court.....	9
3.	Partial renewal of the Court of Justice and of the General Court	13
III.	JNEU Activities	14
1.	Working Groups: Innovation & Legal terminology	14
2.	EuroVoc.....	16
3.	Visit to the Slovak Republic.....	17
4.	Activities of the JNEU in Sofia in collaboration with the Bulgarian National Institute of Justice	19
IV.	Standing call for contributions	21

I. Annual correspondents' meeting

The sixth meeting of the correspondents of the Judicial Network of the European Union ('JNEU') was held in Brussels on 21 and 22 November under the patronage of the Belgian Council of State. Representing forty-six member courts and five observers, fifty-nine correspondents participated, twenty-two in situ.

© Court of Justice of the European Union 2024



The activities started in the evening of 21 November. A welcome reception was organised at the Council of State, where participants were welcomed by its *chefs de corps*. The reception was followed by a dinner at the Fondation Universitaire, also attended by one of the Presidents of the Belgian Constitutional Court, as well as the First President and the Prosecutor General of the Belgian Court of Cassation.

The meeting itself took place on the morning of Friday 22 November in the Berlaymont building of the European Commission, where participants were welcomed by the Director-General of the Legal Service, Daniel Calleja Crespo.

The meeting was divided into two parts. The first part was dedicated to the future of cooperation within the JNEU. The First President of the Council of State, Wilfried Van Vaerenbergh, opened the meeting with a very special word of thanks to the correspondents for their indefatigable efforts in further strengthening the role of the JNEU as a suitable forum at the service of the rule of law and case-law consistency across the European Union.

In his introductory remarks, the President of the Court of Justice, Koen Lenaerts, stressed the importance of the annual meeting, organised for the first time outside Luxembourg, pointing out that 'the fact that it is another member of the

Judicial Network of the European Union that organises this meeting, demonstrates that the Network really is *our* Network, a common enterprise of all its members'. As the JNEU meetings constitute a forum for informal dialogue between the courts of the Member States and the Court of Justice, the President of the Court updated participants, in particular, on the transfer to the General Court of jurisdiction to hear references for a preliminary ruling in six specific areas, which became effective on 1 October 2024. Special attention was given to the 'one-stop-shop' system set up to decide whether a preliminary reference falls within one of these six areas and, therefore, within the jurisdiction of the General Court.

Next, the Registrar of the Court of Justice, Alfredo Calot Escobar, provided an overview of the action taken following the survey conducted in 2023. He began by emphasising that the holding of meetings outside Luxembourg and directing discussions towards more legal topics, two key ideas resulting from the survey, were accomplished in 2024. He also noted that the suggestion of a dedicated contact person at the CJEU to assist with questions relating to EU law had fruitfully developed into a conversation between courts. Furthermore, the ever-evolving character of the JNEU was underscored, it being observed that there are still many avenues for further cooperation and that the opportunities for this are as boundless as our imagination.



This was followed by a presentation given by the President of the Austrian Supreme Court, Georg Kodek, who analysed cooperation within the JNEU from a national perspective. He focused particularly on the content-sharing space of the internal platform. One of its features, the forum, was the subject of an in-depth presentation raising different questions concerning best practices in cooperation. In his presentation, several suggestions for the future were also formulated, notably on enhancing the dissemination of content from the JNEU website and on increasing its awareness of the JNEU within domestic legal communities.

Still in terms of developments since the previous correspondents' meeting, the Director of Research and Documentation, Celestina Iannone, highlighted four main areas of activity. First, with regard to communication, the transformation of *News@JNEU* into an information newsletter in which members publish articles to present their activities and projects, as well as the setting up of two new publications (*The Month Ahead@CJEU* and *New CJEU Case-Law*). Second, participants

were updated on the visits the Court of Justice organised to national courts as well as on recent developments in reinforcing collaboration with the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN). Third, a thorough examination of the cooperation between members on legal and judicial organisation questions within the forum was conducted. Finally, the activities of the JNEU's three thematic working groups were also presented.



Following this, the EJTN's Secretary General, Ingrid Derveaux, outlined the key actions of cooperation between this network and the JNEU. In this context, the contribution of the JNEU to the assessment of the training needs of judges and prosecutors and the role of the JNEU's internal platform in ensuring the dissemination of decisions delivered by national courts and the CJEU were mentioned as being of crucial importance.

The second part of the meeting was devoted to the application of the principle of consistent interpretation by national judges.

Frédéric Gosselin, Counsellor of the Belgian Council of State, made an introductory presentation on the duty of consistent interpretation. To this end, the constituent elements of the principle (the duty of national courts to interpret national law to the fullest extent possible in conformity with the requirements of EU law), as well as its limits (interpretation *contra legem*, general principles of law) were examined. Moreover, two important ramifications of the principle were illustrated with examples from Belgian case-law. These ramifications concerned: (i) the priority of consistent interpretation regarding the primacy of EU Law and (ii) the freedom of national courts to submit a request for a

preliminary ruling where consistent interpretation is not possible.

This introduction was followed by two presentations on the application of the principle by national courts. First, Valeria Piccone, Counsellor of the Italian Supreme Court, analysed a judgment concerning domestic law on the provision of labour services in relation to the provisions of the Temporary Agency Work Directive.¹ Second, Corinna Wissels, Counsellor of the Dutch Council of State, discussed two decisions: on the one hand, a decision dealing with a national law limiting asylum seekers' right to work to 24 weeks per year and its conformity with the Reception Conditions Directive.² On the other, a decision on the compatibility of the refusal to renew a driving licence with the Driving Licence Directive.³

¹ Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on temporary agency work (OJ 2008 L 327, p. 9).

² Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast) (OJ 2013 L 180, p. 96)

³ Directive 2006/126/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on driving licences (Recast) (OJ 2006 L 403, p. 18)

In the context of the debates which took place at the end of each of the two parts of the meeting, participants had particularly rich and fruitful exchanges of opinions, bearing notably on the challenges surrounding the use of artificial intelligence and digitalisation, as well as on numerous examples of instances of application of the principle of consistent interpretation by national courts.

The meeting was followed by a lunch, which provided an opportunity to continue exchanges and strengthen links between member courts and their representatives.

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

The JNEU team received many positive feedback comments from participants:

- Thursday evening was an excellent opportunity to get to know the other correspondents in an informal setting and talk to them about their work and role at their respective courts.
- The first half [of the meeting] was useful to get more information about the JNEU that I could bring back home with me and pass on to my colleagues. The second half was even more insightful, I thought, because it highlighted the differences in approaches between the member states very well and offered an opportunity for exchange.
- The meeting was very important: from an institutional point of view, we were made aware of the organisation behind the network (services and collaborators of the CJEU to whom we can turn); as well as regarding the aims of the network and how it can actively contribute to the construction of a “common European law”.
- We realised how important the contribution provided by each of us is to the discussions which take place in the forum, and this motivates us to continue to undertake the necessary research to reply to the different questions raised.
- I particularly appreciated the hospitality of the hosts, as well as the programme they proposed.
- The choice of the meeting’s central theme, consistent interpretation, which is at the heart of the relationship between national judges and the ECJ was very timely.
- I particularly thank the Belgian colleagues for an extraordinary welcome.
- The possibility to spend some meaningful time with the President of the Court of Justice, the President of the Belgian Council of State, Academic and Judicial staff, as well as with Colleagues from the Court, the Commission, and the highest judicial Institutions of the Member States is a tremendous enrichment. The hope is that these meetings will become more frequent and will be organized more than once a year, as well as that conditions will be created to activate work experiences within institutions in other countries (foreign training).
- The meeting took place in a relaxed atmosphere where the correspondents had the possibility to make comments or to ask questions and receive answers on the interaction between national jurisprudence and the CJEU case law regarding the limits of the application of the principle of consistent interpretation and on the difficulties of national courts to adopt such an interpretation where the CJEU sets an objective which itself tests the national courts’ sphere of competence through the lens of the principle of separation of powers.

The speeches from the meeting will be available shortly from the internal platform [here](#).

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. New member court: Supreme Constitutional Court of Cyprus

Cyprus, formerly a British Crown Colony, was officially proclaimed an independent sovereign Republic on August 16, 1960. The newly established constitutional framework was founded on two core principles: first, the recognition of the Greek and Turkish communities as distinct entities, and second, their shared participation in all branches of government, namely the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The Treaty of Establishment, signed by the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, and the Republic of Cyprus, is a fundamental part of the constitutional framework that created the Republic of Cyprus. While the protection of fundamental human rights and liberties was not addressed in the Zurich Agreement, it was guaranteed by the London Agreement as a prerequisite for the establishment of the new State. Additionally, Article 5 of the Treaty of Establishment enshrined these protections, ensuring that the rights and freedoms of individuals would be safeguarded in the newly formed Republic.

The judicial power of the Republic, as outlined in the Constitution, is exercised by the Supreme Constitutional Court, the High Court, and its subordinate courts. The Supreme Constitutional Court has exclusive jurisdiction over constitutional and administrative matters and was presided over by a Greek judge, a Turkish judge, and a neutral (foreign) judge.

Intercommunal riots in 1963-1964 led to the resignation of the neutral presidents of both the Constitutional and the High Court, which prompted the enactment of the Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) Law 33/1964. This law merged the Supreme Constitutional Court and the High Court into a single entity known as the Supreme Court in which Justice Mehmet Zekia served as the inaugural President. The constitutionality of this law was subsequently challenged in the case of Attorney General of the Republic v. Mustafa Ibrahim (1964) C.L.R. 195. In its ruling, the Supreme Court declared the law constitutional, asserting that its enactment was justified under the principle of necessity.

Consequently, in 1966 all the Turkish Judges resigned, leading to the appointment of Justice Vassiliades as President of the Supreme Court. Over the following years, the Supreme Court bench gradually expanded to thirteen Justices in total.

The Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) Law 33/1964, as amended by the Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Law 145(I)/2022, which came into effect on June 1, 2023, has now established two distinct jurisdictions for the Supreme Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court (Article 9, Law 145(I)/2022). The enactment of article 9, and the disjoint of the merge was deemed necessary in order to facilitate the safeguarding, promotion and security of the Rule of Law, as pointed out by the Venice Commission and ensure the expeditious adjudication of cases.



The Supreme Constitutional Court consists of nine justices, including the President. All justices are appointed by the President of the Republic and hold office until they attain the age of 68 years.

The Supreme Constitutional Court has exclusive jurisdiction in providing the definitive interpretation of the Constitution, is vested with very wide powers on constitutional matters and is rightly described as “the vertebral column of the whole constitutional mechanism”. Among others, it has exclusive jurisdiction to adjudicate in a final and conclusive way, on the following matters:

- (i) Recourse made in connection with matters relating to any conflict, contest of power, or competence, arising between any organs or authorities of the Republic.
- (ii) Referrals of the President of the Republic of Cyprus for its opinion, prior to the promulgation of any law or decision of the House of Representatives as to whether such law or decision or any specified provision thereof is repugnant or inconsistent with any provision of the Constitution.
- (iii) Issues of unconstitutionality of laws. A party involved in any judicial proceedings, including appeals, may raise the question of the unconstitutionality of any law or decision, or any provision thereof that is relevant to the determination of the matter at issue, at any stage of the proceedings. Upon raising such a question, the court before which it is presented shall refer the issue to the Supreme Constitutional Court for a decision.
- (iv) Appeals referred by the Court of Appeal concerning any decision of the Administrative Court on matters of public law or of significant public interest or issues of general public importance or issues regarding the coherence of the law in relation to conflicting or

- contradictory decisions of the Court of Appeal.
- (v) Jurisdiction to decide, as a third and final instance, after obtaining leave and following a prior appeal review procedure, on legal matters arising from decisions of the Court of Appeal (Administrative Jurisdiction) that involve significant public interest, address discrepancies in existing jurisprudence, or require accurate interpretation of a legislative provision.
 - (vi) Election petitions filed under the provisions of the Electoral Law concerning the election of the President of the Republic and members of the House of Representatives.
 - (vii) Jurisdiction to make a final adjudication on a recourse submitted regarding a complaint that a decision, act, or omission by any organ, authority, or individual exercising executive or administrative authority is contrary to the provisions of this Constitution or any law, or that it was made in excess of or in abuse of the powers vested in that organ, authority, or individual.
 - (viii) The Supreme Constitutional Court also acts as an annulment Appellate Judicial Council against any decision of the Supreme Judicial Council. It reviews its decisions regarding appointments and promotions and disciplinary proceedings concerning the Judges.

The Supreme Constitutional Court, entrusted with a pivotal role, as a shaper of constitutional law and a guardian of its constitutional mission, stands ready to meet these challenges with steadfast prudence and resolve.

2. Transfer of jurisdiction from the Court of Justice to the General Court

Amendment to the Statute of CJEU – Transfer of preliminary ruling jurisdiction to the General Court in six specific areas

A significant amendment to the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union, published in the Official Journal of the European Union on 12 August 2024,⁴ entered into force on 1 September. This amendment provides, inter alia, for a transfer, applicable from 1 October 2024, from the Court of Justice to the General Court of part of the jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings. The transfer concerns six specific areas of law. Moreover, the amendment to the Statute provides for an extension, as of 1 September 2024, of the mechanism for the determination of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed.

The aim of this reform is to reduce the workload of the Court of Justice in the sphere of preliminary rulings and to allow it to continue to fulfil, within a reasonable period, its mission of ensuring that in the application and interpretation of the Treaties the law is observed. In 2001, the authors of the Treaty of Nice had provided for the possibility of the General Court hearing and ruling on certain requests for a preliminary ruling, but the Statute had not been adapted for that purpose. However, over the past five years, a significant structural increase in disputes was observed. This development was accompanied by an increase in the complexity and sensitivity of cases concerning, in particular, matters of a constitutional nature or related to fundamental rights. The reform will therefore allow the Court of Justice to focus on its mission of safeguarding and strengthening the unity and consistency of Union law. For its part, the General Court is in a position to absorb that additional workload and will deal with the questions referred for a preliminary ruling which are transmitted to it in such a way as to provide national courts and tribunals and interested persons with the same guarantees as are provided by the Court of Justice.

The reform essentially consists of three parts, the broad outlines of which are set out below.

Partial transfer to the General Court jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings

The first part of the reform relates to the transfer from the Court of Justice to the General Court, to which two judges are appointed from each Member State, of jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings. For reasons of legal certainty, the transfer concerns only six areas, which are clearly defined and sufficiently separable from other areas and which have given rise to a substantial body of case-law of

⁴ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

the Court of Justice. Jurisdiction will thus be conferred on the General Court to rule on requests for a preliminary ruling that come exclusively within one or several of the following six specific areas:

- 1. Common system of value added tax;**
- 2. Excise duties**
- 3. Customs Code**
- 4. Tariff classification of goods under the Combined Nomenclature**
- 5. Compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding or of delay or cancellation of transport services**
- 6. System for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading**

These areas rarely give rise to questions of principle likely to affect the unity or consistency of Union law. They already benefit from an extensive body of case-law of the Court of Justice, which should enable the General Court to draw on judgments delivered previously. These areas account for approximately 20% of the references for a preliminary ruling brought before the Court of Justice, which represents a sufficiently high number of cases to bring about a real reduction in its workload. The Court of Justice will thus be in a position to focus to a greater extent on its roles as the supreme and constitutional court of the European Union.

The Court of Justice retains jurisdiction to adjudicate on requests for a preliminary ruling that, although connected to the specific areas mentioned above, also concern other areas. It also retains jurisdiction in respect of requests for a preliminary ruling which, even where they fall within one or more of the specific areas, raise independent questions of interpretation of:

- 1. Primary law, including the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;**
- 2. Public international law; or**
- 3. General principles of EU law.**

In addition, the General Court will also be able to refer to the Court of Justice a case that falls within the General Court's jurisdiction but requires a decision of principle likely to affect the unity or consistency of Union law.

For reasons of legal certainty and expedition, every request for a preliminary ruling must be submitted to the Court of Justice so that that court may determine, in accordance with the detailed rules set out in its Rules of Procedure, whether the request falls exclusively within one or several specific defined areas and, accordingly, whether that request is to be transmitted to the General Court. In the interest of legal certainty and transparency, the Court of Justice or the General Court will briefly provide reasons, in its ruling on a preliminary reference, as to why it has jurisdiction to hear and determine the question referred for a preliminary ruling.

Changes applicable to all preliminary ruling cases

A second part of the reform comprises two changes provided for by the Regulation amending the Statute, which will apply to all requests for a preliminary ruling regardless of the area concerned and whether they may be transferred to the General Court.

In the first place, as is already the case for all Member States and for the Commission, all requests for a preliminary ruling will from now on be notified to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Central Bank, so that they can assess whether they have a particular interest in the issues raised and decide whether they wish to exercise their right to submit statements of case or written observations.

In the second place, to strengthen the transparency and openness of the preliminary ruling procedure and to enable a better understanding of the decisions of the Court of Justice and the General Court, it is provided that, in all preliminary ruling cases, the statements of case or written observations submitted by an interested person referred to in Article 23 of the Statute will be published on the website of the Court of Justice within a reasonable time after the closing of the case, unless that person raises objections to the publication of that person's own written submissions.

Extension of the mechanism for the determination of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed

The third part of the reform is intended to maintain the efficacy of appeal proceedings against decisions of the General Court, in view of the high number of appeals lodged with the Court of Justice. In order to allow the Court of Justice to focus on the appeals that raise important legal questions, the mechanism for the determination of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed is extended to other decisions of the General Court.

The mechanism for the determination by the Court of Justice of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed concerns appeals in cases which have already been considered twice, initially by an independent board of appeal of a body, office or agency of the Union, then by the General Court. The mechanism previously concerned only the decisions of four boards of appeal which are subsequently challenged before the General Court, as referred to in Article 58a of the Statute (see points (1) to (4) below). The amendment to the Statute entering into force on 1 September will see six new independent boards of appeal added to the four current boards of appeal, bringing their total number to ten.

The relevant boards of appeal are:

- 1. European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) (Alicante, Spain);**
- 2. Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) (Angers, France);**
- 3. European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) (Helsinki, Finland);**
- 4. European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) (Cologne, Germany),**

to which the following boards of appeal will be added:

- 5. European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) (Ljubljana, Slovenia);**
- 6. Single Resolution Board (SRB) (Brussels, Belgium);**
- 7. European Banking Authority (EBA) (Paris, France);**
- 8. European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) (Paris, France);**

9. European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) (Frankfurt am Main, Germany);

10. European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) (Valenciennes, France).

In addition, the mechanism for the determination of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed will also apply to appeals brought against decisions of the General Court concerning a decision of an independent board of appeal, set up after 1 May 2019 within any other body, office or agency of the Union, which has to be seised before an action can be brought before the General Court.

Lastly, the mechanism has also been extended to disputes relating to the performance of contracts containing an arbitration clause. Such disputes most frequently merely require the General Court to apply to the substance of the dispute the national law to which the arbitration clause refers.

The extensions of the mechanism for the determination of whether an appeal is allowed to proceed has been applicable from 1 September 2024.

In the light of the entry into force of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the Recommendations to national courts and tribunals in relation to the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings ⁵ have also been amended. The amended text can be found here: [recommandations-jurid-nationales-en.pdf](#)

⁵ OJ 2019 C 380, p. 1

3. Partial renewal of the Court of Justice and of the General Court

By decisions of 8 November 2023, 27 March 2024 and 2 October 2024, the representatives of the governments of the Member States of the European Union renewed the term of office of five judges of the Court of Justice, namely Constantinos Lycourgos, Jan Passer, Thomas von Danwitz, Ineta Ziemele, Irmantas Jarukaitis and Andreas Kumin, for the period from 7 October 2024 to 6 October 2030.

By decisions of 22 May 2024, 3 July 2024 and 2 October 2024, Bernardus Smulders (who replaces Alexandra Prechal), Massimo Condinanzi (who replaces Lucia Serena Rossi), Fredrik Schalin (who replaces Nils Wahl), Stéphane Gervasoni (who replaces Jean-Claude Bonichot), Niels Fenger (who replaces Lars Bay Larsen) and Ramona Frendo (who replaces Peter George Xuereb) were appointed as Judges of the Court of Justice for the period from 7 October 2024 to 6 October 2030.

By decision of 27 March 2024, the representatives of the governments of the Member States of the European Union renewed the term of office of Jean Richard de la Tour, Advocate General of the Court of Justice for the period from 7 October 2024 to 6 October 2030.

By decisions of 27 March 2024, 3 July 2024 and 2 October 2024, Dean Spielmann (who replaces Anthony Michael Collins), Andrea Biondi (who replaces Giovanni Pitruzzella) and Rimvydas Norkus (who replaces Priit Pikamäe) were appointed as Advocates General of the Court of Justice for the period from 7 October 2024 to 6 October 2030.

By decision of 2 October 2024, Hervé Cassagnabère (who replaces Stéphane Gervasoni) and Raphaël Meyer (who replaces Dean Spielmann) were appointed as Judges of the General Court for the periods from 7 October 2024 to 31 August 2025 and 7 October 2024 to 31 August 2028, respectively.

On the occasion of, first, the departure from office of Lars Bay Larsen, Alexandra Prechal, Jean-Claude Bonichot, Peter George Xuereb, Lucia Serena Rossi, Priit Pikamäe, Nils Wahl and Anthony Michael Collins, and, second, the taking of the oath and entry into office of the new Members of the institution, a formal sitting of the Court of Justice of the European Union took place on 7 October 2024.

New Members of the Court of Justice

Judge Bernardus Smulders

Advocate General Dean Spielmann

Judge Massimo Condinanzi

Judge Fredrik Schalin

Advocate General Andrea Biondi

Judge Stéphane Gervasoni

Judge Niels Fenger

Judge Ramona Frendo

Advocate General Rimvydas Norkus

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

New Members of the General Court

Judge Hervé Cassagnabère

Judge Raphaël Meyer

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

III. JNEU Activities

1. Working Groups: Innovation & Legal terminology

'Artificial Intelligence for terminological purposes': a joint meeting of the 'Legal Terminology' and 'Innovation' Thematic Working Groups



A joint meeting of the thematic groups “Legal Terminology”, coordinated by Projects and Terminological Coordination Unit (PCT) of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), and “Innovation” (coordinated by Innovation Lab of CJEU), took place on 4 July 2024.

Shared interest in “artificial intelligence for terminological purposes” brought together the members of these thematic groups. Three main presentations on terminological tools and resources based on artificial intelligence were given by the CJEU’s colleagues:

- **Experimental features in the interinstitutional terminology database of the European Union, IATE (Interactive Terminology for Europe):** presentation on the integration of artificial intelligence and neural machine translation (“eTranslation”) features into IATE, aiming to facilitate and accelerate terminology work (e.g., machine translation of text fields, completion suggestion with the help of AI for the missing language, AI suggestion of definition, automatic domain detection).

- **Terminological analysis:** presentation on the terminological pre-processing at the CJUE carried out by PCT unit of the requests for a preliminary ruling and its objectives. The main focus of the presentation was a tool under internal development within the CJEU, integrating artificial intelligence technology to facilitate this pre-processing by automatically identifying notions for which there are entries in IATE.
- **Detection of references:** an artificial intelligence module detecting references to EU case-law in legal documents was presented. This tool was also under internal development within the CJEU.

A discussion on the progress of the use of artificial intelligence in the working environment of the national Courts followed the presentations.

Afterwards, a short presentation informed the participants about the AI-based multilingual services available on the [European Commission website](#).

Finally, the meeting was also an opportunity to present the new website of CJEU dedicated to multilingualism (<https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/multilingualism>), and more specifically to legal multilingualism. The website is available in all 24 EU languages.

2. EuroVoc

Update of EuroVoc: Improving multilingual search capabilities on the JNEU's platform

The collection of national decisions of interest to the European Union on the JNEU's platform features a wide range of decisions drafted in multiple languages. This linguistic diversity can pose challenges when users attempt to search for specific decisions across various languages. However, these limitations can be addressed through EuroVoc, a powerful tool that facilitates efficient searching across different subject matters.

EuroVoc is a multilingual, multidisciplinary thesaurus managed by the Publications Office of the European Union. It is specifically designed to cover the broad range of EU activities, along with topics relevant to Member States and related international organisations. EuroVoc provides a structured vocabulary that supports the indexing and retrieval of information in official EU documents, legislative texts, and other resources in all EU official languages.

Organised into thematic fields such as law, economics, trade, technology, environment and politics, EuroVoc contains approximately 7000 terms, known as "descriptors", which are translated into the 24 official languages. This extensive framework ensures comprehensive coverage of subjects relevant to EU policies

and operations, enabling consistent terminology usage across EU institutions and Member States.

Recently, the JNEU's platform was updated with the latest version of EuroVoc. In addition, a new project has been launched to index national decisions of interest that currently lack EuroVoc descriptors. The first set of analysed decisions includes 240 entries, following an indexing policy designed to ensure consistency across documents and further enhance the platform's added-value. These decisions will be updated in the platform with the agreement of the relevant correspondents.

By using EuroVoc, users can overcome language barriers and navigate the case-law collection with greater ease. This initiative not only improves access to information but also fosters better understanding and communication between member courts of the JNEU.

Browsing national decisions by EuroVoc descriptors is available in the Expert search feature of the JNEU's platform. Contributors can also select descriptors in the form used for submitting national decisions of interest to the platform.

3. Visit to the Slovak Republic

A visit to Slovakia's supreme courts – the Najvyšší súd (Supreme Court) and the Najvyšší správny súd (Supreme Administrative Court) – proposed by Judges Koen Lenaerts, President of the Court of Justice, and Miroslav Gavalec, Slovak Judge at the Court of Justice, took place as part of a project of cooperation and exchange between that court and the Slovak supreme courts, which began in autumn 2023. The visit focused in particular on preliminary references.



The assignment was carried out by Jozef Čuboň, a senior lawyer-linguist from the Court of Justice's Slovak translation unit. He was present in Bratislava in October 2023, for three weeks at the Supreme Administrative Court and in March and April 2024 for two weeks at the Supreme Court. The visit was prepared in collaboration with other lawyer-linguists from the Slovak translation unit and colleagues from the Registry and the Research and Documentation Directorate – a perfect example of cross-department collaboration within the Court of Justice.

On the part of the Slovak courts, the participants included judges, their legal secretaries and analysts.

The programme was composed of several presentations and workshops dealing, in particular, with the activity of the Court of Justice itself, the preliminary ruling procedure, best practices in drafting requests for preliminary ruling, consumer protection, value added tax, environmental law and the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Thanks to the open, informal format, participants were able to intervene actively, ask questions and discuss the issues involved. In each workshop on preliminary references, participants were given the opportunity to write their own questions for a preliminary ruling, based on 6 fictive cases. An online workshop on the Brussels and Rome Regulations was also added to the programme at the request of the Supreme Court, and given by another Slovak lawyer-linguist, Juliana Berg.

These practical workshops enabled the judges, legal secretaries and analysts to look at the cases they were dealing with from an EU law perspective, and to identify points likely to give rise to the application of EU case-law. The visit also allowed more generally for a fruitful exchange of information and a better understanding and knowledge of the preliminary ruling procedure and the Court's case-law.

Moreover, as part of the visit, three administrators of the Research and Documentation Directorate (Tereza Gubalová, Danica Minarovská and Carolina García Rato) gave online presentations on the Judicial Network of the European Union, the webpage of the Court of Justice and Infocuria, its search engine.

The mission also provided very positive feedback for the Court of Justice, and in particular for the Slovak lawyer-linguists, who were able to see how the judges of supreme national courts work enthusiastically with the case-law of the Court of Justice.

The project received substantial media coverage. Both Slovak courts published press releases summarising the activities, accompanied by photos, on their websites (www.nssud.sk and www.nsud.sk).

This was followed at the end of May 2024 by a visit of President Lenaerts and Judge Gavalec to both national courts.

4. Activities of the JNEU in Sofia in collaboration with the Bulgarian National Institute of Justice



Following visits by representatives of the CJEU to Sweden, Ireland and Portugal within the framework of the JNEU, a fourth visit was made at the end of September 2024 to Bulgaria. The CJEU delegation was comprised of Dimitar Stefanov, Head of the Bulgarian Translation Unit, at the Directorate for Multilingualism (DGM), Radostina Kamisheva, Administrator at the Court Registry, Nadezhda Todorova, Administrator at the Directorate for Research and Documentation (DRD) and Detelina Dimova, seconded national expert at the DRD. The Bulgarian judge at the Court of Justice, Alexander Arabadjiev, also participated remotely.

The visit was made possible through collaboration with the Bulgarian Национален институт на правосъдието (Nacionalen institut na pravosadieto; National Institute of Justice), on whose initiative the judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation and of the civil and criminal courts were invited to participate in the event, including in hybrid format.

On 26 September, the Forum was opened with speeches by Judge Arabadjiev, Lada Paunova, Vice-President of the Supreme Court of Cassation, and Miglena Tacheva, Director of the Judicial Training School.

In his speech, Judge Arabadjiev stressed the importance and usefulness of the visit and stated that the topics for discussion would enable national judges to take note of each step in the case management of requests for preliminary rulings and the role of the various departments of the Court in that process, in particular that of the Registry, the DRD and the DGM. In that regard, he stressed that this process is costly, in human resources, length of time and economic terms. He therefore drew attention to the need for responsible recourse to the preliminary ruling mechanism and emphasised the important role of the national court when drafting requests for a preliminary ruling. Judge Arabadjiev also highlighted the role of the JNEU as a platform for exchange and dialogue between the supreme courts of the Member States.

Following the speech of Judge Arabadjiev, Ms Kamisheva presented the management of references for a preliminary ruling at the Registry. This was followed by a presentation by Mr Stefanov on the activities of the Bulgarian Translation Unit in the course of the preliminary ruling procedure. Finally, Ms

Todorova and Ms Dimova gave presentations on the activities of the Directorate for Research and Documentation, focusing in particular on the detailed preliminary analysis of requests for a preliminary ruling for detecting cases which may be dealt with by means of an order pursuant to Article 53(2) ¹ and Article 99 ² of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice and requests in respect of which the circumstances justify the application of the expedited procedure or the urgent procedure. They also introduced participants to the InfoCuria and Eurlex search engines and the JNEU internal platform.



© Bulgarian National Institute of Justice 2024

On the following day, 27 September, Ms Todorova and Ms Dimova gave a presentation on the grounds on which the Court of Justice lacks jurisdiction and requests for a preliminary ruling which are inadmissible. Ms Todorova and Ms Dimova also visited the House of Europe and, in an informal setting, exchanged information with the participants on the role of the DRD as an institute of applied comparative law, responsible for assisting the Court of Justice and the General Court in the exercise of their judicial function and participating in the dissemination of their case-law and the idea of disseminating information on the DRD's activities on the site of the House of Europe in order to attract Bulgarian law trainees to the Directorate.

The positive feedback from participants and judges from the national civil and criminal courts led the National Institute of Justice to submit an invitation to the Court of Justice to plan a subsequent visit to the administrative courts.

¹ 'Where it is clear that the Court has no jurisdiction to hear and determine a case or where a request or an application is manifestly inadmissible, the Court may, after hearing the Advocate General, at any time decide to give a decision by reasoned order without taking further steps in the proceedings'.

² 'Where a question referred to the Court for a preliminary ruling is identical to a question on which the Court has already ruled, where the reply to such a question may be clearly deduced from existing case-law or where the answer to the question referred for a preliminary ruling admits of no reasonable doubt, the Court may at any time, on a proposal from the Judge Rapporteur and after hearing the Advocate General, decide to rule by reasoned order'.

IV. 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