СЪД НА ЕВРОПЕЙСКИТЕ ОБЩНОСТИ

TRIBUNAL DE JUSTICIA DE LAS COMUNIDADES EUROPEAS SOUDNÍ DVŮR EVROPSKÝCH SPOLEČENSTVÍ DE EUROPÆISKE FÆLLESSKABERS DOMSTOL GERICHTSHOF DER EUROPÄISCHEN GEMEINSCHAFTEN EUROOPA ÜHENDUSTE KOHUS ΔΙΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΟ ΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΩΝ ΚΟΙΝΟΤΗΤΩΝ COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES COUR DE JUSTICE DES COMMUNAUTÉS EUROPÉENNES CÚIRT BHREITHIÚNAIS NA gCÓMHPHOBAL EORPACH CORTE DI GIUSTIZIA DELLE COMUNITÀ EUROPEE EIROPAS KOPIENU TIESA



LUXEMBOURG

EUROPOS BENDRIJŲ TEISINGUMO TEISMAS

IL-QORTI TAL-ĠUSTIZZJA TAL-KOMUNITAJIET EWROPEJ HOF VAN JUSTITIE VAN DE EUROPESE GEMEENSCHAPPEN TRYBUNAŁ SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI WSPÓLNOT EUROPEJSKICH TRIBUNAL DE JUSTIÇA DAS COMUNIDADES EUROPEIAS CURTEA DE JUSTIȚIE A COMUNITĂȚILOR EUROPENE SÚDNY DVOR EURÓPSKYCH SPOLOČENSTIEV SODIŠČE EVROPSKIH SKUPNOSTI

EUROOPAN YHTEISÖJEN TUOMIOISTUIN EUROPEISKA GEMENSKAPERNAS DOMSTOL

## Press and Information

## PRESS RELEASE No 16/07

27 February 2007

Judgment of the Court of Justice in Case C-354/04 P and 355/04 P

Gestoras Pro-Amnistía, Juan Mari Olano Olano and Julen Zenarain Enarrasti v Council of the European Union

Segi, Araitz Zubimendi Izaga and Aritza Galarraga v Council of the European Union

## THE COURT OF JUSTICE REJECTS THE APPEALS BROUGHT BY GESTORAS PRO-AMNISTÍA AND SEGI CLAIMING COMPENSATION FOLLOWING THEIR INCLUSION ON THE LIST OF PERSONS, GROUPS OR ENTITIES INVOLVED IN **ACTS OF TERRORISM**

The appellants are not deprived of all effective judicial protection and the orders of the Court of First Instance do not prejudice their right to such protection

In 2001 the Council of the European Union adopted a common position <sup>1</sup> on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism. A list of persons, groups or entities involved in terrorist acts appears in the Annex to that common position. It was drawn up on the basis of precise information supplied by the judicial or police authorities of the Member States.

On 7 June 2004 the Court of First Instance rejected the actions brought by Gestoras Pro-Amnistía, Juan Mari Olano Olano and Julen Zenarain Enarrasti and by Segi, Araitz Zubimendi Izaga and Aritza Galarraga respectively, seeking damages for the harm allegedly suffered as a result of the inclusion of Gestoras Pro-Amnistía and Segi in the list of persons, groups or entities involved in terrorist acts. The appellants have brought two appeals before the Court of Justice seeking to have those orders set aside. They maintain, in particular, that they have no means of challenging the inclusion of Gestoras Pro-Amnistía and Segi in that list and that the orders of the Court of First Instance prejudice their right to effective judicial protection.

By today's judgment the Court of Justice upholds the orders of the Court of First Instance and dismisses the appeals.

First of all, the Court of Justice points out that, in accordance with the EU Treaty, the Union is founded on the principle of the rule of law and it respects fundamental rights as general principles of Community law.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Council Common Position 2001/340/CFSP of 27 December 2001 (OJ 2001 L 344, p. 93). The list was updated by Council Common Positions 2002/340/CFSP of 2 May 2002 and 2002/462/CFSO of 17 June 2002; Gestoras Pro-Amnistía and Segi continued to be included in that list.

Next, it observes that in the sphere of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters (the third pillar of the EU Treaty) the Council may adopt common positions. A common position requires the compliance of the Member States by virtue of the principle of the duty to cooperate in good faith, which means in particular that the Member States are to take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of their obligations under European Union law. The EU Treaty does not, however, enable national courts to refer questions to the Court for a preliminary ruling on a common position, for common positions are not supposed to produce of themselves legal effects in relation to third parties. In contrast, and still in the context of the third pillar, the Council may adopt decisions and framework decisions intended to produce legal effects in relation to third parties. Those may be the subject of a reference for a preliminary ruling.

Given that the procedure enabling the Court to give preliminary rulings is designed to guarantee observance of the law in the interpretation and application of the Treaty, the right to make a reference for a preliminary ruling in the context of the third pillar must therefore exist in respect of all measures adopted by the Council, **whatever their nature or form**, which are intended to have legal effects in relation to third parties.

Therefore, a national court hearing a dispute which indirectly raises the issue of the validity or interpretation of a common position adopted in the context of the third pillar, and which has serious doubt whether that common position is really intended to produce legal effects in relation to third parties, may ask the Court to give a preliminary ruling. It would then fall to the Court to find, where appropriate, that the common position is intended to produce legal effects in relation to third parties, to accord it its true classification and to give a preliminary ruling.

Consequently, the Court concludes that the appellants are not deprived of effective judicial protection and that the orders of the Court of First Instance do not prejudice their right to such protection.

Unofficial document for media use, not binding on the Court of Justice.

Languages available: ES, DE, EN, FR

The full text of the judgment may be found on the Court's internet site <a href="http://curia.europa.eu/jurisp/cgi-bin/form.pl?lang=EN&Submit=rechercher&numaff=C-354/04">http://curia.europa.eu/jurisp/cgi-bin/form.pl?lang=EN&Submit=rechercher&numaff=C-354/04</a>
It can usually be consulted after midday (CET) on the day judgment is delivered.

For further information, please contact Christopher Fretwell Tel: (00352) 4303 3355 Fax: (00352) 4303 2731