

Contents

	<i>page</i>
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	
<i>Preface</i>	
<i>Introduction</i>	
1 Jurisdiction and conflicts of criminal jurisdiction within the european union .	
1.1 Criminal Jurisdiction and <i>ius puniendi</i>	
1.2 Grounds for claiming jurisdiction	
1.2.1 Previous considerations	
1.2.2 Principle of territoriality	
1.2.3 Extraterritorial principles for claiming jurisdiction	
1.2.3.1 Principle of personality	
1.2.3.2 Principle of protection	
1.2.3.3 Principle of universality	
1.2.3.4 Principle of vicarious or representational jurisdiction	
1.2.4 Rules on jurisdiction within international and supranational instruments	
1.3 Conflicts of criminal jurisdiction: general profiles	
1.3.1 The “Hierarchy issue” on the allocation of jurisdiction	
1.3.2 Conflicts of criminal jurisdiction	
1.3.2.1 Positive conflicts of jurisdiction	
1.3.2.2 Negative conflicts of jurisdiction	
2 Eu legal framework on conflicts of criminal jurisdiction	
2.1 Primary law	
2.1.1 Background	
2.1.2 Current legal basis in the Treaties	
2.1.2.1 Art82(1)(b) TFEU	
2.1.2.2 Art. 85(1)(c) TFEU	
2.1.2.3 Compatibility of both provisions	
2.1.3 Other relevant primary law: CISA and CFREU	

2.2	The Framework Decision 2009/948/JHA.....	
2.2.1	Background.....	
2.2.2	Procedure	
2.2.3	Limits and shortcomings	
2.3	The role of Eurojust in the prevention and settlement of conflicts of jurisdiction....	
2.3.1	Background.....	
2.3.2	Limited powers granted to Eurojust	
2.3.3	Eurojust's Guidelines for deciding on jurisdiction	
2.4	Lack of EU instruments for transfer of criminal proceedings	
2.4.1	The concentration of proceedings as an ideal procedural solution	
2.4.2	Transfer of criminal proceedings provided by international law	
2.5	Implementation into national law: the Spanish and Italian examples.....	
2.5.1	Procedure acting as contacting authority.....	
2.5.1.1	Spain.....	
2.5.1.2	Italy	
2.5.2	Procedure acting as contacted authority	
2.5.2.1	Spain.....	
2.5.2.2	Italy	
2.5.3	Agreement on the settlement of the conflict.....	
2.5.3.1	Spain.....	
2.5.3.2	Italy	
2.5.4	Referring the case to Eurojust	
2.5.4.1	Spain.....	
2.5.4.2	Italy	
3	Conflicts of jurisdiction and due process of law	
3.1	Introduction	
3.2	The ne bis in idem principle.....	
3.2.1	National dimension	
3.2.2	Transnational dimension	
3.3	Right to be heard by a court previously established by law	
3.4	Substantive legality.....	
3.5	Procedural safeguards and the right to defence of the investigated or accused person	
3.6	Victim's interest in the allocation of jurisdiction.....	
3.7	Negative consequences for the effective prosecution of crimes	
4	Towards a new model of settlement of conflicts: background and methodology	
4.1	Foreword	
4.2	Legislative backgrounds	
4.2.1	The Council of Europe Proposal	

4.2.2	The EPPO as a potential example of a vertical mechanism.....	
4.3	Model proposals and explanatory notes	
4.3.1	Methodology and approach.....	
4.3.2	Scope of application.....	
4.3.2.1	Parallel investigations and proceedings	
4.3.2.2	Criminal investigations and proceedings stricto sensu.....	
4.3.3	Study on viability	
4.3.3.1	Inability of unifying grounds for claiming jurisdiction.....	
4.3.3.2	Inability of models based on applying foreign substantive criminal law	
4.3.3.3	Improving information exchange as a mandatory previous action.....	
5	<i>De lege ferenda</i> proposals on settlement of conflicts of criminal jurisdiction: model a - horizontal approach	
5.2	Action 1: Replacing Framework Decision 2009/948 / JHA	
5.2.1	Legal basis and proper EU legal instrument.....	
5.2.2	Subject matter and scope.....	
5.2.3	Procedure	
5.2.4	Deadlines	
5.2.5	Procedural effects in national criminal proceedings.....	
5.2.6	Connecting factors	
5.2.7	Final decision and agreement.....	
5.3	Action 2: New instrument on transfer of criminal proceedings.....	
5.3.1	Rationale	
5.3.2	Legal basis and proper EU legal instrument.....	
5.3.3	Subject matter and scope.....	
5.3.4	Waiving or discontinuing proceedings	
5.3.5	Conditions for requesting a transfer	
5.3.6	Procedure	
5.3.7	Procedural effects in national criminal proceedings.....	
5.3.8	Grounds for refusal	
5.4	The role of Eurojust	
5.4.1	Role in the proposed instruments on prevention and settlement of conflicts	
5.4.2	Powers granted in Eurojust's Regulation.....	
5.5	Judicial review	
5.5.1	National level.....	
5.5.2	Supranational level.....	
6	<i>De lege ferenda</i> proposals on settlement of conflicts of criminal jurisdiction: model b - vertical approach	
6.1	General aspects and explanation	

6.2	Action 1: Replacing Framework Decision 2009/948/JHA	
6.2.1	Legal basis and proper EU legal instrument.....	
6.2.2	Subject matter and scope.....	
6.2.3	Procedure	
6.2.3.1	Competence and locus standi.....	
6.2.3.2	Stage of proceedings and momentum	
6.2.3.3	Referral duty.....	
6.2.3.4	Deadlines.....	
6.2.3.5	Procedural effects in national criminal proceedings	
6.2.3.6	Connecting factors.....	
6.3	Action 2: New instrument on transfer of criminal proceedings.....	
6.3.1	Rationale, legal basis and scope	
6.3.2	Conditions for requesting a transfer	
6.3.3	Grounds for refusal	
6.4	The role of Eurojust	
6.4.1	Eurojust's binding decision: rationale and legal basis	
6.4.2	Eurojust assistance in the proposed instrument on settlement of conflicts ...	
6.4.3	Powers granted in Eurojust's Regulation.....	
6.5	Judicial review	
6.5.1	Supranational judicial control of the decision: rationale and legal basis	
6.5.2	Remedies available according to current EU primary law	
6.5.3	Judicial review models in practice and other academic proposals.....	
6.5.4	Supranational judicial review: proposal according to de lege lata system....	
6.5.5	Supranational judicial review: specialized Court pursuant to Art. 257 TFEU	
	<i>Annex A horizontal model proposal</i>	
	<i>Annex b vertical model proposal</i>	
	<i>Bibliography</i>	