
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xix
<i>Abbreviations and Glossary for French Sources</i>	xxvii
<i>Table of Equivalences</i>	xxix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxxi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xlix
<i>Table of Conventions</i>	lv
<i>Introduction</i>	lvii

Part 1

Unjust Enrichment and Public Law in England and Wales

1—Definitions and Controversies	3
‘RESTITUTION’ OR ‘UNJUST ENRICHMENT’	3
Using the Map	5
The Criteria for a Claim in ‘Autonomous’ Unjust Enrichment	7
‘PUBLIC BODIES’ AND ‘PUBLIC LAW’	10
CONCLUSION	18
2—<i>Woolwich</i> and the Creation of the Public Law Reason for Restitution	20
THE FACTS	20
THE BACKGROUND TO THE CLAIM	21
A WHOLLY PRIVATE APPROACH? POTENTIAL UNJUST FACTORS AVAILABLE TO THE WOOLWICH	23
Duress or <i>Colore Officii</i>	23
Inequality	24
No Consideration	24
Failure of Consideration	26
Mistake of Law	26
TWO NEW OPTIONS FOR RECOVERY	27
WHAT IS THE WOOLWICH UNJUST FACTOR?	28
Illegality	28

Incapacity	29
Absence or failure of basis	29
Inequality	30
A WHOLLY PUBLIC APPROACH: COULD RESTITUTION SIMPLY BE A RESPONSE TO A PUBLIC LAW EVENT?	31
THE SOLUTION: A HYBRID APPROACH	36
3—The Scope of the Public Law Reason for Restitution	40
THE SCOPE OF THE PUBLIC LAW REASON FOR RESTITUTION: EIGHT KEY QUESTIONS	40
Need There Have Been a Demand for the Public Law Reason for Restitution to Operate?	40
Need There Have Been a Protest for the Public Law Reason for Restitution to Operate?	41
To What Extent is the Public Law Reason for Restitution Overridden by Statute?	42
What Exactly Does the Claimant Recover?	44
Is it Always Necessary to Bring Two Separate Cases, One Action for Judicial Review and One Private Law Claim?	49
Over What Subject Matter does the Public Law Reason for Restitution Extend?	52
What Sort of Invalidity Triggers this Reason for Restitution?	54
Which Kinds of Body Will Give Rise to this Reason for Restitution?	55
THE SCOPE OF THE PUBLIC LAW UNJUST FACTOR: RESTITUTION FOR PUBLIC BODIES	56
The ‘Swaps’ Cases	57
4—A Hierarchy of Reasons for Restitution	70
THE ADVANTAGES OF THE PUBLIC LAW REASON FOR RESTITUTION OVER THE PRIVATE LAW UNJUST FACTORS	72
REASONS FOR RESTITUTION AND TIME LIMITS: IS A HIERARCHY POSSIBLE?	74
<i>Deutsche Morgan Grenfell v IRC</i>	75
FURTHER ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE HIERARCHY	97
Does Mistake Provide a Broader Ground of Recovery than the Public Law Reason for Restitution?	102
HOW WIDE ARE THE EFFECTS OF THE PUBLIC LAW REASON FOR RESTITUTION?	110
How Wide is the Finding of Ultra Vires?	110

How Far does a Claim in Unjust Enrichment Extend into Consequential Loss?	113
EVIDENCE FOR THE HIERARCHY AND THE ISSUE OF 'CLOSED' SWAPS	118
CONCLUSION	121
5—Defences	123
WHAT GENERAL IMPLICATIONS DOES THE HYBRID NATURE OF THE REASON FOR RESTITUTION HAVE FOR DEFENCES?	123
TIME LIMITS	128
PRIVATE LAW DEFENCES	136
Change of Position	136
Estoppel	149
Bona Fide Purchase	150
Impossibility of Counter-Restitution	150
Submission to an Honest Claim	151
Ultra Vires	152
Passing On	152
SPECIAL DEFENCES IN PUBLIC LAW UNJUST FACTOR CASES	157
Fiscal Disruption	157
The Law Commission's 'Special' Defence of Exhaustion of the Statutory Mechanism	159
Prospective Overruling	160
CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER IMPLICATIONS	161
Part 1 Conclusions and further implications	162
Part 2	
Unjust Enrichment and Public Law in France	
6—Public Body Unjust Enrichment Claims in France; Lessons for England and Wales	167
THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE DIVIDE IN FRANCE	167
THE FRENCH LAW OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT	171
Enrichissement Sans Cause	172
Répétition de l'indu	174
Gestion d'affaires	176
ENRICHMENT WITHOUT CAUSE AND PUBLIC BODIES	177
Quasi-Contracts are Automatically Adjusted in their Application to Public Bodies	178

If Courts Have to Choose Between Two Events, Both of which are Actually Relevant to the Basis of the Claim, Some Courts Will Choose One, and Others the Other	181
As well as Adjusting its Quasi-Contracts to Take Account of Public Bodies, French Law Also Distinguishes between Public Law Rules and Public Law Procedure, so that even within the Private Procedure Adjustments can be Made to Take Account of the Public Nature of one of the Parties to the Claim	190
The 'Absence of Cause' Approach does not Necessarily Provide a Better Solution for Public Body Enrichment Cases	192
The Need to Accommodate Public Bodies in Private Claims has a Tendency to Change the Rules of Private Law Itself	200
CONCLUSION	202

Part 3

Unjust Enrichment and Public Law in the European Union

7—Unjust Enrichment and the EU Institutions	207
AN EU LAW OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT?	209
UNJUST ENRICHMENT AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF EU LAW	211
Staff Cases	212
Annulment Cases	214
Three Party Cases	222
UNJUST ENRICHMENT: ONLY A 'GENERAL PRINCIPLE' OF EU LAW	229
CONCLUSION	231
8—Unjust Enrichment in National and European Law, and the 'Remedies' Jurisprudence of the ECJ	232
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELEVANT EUROPEAN UNION LAW	233
THE MEMBER STATE/EU DIVIDE: REMEDIES IN NATIONAL COURTS FOR BREACH OF EUROPEAN LAW	236
The Principles of National Procedural Autonomy, Equivalence and Effectiveness, and the Three Phases of the ECJ's Case Law	236
UNJUST ENRICHMENT AND ULTRA VIRES IN NATIONAL AND EU LAW; TWO DIFFERENT MODELS FOR ANALYSING THE DIVISION OF LABOUR BETWEEN THE MEMBER STATES AND THE EU	242
Two important factors against Model 2	247

Cases in which a Member State or a National Intervention Agency Levies Money in Contravention of EU Law	253
Cases in which an NIA or the EU Pays Out Money in Breach of EU Law which it then Seeks to Recover	265
IS THERE AN EU LAW ‘EVENT’ OF ULTRA VIRES IN CASES INVOLVING BOTH EU AND NATIONAL LAW?	269
CONCLUSION—THE IMPACT OF EU LAW ON NATIONAL UNJUST ENRICHMENT CLAIMS INVOLVING PUBLIC BODIES	271
Index	285

<http://www.pbookshop.com>