

---

# Contents

---

<i>Table of Cases</i>		xiii
<i>Introduction</i>		xix
<b>Part One</b>		
1	<b>The Enduring Legacy of ‘Inquisitorial’ and ‘Accusatorial’ Procedural Forms in the Debate on Comparative Criminal Procedure</b>	3
	A The Enduring Legacy of the Inquisitorial/Accusatorial Divide	3
	B The Connection to Legal Nationalism	11
	C Developing a New Approach for Analysing European Criminal Procedure Law	14
2	<b>The Origins of the European Criminal Procedural Tradition</b>	21
	A The Importance of the Developments of the Nineteenth Century	21
	B The Development of the ‘Accusatorial Trinity’	24
	C Judicial Impartiality	29
	(i) The Separation of the Functions of ‘Judging’ and ‘Prosecuting’ in France and Germany	31
	(ii) Impassivity or Activity: The Role of the English Judge in the Examination of the Evidence	35
	(iii) Institutional Impartiality	38
	D The Public Hearing Requirement	38
	E Immediate and Oral Proceedings	47
	(i) Immediate and Oral Examination of the Evidence at Trial	50
	(ii) Consideration at Trial of Evidence Collected Before the Trial and Submitted in Writing	53
	(iii) Immediate and Oral Proceedings as Fundamental to the Accusatorial System	54
	F Conclusions	58
3	<b>The Rights of the Defence: Lessons from the Nineteenth Century</b>	61
	A The Institutional Nature of the ‘Rights of the Accused’	61
	B The Rights of the Defence at Trial	63
	(i) The Presence of the Accused	63
	(ii) Participatory Rights of the Accused	68
	(iii) The Assistance of Counsel	78
	C The Role of the Defence in the Pre-trial Phase	82
	(i) The Pre-trial Phase as ‘Investigative’	82

x Contents

	(ii) The ‘Determinative’ Reality of the Investigation	89
D	Conclusions	92
<b>Part Two</b>		
4	<b>Defining Fairness in Article 6(1) ECHR</b>	97
A	Introduction	97
B	Identifying Vargha’s ‘Accusatorial Trinity’	99
C	The Role of the ‘Equality of Arms’ Doctrine	103
D	The Relationship Between the Adversarial Procedure Requirement and the Equality of Arms	110
E	The Court’s Interpretation of the Adversarial Procedure Requirement in Criminal Proceedings	112
	(i) The Right to be Present at Trial	113
	(ii) Knowledge of the Other Side’s Submissions	118
	(iii) Opportunity to Comment on the Other Side’s Submissions	120
F	The Relationship Between the Defence and the Prosecution	124
G	Fairness and Implied Procedural Forms	126
5	<b>The Structure of the ‘Trial’ in Article 6 ECHR</b>	129
A	Introduction	129
B	The Defence’s Right to Challenge Witness Evidence	132
C	Witness Evidence in Europe: An Overview	132
D	Regulating Witness Evidence: Article 6(3)(d)	137
	(i) What is an Adequate and Proper Opportunity to Challenge Witnesses?	137
	(ii) When Should Witnesses be Examined?	142
E	The Importance of the Trial as a Forum for Confronting Witness Evidence	146
F	Reconciling Examination of Witnesses in the Investigation Phase with the ‘Accusatorial Trinity’	148
	(i) The Presence of Counsel During Pre-trial Examination of Witnesses	150
	(ii) The Presence of an Impartial Supervisory Authority During the Examination of Witnesses	151
	(iii) Immediacy	154
G	The Privilege Against Self-incrimination	155
	(i) Improper Compulsion	156
	(ii) Indirect ‘Acceptable’ Compulsion	157
	(iii) The Relationship Between ‘Compulsion’ and the Assistance of Counsel	160
	(iv) The Privilege Against Self-incrimination as a Substitute for the Refusal to Insist on Adversarial Principles in the Investigation Phase	161
H	The Root of the Problem: Defining the ‘Trial’	163
	(i) The Investigation Phase Lacuna	163
	(ii) Explaining the Investigation Phase Lacuna: <i>Les Travaux Préparatoires</i> ?	164

	(iii) Resolving the Fairness Deficit: Acknowledging the European Procedural Tradition	166
6	<b>Reassessing Fairness in European Criminal Law: Procedural Fairness, Individual Rights and Institutional Forms</b>	169
	A Procedural Fairness as Individual Rights	169
	B Procedural Rights and Institutional Forms	172
	C Article 6 ECHR and the European Criminal Procedural Tradition	178
	D Towards an Institutional Understanding of Fairness in Criminal Proceedings	183
	<i>Index</i>	185

