

# ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS IN ROMANIA AND POLAND – A TOPICAL COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE\*

Dacian C. DRAGOȘ  
Mariusz SWORA  
Andrzej SKOCZYLAS

Dacian C. DRAGOȘ (corresponding author)  
PhD, Jean Monnet Associate Professor, Public Administration  
Department, Faculty of Political, Administrative and  
Communication Sciences, Babeș-Bolyai University,  
Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
Tel.: 0040-263-431.361  
E-mail: dragos@apubb.ro

Mariusz SWORA  
PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law and Administration,  
Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

Andrzej SKOCZYLAS  
PhD, Professor, Faculty of Law and Administration,  
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland

---

\* This article is the outcome of a research financed through a post-doctoral grant under European Social Fund, Operational Sectorial Program for the Development of Human Resources, 'Transnational network for the integrated management of post-doctoral research in the field of Science Communication. Institutional building (post-doctoral school) and grant program (CommScie)' contract no. POSDRU/89/1.5/S/63663.

## Abstract

The article focuses on the issue of administrative appeal and analyzes how the appeal functions in two different jurisdictions: Poland and Romania. The authors start by providing information on the nature of the administrative appeal (mandatory or not), deadlines for exercising it, suspensive effect for the action in court etc. All these aspects are examined from a comparative perspective. The aim of the comparative perspective is to highlight that currently the European national systems are fluid and continuously changing; in addition, the goal is to identify best practices that could be transferred from one system to the other. One of the key topics addressed in the context of this theme refers to the relationship that exists between the administrative appeal and the action in court. Authors try to answer the question whether the citizens' access to justice is breached in cases when the appeal is mandatory. The authors also discuss the fact that very often a mandatory appeal can lead to a high number of cases being solved outside the courts.

**Keywords:** appeal, Romania, Poland, administrative law, public administration.

## 1. Introduction

Before resorting to a court for annulment/modification of an administrative decision, an interested party has the possibility of challenging the decision before the administration itself. The (internal) administrative appeal is addressed to the issuing public authority (or to the higher public authority); in most cases, this is a compulsory requirement before a lawsuit can be filed.

There are two major systems of administrative appeals – mandatory and optional. The first one, adopted by the large majority of legal systems (among which the German, Austrian and Dutch ones) precludes an action to a court in the absence of a prior administrative appeal. The second one (*recours administratif*), promoted by the French legal system and those inspired by it, attaches certain effects to the exercise of the administrative appeal (prorogation of the statute of limitations for filing an action with the courts), without making it mandatory.

Administrative appeals have always been considered an affordable tool for alternative dispute resolution in administrative matters, and a way of reducing the burden of litigation on the courts. Nevertheless, the two systems of administrative appeals have fueled debates concerning their effectiveness, access to justice, promotion of good governance principles and accountability and their relationship with mediation.

In terms of effectiveness, there are questions regarding the most effective system of administrative appeal; however, remarkably, no meaningful research on this issue is – as yet – available at the European level. The mandatory system benefits from the fact that both parties in the administrative law litigation are not only offered the opportunity but, rather, are forced to measure their forces before going to court; this can result in an amiable dispute resolution at the administrative level. On the other hand, in cases where the appeal is considered a ‘nuisance’ for those seeking access to justice or by the public authorities, or where administrative appeals are not treated very seriously due to a lack of accountability, the procedure can be counterproductive if it is imposed on parties; so, the optional system could be considered as being a preferable solution.

The relation with the judicial review is of critical significance, both in terms of justice administration (the number of cases that reach the courts in different systems of administrative appeals) and judicial proceedings. The conditionality between mandatory administrative appeals and judicial review also raises questions about access to justice.

The present article endeavors to make an embryonic analysis of the issues related to this topic, in a comparative perspective. The research conducted is a first step for more in-depth considerations about the Romanian and Polish legal systems.

## 2. Administrative appeal: the concept

In comparative administrative law there are two major ways of appealing against allegedly unlawful decisions: the administrative appeal and the judicial review or court action (Dragoş, 2001; Dragoş, 2010; Rarincescu, 1936, p. 106).

The administrative appeal is a request addressed to a public authority by which the aggrieved person asks for administrative measures to be taken regarding the

administrative decision: annulment, modification or even issuance of a decision – when this has been refused by the administration. Judicial review is a contested (adversary) proceeding by which an individual removes a conflict with a public authority to the (administrative) courts.

In principle, the two actions mentioned above are independent, and rules for their exercise normally do not interfere with one another (Auby and Fromont, 1971, p. 215; Darcy and Paillet, 2000, pp. 2, 22; Rivero and Waline, 2000, p. 206). Each action can be exercised separately, and those aggrieved by an administrative decision can opt freely between these two ways of contesting the decisions (Darcy and Paillet, 2000, p. 22). In many cases, however, the applicable law requires that prior to commencing court proceedings, an administrative appeal must be filed. Other jurisdictions, without imposing the exercise of the administrative appeal, still link – in many ways – administrative appeals to judicial review (Auby and Fromont, 1971, p. 219).

A chief feature of administrative justice is that it allows parties to resolve their dispute at administrative level: they have the possibility to challenge the decision before the administration itself. It is, in a sense, an ‘alternative dispute resolution’ tool in the area of administrative justice; also, it has been strongly recommended by the Council of Europe (2001) and has found its way into most of the Council’s jurisdictions and, also, EU law.

### **3. Legal foundations of administrative appeal in Romania and Poland**

Romania does not yet have a law on administrative procedure, so the administrative appeal is regulated in the General Law on judicial review no. 554/2004 and in several special laws.

The administrative appeal can be found in all of its forms: objection and hierarchical appeal (art. 7 of the Law no. 554/2004 on judicial review), and even improper hierarchical appeal (addressed to a body that is not the hierarchical superior of the issuing body). The first two (objection and hierarchical appeal) are regulated expressly by the 2004 general law on judicial review. They can be lodged together or separately, within 30 days from the communication of the decision. For third parties, the deadline counts from the date they find out about the decision. If both authorities (issuer body and superior body) are approached at the same time or consecutively and they do not coordinate the answer, the solution most beneficial to the applicant shall have priority. The deadline for court action will start, however, when the applicant receives the first answer or when the first deadline for answering the appeal has passed.

The higher body cannot refuse to deal with the hierarchical appeal on the ground that the issuer has also been notified. The explanation lies in the fact that the hierarchical appeal has a rather different scope and chances of success than the objection. The first one is meant to trigger a form of external control over the issuer, while the second one is the self-control of the issuer. Apart from the objectivity of these forms of control, which can prove to be relevant, those who conduct the procedure have also a different perspective over the administrative decision.

The quasi hierarchical appeal can be traced in the form of an appeal to the prefect, who is assessing the legality of the decisions issued by autonomous local authorities (mayors, local and county councils, presidents of county councils). The prefect can then lodge a court action in order to annul the decision. The same attributions have been granted to the Romanian National Agency for Civil Servants, which can lodge a court action against public bodies that infringe the legal provisions regarding civil service, such as recruitment, disciplinary measures etc. (Law no. 188/1999 on civil service). Another example is the Romanian Court of Auditors, which controls the execution of the public budgets, and the legality of expenses made by public authorities. It can refuse public authorities the discharge of their expenses.

All these forms of control can be exercised at the request of a private or public person, upon an administrative appeal. This appeal is not a typical hierarchical one, but a quasi-hierarchical or 'improper' appeal.

There is also a national Romanian Ombudsman, Advocate of the People, who can act upon an administrative appeal from individuals (complaint), and also exercise an administrative appeal to the issuer or to the hierarchical body, in order to deal with the complaint (Law no. 35/1997 on the functioning of the Ombudsman institution).

Generally, administrative contracts are benefiting from the same treatment as administrative decisions regarding administrative appeals. In Romanian law, though, in the case of administrative contracts, the administrative appeal is taking the form of 'conciliation', which is specific to commercial contracts (art. 7 of the Law on judicial review) and is regulated in the Code of Civil Procedure. The conciliation has to be conducted, however, taking into consideration the position of the parties in administrative contracts, which are governed by the public law and by the priority of the public interest.

In Poland, the administrative procedure is codified, and the most important legal act regulating administrative procedure is the Administrative Procedure Code Act of June 14, 1960 (hereinafter APC), regulating first of all the so-called general administrative procedure. Another important law is the Tax Ordinance Act of August 29, 1997 (hereinafter TO), regulating procedures in fiscal cases (e.g., tax cases). The issue of appeals in the Tax Ordinance will not be presented separately though, because after some recent amendments these regulations have become similar to those contained in the Administrative Procedure Code. In this respect attention will be drawn only to the differences between the two procedures.

The scope of application of general administrative procedure is defined in Article 1, Points 1 and 2 of the Administrative Procedure Code (APC), stipulating that the Code is to be applied by public administration bodies in individual cases falling within the jurisdiction of these bodies, adjudicated by means of administrative decisions, as well as by other public bodies and organizations adjudicating individual cases by means of administrative decisions (whether statutorily or on a contractual basis). It needs to be explained that an individual case is one that relates to a specific party (e.g., a land owner) in a specific situation (e.g., pulling down a building) (Szubiakowski, Wierzbowski and Wiktorowska, 1998, pp. 10-12).

The right to appeal is one of the fundamental rights of parties to the proceedings guaranteed in the Polish Constitution. The Polish administrative procedure follows the principle of two instances, based on the provisions of the Polish Constitution, defined in detail in procedural acts (Administrative Procedure Code and Tax Ordinance). It follows from the said principle that each party has the right to have the merits of the case heard twice (Adamiak *et al.*, 2010, p. 203 *ff*; Adamiak, 1998, pp. 58-63), hence the two instances, which means that each first instance decision can be appealed against only once. In the light of legal solutions applied in the Administrative Procedure Code (articles 15 and 127, clause 1 of the APC), the party can appeal against any decision, and not only against negative decisions (i.e., including those decisions which approve of only a part of the applicant's claims). The party to an administrative procedure defends its legitimate interests and has the right to evaluate whether or not the party's interests have been fully acknowledged<sup>1</sup>. The principle of two instances further provides that 'issuing two decisions by two bodies representing different instances' is not sufficient, because such decisions must be 'preceded by a procedure – to be carried out by the deciding body – enabling the accomplishment of objectives at which the procedure in question is aimed'<sup>2</sup>. An appeal procedure cannot thus be limited to verification of arguments stated in the appeal (regarding the first instance decision)<sup>3</sup>.

#### **4. Deadlines for exercising administrative appeals**

From a comparative perspective, there are several options regarding the legal arrangement of the time frames for exercising and solving the administrative appeal.

First, there is the fixed time limit, within which the applicant should lodge the appeal. Romania has a 30 days time frame. The legal nature of the time limit seems to be one of a recommending nature (Iorgovan, 2005, p. 314), due to the fact that it is doubled by a term of 6 months, calculated from the issuance of the decision. The appeal lodged within the longer term is to be agreed by the public authority, upon assessment of the 'reasoned grounds' presented by the claimant, so it is a decision taken with discretionary power. No need to say that public authorities in Romania are not too keen on considering the grounds as justified, when this claim occurs. The possible abuse in assessing the grounds for extension of the term can be reviewed by the court, when the case is brought before it.

It was argued (Dragoş, 2001, p. 90) that 'reasoned grounds' should be interpreted taking into account the criteria used by judges in re-activating the time frames for

---

1 Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of July 3, 1992, SA/Wr 455/92, ONSA 1993, No. 3, item 62.

2 Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of November 12, 1992, V SA 721/92, ONSA 1992, No. 3-4, item 95; Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court 15 V 2000, V SA 2722/99, LEX No. 56632; Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of December 12, 2000, V SA 359/00, LEX No. 51287.

3 Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of March, 22 1996, SA/Wr 1996/95, ONSA 1997, No. 1, item 35.

filing procedural acts (art. 103 of the Civil Procedure Code): circumstances that are 'beyond the control of the claimant'. This opinion is shared also by the courts<sup>4</sup>. Thus, the simple fact that the public clerk was on medical leave is not a circumstance to justify the reactivation of the term for the claimant, when the appeal could be registered at the institution or sent by post, fax etc.<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, the absence from the country of the addressee of an administrative decision communicated by posting it on the door, or by post, could be considered as a sufficient ground for exceeding the shorter term. Also, the fact that another judicial proceeding is pending, and the resolution might influence the outcome in the current proceeding, could be considered as a reasoned ground<sup>6</sup>.

The moment when the administrative appeal is considered lodged is when it is sent by mail<sup>7</sup>, or by electronic mail<sup>8</sup>, when it is registered directly at the public authority's premises, respectively when the verbal complaint is registered.

The written form of the appeal or its registration, when is expressed verbally, should be necessary in order to facilitate the proof<sup>9</sup>; nevertheless, if during the court proceedings the public authority accepts the verbal appeal, it will be not possible to invoke afterwards its absence<sup>10</sup>.

The Romanian law does not impose such a requirement that administrative appeals have to be motivated, although comparative studies show that this provision would be beneficial (Brabant, Questiaux and Wiener, 1973, p. 264; Chapus, 1999, p. 571; Peiser, 2000, p. 121). The motivation of the decision issued upon administrative appeal is as important as are the bases for the initial decisions rendered by public authorities. In this context, a complete motivation would comprise information about both administrative appeals available, and about the judicial review. Thus, Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers (2001) recommended that member states shall 'ensure that parties receive appropriate information about the possible use of alternative means' [Council of Europe, 2001, Art. 3 (2) (a) (ii)].

General administrative acts are usually published in official but general sources and only exceptionally are they communicated directly to those interested. In the case of such acts, the question is how to organize the administrative appeal that has a fixed time limit? Should the time limit run from the date of the publication or from the date when the decision has been harmful for the applicant? The second choice is the right one, because it accommodates well the principle of legitimate expectations. The

---

4 See, for example, Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 3441/2002.

5 Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 2689/2002.

6 Bucharest Court of Appeal, Administrative and Fiscal Law Section, Decision no. 1401/2006.

7 Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 1434/2000.

8 Governmental Ordinance no.27/2002 on the procedure for solving petitions (art. 2); Bucharest Court of Appeal, Decision no. 307/2006.

9 Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 962/2000 and Decision no. 40/1994.

10 Neamț County Court, Decision no. 11/1991.

Romanian law has no provisions regarding the exercise of administrative appeal in case of general acts, leaving the same rules that apply to individual acts to be applicable to general acts. This can be quite frustrating for claimants, who would be forced to complain about general acts in 30 days (or 6 months) from the date of publication, which is not acceptable for a number of reasons. In this context, the doctrine and the jurisprudence have concluded that it should be exercised at any time before going to court against the act. This solution is also in line with the fact that general decisions can be challenged anytime.

The administrative appeal has to be answered, according to Romanian law, in 30 days' time, which can be extended with 15 days in case the request is complex, but only after the claimant is informed about the extension (Law no. 554/2004, art. 7, interpreted in view of art. 8-9, Governmental Ordinance no. 27/2002).

An interesting debate could be carried out regarding the duty to re-direct wrongly addressed administrative appeals. There are several options: the public authority rejects the appeal because it does not fall within its competence; the public authority rejects the appeal because it is not competent, but informs the claimant about the public body that has competence to deal with the complaint; the public authority re-directs a wrongly addressed appeal to the competent authority. The last one comes with two sub-options: (a) the re-directing duty applies only when the competent body is under its supervision/subordination, or (b) it applies in any cases.

The Romanian approach, to impose in any cases a duty to re-direct all petitions to the competent authority (Governmental Ordinance no. 27/2002, art. 61) is the most accommodating for petitioners, in our opinion. It demands a proper expertise from the public authority, while exempting the petitioner from browsing the public bodies in search for the competent one. The timeframe for re-directing the wrongfully addressed petitions is 5 days. The timeframe for answering the administrative appeal by the competent authority starts to run again after it is registered there.

In the case of a person aggrieved by the decision addressed to another person, the deadline is 30 days since the third party has learned about the existence of the decision. The jurisprudence of the courts has conflicted here with that of the Constitutional Court. Thus, the Highest Court<sup>11</sup> and Courts of appeals<sup>12</sup> have considered that third parties can lodge the administrative appeal within the 6 months from the issuance of the decision, while the Constitutional court has argued that such an interpretation is preventing third parties to access the courts<sup>13</sup>.

In Poland, one of the more significant and important issues related to the functioning of public administration bodies is the search for legal solutions guaranteeing efficient performance of such bodies. In this context, when analyzing the issue of time limits

---

11 Highest Court of Cassation and Justice, Administrative and Fiscal Law Section, Decision no. 146/2007.

12 Bucharest Court of Appeal, Decision no. 1445/2006.

13 Constitutional Court of Romania, Decision no. 797/2007.

for filing appeals it needs to be emphasized that appeals are filed within 14 days after the decision in question is delivered to the party (and if the decision is announced orally – within fourteen days after such announcement) (article 129, clauses 1 and 2 of the APC). As a result, the time available for filing an appeal commences on the day of announcement or delivery of the decision to the party. In the Polish administrative procedure (both general and governed by the Tax Ordinance), misleading information regarding one's right to appeal (or the lack of such information) cannot be to the detriment of the party. In the opinion of the Supreme Administrative Court, the phrase 'cannot be to the detriment of the party' means that a legal remedy taken advantage of, in accordance with the content of such misleading information, is indeed effective, as if it were filed within the statutory time limit.<sup>14</sup>

When discussing the question of the time for processing appeals it needs to be emphasized that in the Polish administrative procedures the legislator generally requires that appeals be processed without undue delay. This phrase should be understood as a general guideline requiring that all cases are to be handled in such a way so as to not only meet the statutory time limit, but also to process the appeal as quickly as possible, even before the statutory date. In administrative procedures regulated by the Administrative Procedure Code, appeals need to be processed within one month after the delivery of the appeal, whereas tax-related appeal procedures should be processed not later than 2 months after the appeal is delivered to the appeal body (3 months in cases where a trial has been held or where the party has applied for a trial). The above terms do not include time periods statutorily available for completing certain requirements (e.g., provision of missing information in the application), or periods for which administrative proceedings are suspended, as well as periods of delay caused by reasons attributable to the party or resulting from circumstances beyond the control of the appeal body.

An analysis of files of administrative courts (including decisions indicating formal defects) shows that in the practice of many administrative bodies (particularly those dealing with supervision of building investments and environmental protection) the statutory time limits are sometimes grossly exceeded, and proceedings take as much as several years. This may be seen as a breach of one of the fundamental principles of a democratic state, in accordance with which one has the right to have his/her case heard without undue delay in order to have one's interests protected by a public body acting in accordance with applicable laws (Skoczylas, 2005; Wyrzykowski, 1998, p. 81). An analysis of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights<sup>15</sup> as regards lengthy court and administrative procedures allows one to conclude that when evaluating the duration of procedures from the perspective of breaching article 6 of the Convention, the

---

14 Decision of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of June 29, III SA 2545/00, unpublished.

15 E.g., Ruling of the ECHR of June 15, 2004, complaint No. 77741/01, Piekara vs. Poland, LEX No. 122542; Ruling of the ECHR of February 11, 2003, complaint No. 33870/96, Fuchs vs. Poland; Ruling of the ECHR of June 1, 2004, complaint No. 33777/96, Urbańczyk vs. Poland.



ECHR frequently takes into account not only the court procedure, but also the preceding procedures handled by administrative bodies. In particular, this approach is used if:

- a. despite being obliged by the administrative court to issue a decision or take action within a prescribed time limit, the administrative body remained idle, and then the decision issued (or action taken) by the body has been complained about to the court (Skoczylas, 2005)<sup>16</sup>;
- b. the administrative court has waived a decision of an administrative body, following which the said body issued another decision that has been complained about to the court<sup>17</sup>;
- c. a considerable number of decisions issued in the same case (and then complained about to the court) implies – in the opinion of the ECHR – that the authorities failed to act with due diligence<sup>18</sup>.

The foregoing means that – when investigating the matter of exceeding reasonable time of procedure (Article 6, Section 1 of the Convention) – the ECHR considers not only the circumstances of the proceedings in the administrative court, but also the ‘total duration of the procedure’, commencing upon initiation of the administrative procedure (Skoczylas, 2005, pp. 52-61).<sup>19</sup>

## **5. The administrative appeal and the judicial review: conditionality *versus* access to justice**

Traditionally, in Romanian law, the exhaustion of administrative appeals before going to court was mandatory. Thus, since 1864, when a Council of State was established in Romania, the prior exhaustion of administrative remedies was mandatory before going to court. It became optional in 1925, and again mandatory from 1967 onwards. The post-communist Law on judicial review (1990) maintained the mandatory administrative appeal (Dragoş, 2001).

Based on current legislation (Law no. 554/2004) the administrative appeal is mandatory for explicit administrative decisions, but there are no provisions for implicit or explicit refusal to act. Regarding the solution to exclude the appeal against the refusal to act, it was argued that in this case the petitioner should not be exposed again to a negative response from the public authority that refused once to accommodate its request.

The appeal is mandatory only for individuals and legal persons challenging administrative decisions, not for public authorities acting on public interest (the Prefect, the Public Prosecutors, the National Agency for Public Servants, the Ombudsman). It

---

16 Ruling of the ECHR of June 15, 2004, complaint No. 77741/01, Piekara vs. Poland, LEX No. 122542.

17 ‘liczne przekazania sprawy do ponownego rozpatrzenia powodowały dalsze opóźnienia (numerous reconsiderations of the case resulted in further delays)’ – Ruling of the ECHR of June 1, 2004, complaint No. 33777/96, Urbańczyk vs. Poland.

18 Ruling of the ECHR of February 11, 2003, complaint No. 33870/96, Fuchs vs. Poland.

19 Ruling of the ECHR of February 11, 2003, complaint No. 33870/96, Fuchs vs. Poland.

is also exempted in case of governmental ordinances (Law no. 554/2004, art. 7 par. 5). In case of the Ombudsman, the exemption from administrative appeal is based on the fact that the institution already exercised a form of administrative appeal by launching an investigation, during which the parties are mediated.

The legal consequence of not exercising the mandatory administrative appeal is the inadmissibility of the court action<sup>20</sup>. That is, when the deadline for exercising the administrative appeal has expired. When the court action is lodged within the deadline for administrative appeal, the action will be dismissed as premature. The same solution applies when the administrative appeal was exercised, but the deadline for answering has not expired.

In Poland, the administrative appeal is a mandatory stage before going to court. In order to file a complaint with an administrative court one must exhaust all other means of appeal (if available to the complaining party), unless the complaint is filed by the prosecutor or the Ombudsman. If no means of appeal are provided for by applicable regulations, the appeal can be filed after requesting the issuing body to correct the decision if it breaches the law. The Act precisely specifies also the formal prerequisites for filing a complaint if no means of appeal are provided (in the light of the Act, means of appeal also include a request for rehearing, and an administrative complaint) and regulates the situation where a complaint must be preceded by requesting the issuing body in writing to correct the decision if it breaches the law (art. 52 of the Administrative Court Proceedings Law – ACPL). The foregoing means that when acting before Polish administrative courts, the prosecutor and the Ombudsman enjoy certain process privileges. Neither of them needs to exhaust the so-called sequence of instances and they can complain to the administrative court directly against the decision issued in the first instance, which obviously cannot be done by an ordinary party to the proceedings (a citizen being the addressee of the decision in question would first have to appeal against it and only then – if the decision were maintained in the second instance – he/she could complain to the administrative court) (Hauser *et al.*, 2009, p. 148). Furthermore, as a general rule (ACPL, art. 53, clause 1), complaints to administrative courts are filed within 30 days after the delivery of the decision to the complainant. However, both the prosecutor and the Ombudsman can make their complaints within six months after delivering a decision in an individual case, or after the date on which a law enters into force or after an act complained about is effected (the foregoing does not apply to complaints against local laws passed by local governments and by regional units of the central administration).

Another question that can be raised in the context of the scope of administrative appeal is whether the plaintiff can modify the scope of the review when reaching the court or the review should match fairly the scope of the administrative appeal? The

---

20 Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision. no. 416/1995; Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 134/1991; Pitești Court of Appeal, Decision no. 79/1998.

Romanian courts have always looked for a sort of link between the administrative appeal and the judicial review, though not going very deep into their endeavor. Minimum requirements are held by the courts: the administrative appeal should regard the same decision that is contested in court, and third parties cannot benefit from administrative appeals exercised by the addressee of the act<sup>21</sup>.

In Poland, on the other hand, the scope of appeal in administrative procedures does not affect the scope of appeal in court procedures, as the latter is not based on the former. First instance administrative courts do not take over the case from the bodies handling it before, but they merely evaluate the legality of the item complained against. In such evaluation, they are not limited either by the boundaries, or by the content of the complaint. Only the cassation appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court is a highly formalized means of appeal, where the appellant needs to state whether the decision is complained against in part or in whole and to specify the requested scope of intervention and provide a statement of grounds for cassation (Skoczylas, 2006, p. 379).

## **6. The suspensive effect of the administrative appeal**

When the suspensive effect of the administrative appeals is discussed, the question is whether it should be left to the decision of the public authority, to the decision of the court or it should have *de jure* effects.

The recommendations of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers (2001) provide that '[national] regulations may provide that the use of some alternative means to litigation will in certain cases result in the suspension of the execution of an act, either automatically or following a decision by the competent authority'.

In Romania, the suspension is granted by the court, in all cases. The request to suspend a decision can be filled at the same time with the administrative appeal, after lodging the administrative appeal, along with the court action or anytime during the court proceedings (Law no. 554/2004, art. 14).

In some of these cases, the suspensive effect could be linked to the fact that administrative appeal is followed or not in a reasonable time by a court action. Thus, in Romanian law, failure to lodge a court action within 60 days from the date when the suspension was granted ends the suspension and puts the decision back into force (Law no. 554/2004, art. 14).

It is also important to consider the object of the decision challenged by administrative appeal, as the suspensive effect could be far more useful for negative (non-beneficial) decisions.

In Poland, as far as the suspensive effect of an appeal is concerned, it needs to be stressed that prior to the expiry of the term for filing the appeal the decision will not be enforced, and then it will be suspended if the appeal has been filed on time (art. 130, clauses 1 and 2 of the APC). Within the meaning of article 130, clause 2 of the APC, the suspension of a decision means that the decision in question has no legal consequences. Therefore, appeals have a suspending effect in the Polish legal system.

---

21 Bucharest Court of Appeal, Decision no. 1445/2006.

There are, however, some exceptions to the above rule (so-called 'relative suspending effect'). These provisions are not applied in the case of a decree *nisi* accompanied by an order of immediate enforceability, or if a decree *nisi* is immediately enforceable by virtue of generally applicable laws (e.g. a decision on temporary seizure of an animal maltreated by its owner or guardian, decisions of local (municipal) Head of the State Fire-Fighting Service on suspension of works, use of equipment, buildings or parts thereof, issued if any identified violations of fire-fighting regulations may cause a health hazard or a risk of fire).

Any other decision can be made immediately enforceable if so required for the purpose of protecting human health or life, or securing national property against grave losses, or due to any other public interests or exceptionally important interests of a party (art. 108 of the APC). If a decision is made immediately enforceable (or if it is immediately enforceable by virtue of generally applicable laws), the enforcement procedure can be held simultaneously with the adjudication procedure<sup>22</sup>. It should also be noted that a decree *nisi* can be enforced before the lapse of the term for filing an appeal, if it fully satisfies the claims of all parties (art. 130, clause 4 of the APC).

In this context it needs to be emphasized that filing a complaint to an administrative court does not result in suspending a decision (or a law or act). However, the deciding body may fully or partially suspend the decision all the same (whether *ex officio* or upon request of the complainant), unless the decision in question is statutorily immediately enforceable or applicable laws prohibit such voluntary suspension. The refusal to suspend a decision does not deprive the complainant of the right to seek such suspension in court. After the complaint is filed, the court may – upon request of the complainant – decide to fully or partially suspend the decision, law or act, particularly if enforcing involves the risk of causing significant damage or irreversible consequences (art. 61 of the ACPL). In particular cases – e.g., a complaint against a decision on issuing a building permit – administrative courts may decide to suspend the decision on condition that the complainant pays a security deposit corresponding to possible future claims of the investor (beneficiary of the decision) relating to such suspension.

## **7. The devolutive effect of the administrative appeal**

In the comparative doctrine, there are debates whether the public authority can worsen the situation of the applicant in its own administrative appeal. In other words, whether or not the appeal should be open to a decision against the interests of the applicant (*reformatio in pejus*)?

The question is, therefore, whether the appeal should be dealt with in a bound competence manner by the public body, meaning that it is held to answer the claimant only within the limits of his requests, or whether the authority can consider itself notified for an objective analysis *de novo* of the decision, which implies the power to modify the decision in a way that may not be to the advantage of the applicant?

---

22 Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of March 30, 1999, III SA 5537/98, LEX No. 44836.

As for the first assumption, it is obvious that the plaintiff does not want that an appeal initiated with a view to defend his rights to turn against him, making the situation worse. So an interdiction of the *reformatio in pejus* should serve the individuals seeking an easy dispute resolution. The argument for the second hypothesis is that the appeal only initiates the control and cannot establish its limits.

Romania has no legal prescriptions on this issue; so, theoretically, the *reformatio in pejus* is possible. Exceptions can be found in the special legislation. Thus, the Code of fiscal procedure states clearly that by solving the contestation the fiscal organ cannot worsen the situation of the complainant (Governmental Ordinance no. 92/2003, art. 213 par. 3).

The appeal body can decide without restrictions *ultra petita*, that is to give the claimant more than requested for (e.g., granting an increased amount of money than the plaintiff asks for, but to which the applicant is rightfully entitled).

In Poland, as well, an appeal is a relatively devolutive legal remedy, which means that in principle filing an appeal transfers the case to a higher instance institution (unless it is approved of by the issuing body). In the case of a decision issued in the first instance by a minister or a local government court of appeal, the unsatisfied party may request the issuing body to reconsider the case (in other words, the party can exercise the so-called right of remonstrance – article 127, clauses 3 and 4 of the APC). Such request is not devolutive, which means that it does not transfer the case to a higher instance institution, but it requires the issuing body to reconsider it. The provisions on appeals apply accordingly to such procedures.

The appeal body can carry out an additional investigation in order to gather more evidence, or have such an investigation carried out by the body that issued the original decision. The right of the appeal body to investigate the merits of the case does not breach the principle of two instances. On the contrary, the said right guarantees that this principle is adhered to (Skoczylas, 2001, pp. 523-524; Polish Supreme Administrative Court, Ruling of April 5, 2000, I SA/Lu 1817/98, LEX No. 4302). One may assume that the appeal body is responsible for determining whether or not to carry out an investigation of the entire case or a substantial portion thereof. If such an investigation is necessary for deciding on the case, and thus the criteria for issuing a cassation decision are met, then the competence of the appeal body will be limited to the right to waive the challenged decision. It needs to be remembered that by carrying out an investigation of the entire case (or a substantial portion thereof) the appeal body would violate the principle of two instances by depriving the party of the right to have the merits of the case investigated twice (Adamiak, 1998, pp. 58-63).

However, *reformatio in peius* is disallowed in the general administrative procedure in Poland. Consequently, the appeal body cannot issue decisions to the detriment of the appellant (unless the challenged decision constitutes a gross violation of law or public interest). In other words, the appeal body cannot modify the content of the first instance decision in such a way that the decision becomes even more unfavorable to the appellant (Skóra, 2002). In the case of tax-related matters, the same issue is somewhat

different. In this case the said prohibition is purely theoretical, because in practice it is thwarted by the so-called 'supplementary tax assessment'. If the appeal body finds out that the amount of tax to be paid by the appellant is lower (or the amount of tax to be refunded is higher) than prescribed in tax regulations, or if the amount of the appellant's losses is overrated, then it will refer the case back to the first instance body in order to have the tax reassessed by means of altering the original decision. The new decision will reflect the laws in effect on the date of accruing the tax obligation. One may file an appeal against such decision, which will be considered in conjunction with the appeal regarding the original decision (art. 230 of the TO).

## 8. Final considerations

The above considerations are a first attempt to grasp the different or concordant realities of the institution of administrative appeal in jurisdictions affected by the communist legacy, but also by the influence of the European law.

Poland has the second oldest Act of administrative procedure in Europe, and a huge experience in dealing with administrative matters. Romania is striving to adopt such an act for a long time now, following the German, Austrian, French and Polish experience with administrative codification. Actually, one of the Polish co-authors of this study was expert consultant for the Romanian Ministry of Internal Affairs and Public Administration between 2006 and 2008 for the drafting of a Romanian Procedure Code, project still under consideration.

The administrative appeal seems to be regulated in a similar manner in the two jurisdictions assessed, but differences still exist on the degree of formalization of the procedure.

The research will be continued with questions regarding the relation between the administrative appeal and judicial review, the importance of mediation in administrative procedure and the extent to which such ADR tools can be effective. Further on, the empirical research under way in the two jurisdictions will showcase the effectiveness of administrative appeals in solving administrative disputes, assessed mainly against the intervention of the courts.

## References:

### *Articles and books:*

1. Adamiak, B., 'Model dwuinstancyjnego postępowania podatkowego' (Two Instance Tax Procedure), 1998, *Państwo i Prawo*, no. 12, pp. 58-63.
2. Adamiak, B., Borkowski, J. and Skoczylas, A., 'Prawo procesowe administracyjne' (Administrative Process Law), 2010, *System Prawa Administracyjnego*, vol. 9, Warszawa.
3. Auby, J.-M. and Fromont, M., *Les recours contre les actes administratifs dans les pays de la Communauté Économique Européenne*, Jurisprudence générale, Paris: Dalloz, 1971.
4. Brabant, G., Questiaux, N. and Wiener, C., *Le contrôle de l'administration et la protection des citoyens (étude comparative)*, Paris: Cujas, 1973.
5. Celińska-Grzegorzczak, K., Hauser, R., Sawczyn, W. and Skoczylas, A., *Postępowania administracyjne, sądowoadministracyjne i egzekucyjne* (Administrative, Court-Administrative and Enforcement Procedures), Warszawa, 2009.

6. Chapus, R., *Droit du contentieux administratif*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition, Paris: Montchrestien, 1999.
7. Council Of Europe, 'Recommendation Rec (2001) 9 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on Alternatives to Litigation between Administrative Authorities and Private Parties', adopted on September 5, 2001, [Online] available at [http://www.coe.int/t/cm/documentIndex\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/cm/documentIndex_en.asp), accessed on August 13, 2009.
8. Darcy, G. and Paillet, M., *Contentieux administratif*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Paris: Dalloz, 2000.
9. Dragoș, D.C., 'National Tradition – Romania', in Galera, S. (ed.), *Judicial Review – A Comparative Analysis inside the European Legal System*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2010, pp. 97-112.
10. Dragoș, D.C., *Recursul administrativ și contenciosul administrativ* (Romanian Administrative Appeals and Administrative Contentious), București: All Beck, 2001.
11. Iorgovan, A., *Tratat de drept administrativ* (Administrative Law Treaty), Bucharest: C.H. Beck, 2005.
12. Peiser, G., *Droit administratif général*, 20<sup>th</sup> edition, Paris: Dalloz, 2000.
13. Rarincescu, C.G., *Contenciosul administrativ român* (Romanian Administrative Contentious), Bucharest: Universala Alcalay & Co., 1936.
14. Rivero, J. and Waline, J., *Droit administratif*, 18<sup>th</sup> edition, Paris: Dalloz, 2000.
15. Skoczył, A., 'Gloss to the Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of May 10, 2005, FSK 2536/04', 2006, *Orzecznictwo Sądów Polskich*, vol. 7-8, item 80a, p. 379.
16. Skoczył, A., 'Gloss to the Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of October 11, 2000, I SA/Ld 1658-1669/98', 2001, *Orzecznictwo Sądów Polskich*, vol. 10, pp. 523-524.
17. Skoczył, A., 'Ocena przewlekłości postępowania sądowoadministracyjnego w świetle orzecznictwa ETPC i NSA (zagadnienia wybrane)' [Assessment of Lengthiness of Court-Administrative Procedure in the Perspective of ECHR and Supreme Administrative Court Rulings (selected issues)], 2005, *Zeszyty Naukowe Sądownictwa Administracyjnego*, no. 2-3, pp. 52-61.
18. Skóra, A., *Reformatio in peius w postępowaniu administracyjnym* (Reformatio in peius in Administrative Procedures), Gdańsk, 2002.
19. Sokolewicz, W. (ed.), *Zasady podstawowe polskiej konstytucji* (Fundamental Principles of the Polish Constitution), Warszawa, 1998.
20. Szubiakowski, M., Wierzbowski, M. and Wiktorowska, A., *Postępowanie administracyjne – ogólne, podatkowe i egzekucyjne* (Administrative Procedure in General, Tax and Enforcement Cases), Warszawa, 1998.

### ***Laws and jurisprudence:***

#### ***For Romania:***

21. Bucharest Court of Appeal, Administrative and Fiscal Law Section, Decision no. 1401/2006, in Bogasiu, G., *Procedura prealabilă în contenciosul administrativ, practică judiciară* (The Preliminary Procedure in Romanian Administrative Appeals, Jurisprudence), Bucharest: Hamangiu, 2006, p. 127.
22. Bucharest Court of Appeal, Decision no. 1445/2006, in Bogasiu, G., *Procedura prealabilă în contenciosul administrativ, practică judiciară* (The Preliminary Procedure in Romanian Administrative Appeals, Jurisprudence), Bucharest: Hamangiu, 2006, p. 1.
23. Code of fiscal procedure, Governmental Ordinance no. 92/2003, published in the Official Journal of Romania no. 941 of December 29, 2003.

24. Constitutional Court of Romania, Decision no. 797/2007, published in the Official Journal of Romania no.751 of November 6, 2007.
25. General Law on Judicial Review no. 554/2004, published in the Official Journal of Romania, Part I, no. 1154 of December 7, 2004.
26. Governmental Ordinance no. 27/2002 on the procedure for solving petitions, published in the Official Journal of Romania, no. 84 of February 1, 2002, amended.
27. Highest Court of Cassation and Justice, Administrative and Fiscal Law Section, Decision no. 146/2007, in Birsan, G.V. and Georgescu, B., *Legea contenciosului administrativ adnotată* (Law on Administrative Appeals, with Comments), Bucharest: Hamangiu, 2008.
28. Law no. 188/1999 on civil service, re-published in the Official Journal of Romania, Part I, no. 365 of May 5, 2007.
29. Law no. 35/1997 on the organization and functioning of the Advocate of the People published in the Official Journal of Romania, Part I, no. 48 of March 20, 1997.
30. Neamț County Court, Decision no. 11/1991, in Prisăcaru, V.I., *Contenciosul administrativ* (Administrative Contentious), Bucharest: All Beck, 2003, p. 495.
31. Pitești Court of Appeal, Decision no. 79/1998, in Crișu, Ș. and Crișu, E.D., *Repertoriu de practică și literatură juridică 1997-2000* (Repertoire of Judicial Practice and Literature 1997-2000), Argessis, 2000, p. 247.
32. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 3441/2002, *Jurisprudența Curții Supreme de Justiție* (The Supreme Court of Justice Jurisprudence), Bucharest: All Beck, 2003, p. 245.
33. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 2689/2002, *Jurisprudența Curții Supreme de Justiție* (The Supreme Court of Justice Jurisprudence), Bucharest: All Beck, 2003, p. 234.
34. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 1434/2000, *Jurisprudența Curții Supreme de Justiție* (The Supreme Court of Justice Jurisprudence), Bucharest: All Beck, 2001, p. 754.
35. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 962/2000 in *Jurisprudența Curții Supreme de Justiție* (The Supreme Court of Justice Jurisprudence), 2000, p. 767.
36. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 40/1994, in *Jurisprudența Curții Supreme de Justiție* (The Supreme Court of Justice Jurisprudence), 2000, p. 767.
37. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 416/1995, in *Dreptul*, no. 10, 1997, pp. 101-102.
38. Romanian Supreme Court of Justice, Administrative Law Section, Decision no. 134/1991, in Bogdănescu, V. and Pastor, L., *Probleme de drept din practica Curtii Supreme de Justiție* (Legal Issues in the Jurisprudence of the Supreme Court of Justice), Bucharest: Orizonturi, 1993, p. 645.

**For Poland:**

39. Administrative Court Proceedings Law, Act of 30 August 2002, Journal of Laws of 2002, No. 153, item 1270.
40. Administrative Procedure Code Act of June 14, 1960, Journal of Laws of 2000, No. 98, item 1071, as amended.



41. Decision of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of June 29, III SA 2545/00, unpublished.
42. Ruling of the ECHR of February 11, 2003, complaint No. 33870/96, Fuchs vs. Poland.
43. Ruling of the ECHR of June 1, 2004, complaint No. 33777/96, Urbańczyk vs. Poland.
44. Ruling of the ECHR of June 15, 2004, complaint No. 77741/01, Piekara vs. Poland, LEX No. 122542.
45. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court 15 V 2000, V SA 2722/99, LEX No. 56632.
46. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of April 5, 2000, I SA/Lu 1817/98, LEX No. 43025.
47. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of December 12, 2000, V SA 359/00, LEX No. 51287.
48. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of July 3, 1992, SA/Wr 455/92, ONSA 1993, No. 3, item 62.
49. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of March 30, 1999, III SA 5537/98, LEX No. 44836.
50. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of March, 22 1996, SA/Wr 1996/95, ONSA 1997, No. 1, item 35.
51. Ruling of the Polish Supreme Administrative Court of November 12, 1992, V SA 721/92, ONSA 1992, No. 3-4, item 95.
52. Tax Ordinance Act of August 29, 1997 consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2005, No. 8, item 60, as amended.