



2025/2148(DEC)

21.1.2026

AMENDMENTS

1 - 22

Draft opinion

Ilhan Kyuchyuk

(PE781.390v01-00)

Discharge 2024: General budget of the EU - Court of Justice of the European Union

(2025/2148(DEC))

Amendment 1
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Appreciates the very high budgetary implementation rate of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) for 2024 (98 %), which is similar to that of previous years;

Amendment

1. Appreciates the very high budgetary implementation rate of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) for 2024 (98 %), which is similar to that of previous years (**99.2 % in 2023 and 98.4 % in 2022**);

Or. ro

Amendment 2
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that the budget of the CJEU is essentially administrative, with around 76 % of the appropriations relating to expenditure on Members and staff, and almost all of the remaining expenditure on buildings and IT;

Amendment

2. Stresses that the budget of the CJEU is essentially administrative, with around 76 % of the appropriations relating to expenditure on Members and staff, and almost all of the remaining expenditure on buildings and IT, **and calls on the CJEU to continue to optimise staff and infrastructure expenditure, including through digitalisation and cost-effective IT solutions, while ensuring not to create parallel or redundant structures**;

Or. ro

Amendment 3
Mario Mantovani

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Criticises the fact that, though digitalisation is recognised as a key priority for the modernisation of European justice, only around 6 % of the CJEU's total budget has been earmarked for information technology; considers that this figure is insufficient given the 12 % increase in the number of cases brought before the Court of Justice and the need to speed up proceedings; calls on the CJEU to significantly increase its digitalisation investments with a view to improving efficiency without compromising the quality of its judgments.

Or. it

**Amendment 4
Daniel Buda**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Highlights the fact that, owing to the sustained level of judicial activity, the occupation rate of posts remained very high in 2024 (around 97 %) and that the distribution of posts by sector of activity remained similar to that for previous years, with 85 % of posts dedicated to judicial and linguistic activities;

Or. ro

**Amendment 5
Daniel Buda**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. *Notes that there was a decrease in the pressure on energy-consumption-related expenditure in 2024 and welcomes the fact that this decrease, along with the continuation of a set of energy-saving measures, meant that this category of expenditure could be managed more effectively than in previous years;*

Or. ro

Amendment 6
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Notes that the number of cases brought before the Court of Justice in 2024 increased by 12% compared to the previous year (920 cases in 2024 compared to 821 in 2023);

3. Notes that the number of cases brought before the Court of Justice in 2024 increased by 12% compared to the previous year (920 cases in 2024 compared to 821 in 2023), **which is an increase of around 100 cases more than in each of the previous three years;**

Or. ro

Amendment 7
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. *Notes from the CJEU's replies to the questionnaire for the 2024 discharge that 920 new cases were submitted to the Court of Justice in 2024 (compared to 821 in 2023), out of which 62,30 % were references for preliminary rulings and 277 were appeals against decisions of the*

General Court; notes that the General Court saw a major decrease in the number of new cases, from 1 271 in 2023 to 786 in 2024, of which 35,88 % of cases were actions for annulment of acts of Union institutions, 34,10 % concerned actions relating to intellectual property and 9,67 % concerned disputes between Union institutions and their staff;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Mario Mantovani

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Notes that the majority of these cases arose from references for preliminary rulings by national courts, accounting for 62.8 % of all cases brought before the Court of Justice; considers that this figure is indicative of the fact that courts in the Member States are finding it increasingly difficult to interpret EU law autonomously; highlights that this trend is caused by the increasing complexity and excessive layering of EU law, which makes its uniform application by national legal jurisdictions increasingly problematic;

Or. it

Amendment 9
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls on the CJEU to explore, in

cooperation with the national courts, practical guidance tools (guidelines, preliminary reference templates, online training sessions) to support clear and focused formulation of the questions submitted in preliminary rulings, thereby reducing the risk of unnecessary or excessively-long proceedings;

Or. ro

Amendment 10
Mario Mantovani

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Notes* the increase in the average length of proceedings for cases completed before the Court of Justice (17.7 months in 2024 compared to 16.1 months in 2023), *which is due to a combination of factors, including the high number of appeals requiring both the holding of a hearing and the delivery of an Advocate General's Opinion; also notes* that the average length of proceedings before the General Court *was 18.5 months, which implies a slight increase compared to the previous year* (18.2 months in 2023), *mainly due to the closing of several old complex cases or groups of cases, in particular in the fields of state aid, competition, and banking law;*

Amendment

4. *Is concerned about* the increase in the average length of proceedings for cases completed before the Court of Justice (17.7 months in 2024 compared to 16.1 months in 2023); *also regrets* that the average length of proceedings before the General Court *increased from* 18.2 months in 2023 *to 18.5 months in 2024;*

Or. it

Amendment 11
Mario Mantovani

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Welcomes that, together,*** the Court of Justice and the General Court were able to complete ***1,785*** cases in 2024, compared to ***1,687*** cases in 2023 and ***1,666*** cases in 2022, and that the total number of pending cases has decreased compared to previous years: ***considering the previously mentioned 404 cases as a single case,*** ***2,508*** cases were pending at the end of 2024 (compared to ***2,587*** cases at the end of 2023, ***2,585*** at the end of 2022 and ***2,541*** at the end of 2021);

Amendment

7. ***Acknowledges the high productivity of*** the Court of Justice and the General Court, ***which*** were able to complete ***a combined 1 785*** cases in 2024, compared to ***1 687*** cases in 2023 and ***1 666*** cases in 2022, and ***welcomes the fact*** that the total number of pending cases has decreased compared to previous years: ***2 508*** cases were pending at the end of 2024 (compared to ***2 587*** cases at the end of 2023, ***2 585*** at the end of 2022 and ***2 541*** at the end of 2021); ***considers, nevertheless, that the total number of pending cases is still too high. Stresses that such a high number of pending cases undermines the legal certainty that the Court of Justice has the fundamental task of ensuring; calls on the CJEU to present a multi-annual strategy to significantly reduce the judicial backlog.***

Or. it

Amendment 12
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Notes that 2024 was marked by a fresh substantial partial renewal of the composition of the Court of Justice, with the swearing-in of nine new members, five of whom had previously been judges at the General Court;

Or. ro

Amendment 13
Emil Radev

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Welcomes the entry into force in October 2024 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ amending Protocol No. 3 on the Statute of the CJEU, whereby part of the Court of Justice's jurisdiction for preliminary rulings was transferred to the General Court; notes that this reform aimed to preserve the ability of the Court of Justice to deliver high-quality judgements in a timely manner, while devoting greater focus to its role as the EU constitutional and supreme court;

¹ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Protocol No. 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union (OJ L, 2024/2019, 12.8.2024, ELI: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/2019/oj>)

Amendment

8. Welcomes the entry into force in October 2024 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ amending Protocol No. 3 on the Statute of the CJEU, whereby part of the Court of Justice's jurisdiction for preliminary rulings was transferred to the General Court; ***notes that the partial transfer of jurisdiction for preliminary rulings to the General Court concerns specific areas, and especially value added tax, excise duties, the customs code, the tariff classification of goods, passenger rights and the emissions trading system;*** notes that this reform aimed to preserve the ability of the Court of Justice to deliver high-quality judgements in a timely manner, while devoting greater focus to its role as the EU constitutional and supreme court;

¹ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2019 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Protocol No. 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union (OJ L, 2024/2019, 12.8.2024, ELI: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/2019/oj>)

Or. bg

Amendment 14 **Mario Mantovani**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 10 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Notes that, while the transfer of jurisdiction for preliminary rulings to the General Court is a beneficial and necessary reform, it has yet to produce the

expected results as regards reducing the length of proceedings; notes with concern that the average duration of 18.5 months forces national courts to suspend internal proceedings for excessively long periods, prolonging the individual national legal jurisdictions' already lengthy proceedings and frustrating the growing expectations among citizens regarding swift and accessible justice.

Or. it

Amendment 15
Emil Radev

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Notes with satisfaction the high use rate of e-Curia in 2024, with 11,692 e-Curia accounts registered: 96 % of procedural documents filed with the General Court were transmitted through e-Curia, compared to 94% in the 2 previous years, while the use rate of e-Curia at the Court of Justice went up to 91% compared to 89 % in 2023;

Amendment

14. Notes with satisfaction the high use rate of e-Curia in 2024, with 11,692 e-Curia accounts registered: 96 % of procedural documents filed with the General Court were transmitted through e-Curia, compared to 94% in the 2 previous years, while the use rate of e-Curia at the Court of Justice went up to 91% compared to 89 % in 2023; *stresses that the widespread use of e-Curia is contributing to the efficiency, security and traceability of judicial proceedings and encourages further development of the CJEU's digital tools;*

Or. bg

Amendment 16
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

15 a. Notes with interest the launch in 2024 of a pilot project providing all of the CJEU's departments with access to AI assistants; underlines the importance of ensuring adherence to ethical principles when using AI tools and in particular to CJEU's AI Guidelines adopted in 2024, thus ensuring human oversight in respect of the principle of independence of legal proceedings; highlights in this context the supervisory role of CJEU's AI Management Board; commends the CJEU for the comprehensive training programme it has put in place in 2024, starting with an "AI awareness month" that included training sessions, roundtables animated by AI experts, webinars and bootcamps, thus taking a first and important step towards creating awareness of staff members about the CJEU's AI strategy, guidelines and AI in general; notes that staff members also follow courses on change management, knowledge transfer, mentoring, and mental agility to support adaptation to emerging technologies; invites the CJEU to continue organising such training and awareness programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Mario Mantovani

Draft opinion
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

15a. Stresses that the increasing use of the preliminary ruling procedure by national courts highlights the need to strengthen training and support for the Member States' legal jurisdictions; calls on the CJEU, in cooperation with the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) and the Judicial Network of the European Union (JNEU), to set up

additional dedicated training programmes on the application of EU law and develop interpretative tools to enable national courts to rule autonomously on more legal issues without needing to use the preliminary ruling procedure; asks that consideration be given to establishing an informal preventive consultation mechanism for less complex issues.

Or. it

Amendment 18
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 15 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

15 b. Welcomes the fact that no major cyberattacks occurred in 2024; notes however with concern that an average of 142 security incidents per month were recorded and analysed, some requiring human intervention; welcomes that cybersecurity operational capabilities were further strengthened in 2024 to comply with Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2023/2841; recalls in this regard that the cybersecurity action plan and its implementing related IT infrastructure projects, are essential to protect the CJEU's technological infrastructure from cyber threats;

Or. en

Amendment 19
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 17 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

17 a. Notes that the Court of Justice is composed of 27 Judges and 11 Advocates General and the General Court is composed of 54 Judges; notes further that nine new Judges at the Court of Justice and two new Judges at the General Court took office on account of partial replacement in 2024; regrets that gender composition of the Court of Justice and the General Court continues to be very unbalanced; expresses its appreciation of the letter from the President of the General Court to the President of the Conference of the Representatives of the Member States in 2024, calling on Member States to take the need for gender balance into account when nominating candidates for the replacement of Judges and Advocates General; renews its call on Member States to take the need for gender balance into account when nominating candidates for the replacement of Judges, in line with the principles enshrined in Article 8 TFEU and Article 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and with the commitments taken under Regulations (EU, Euratom) 2015/2422[1] and (EU, Euratom) 2019/629[2] of the European Parliament and of the Council; [1] Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2015/2422 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2015 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union (OJ L 341, 24.12.2015, p. 14). [2] Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2019/629 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 amending Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the Court of Justice of the European Union (OJ L 111, 25.4.2019, p. 1).

Or. en

Amendment 20
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 17 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

17 b. Welcomes the creation of an action plan on the Istanbul Convention which aligns actions, makes recommendations and organises informative and training actions for all staff in order to prevent harassment cases; takes notes of further actions announced, which include continuing the collaboration with national organisations working in the field of preventing violence against women, additional awareness-raising initiatives and training sessions that highlight, in particular, the impact of microaggressions and gender-based bias;

Or. en

Amendment 21
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 17 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

17 c. Regrets, in this regard, the lack of mandatory trainings for all staff and Members, as stated in the CJEU's replies to the questionnaire for the 2024 discharge; urges therefore the inclusion of all individuals, both staff and Members, into obligatory training sessions in the field of preventing violence against women;

Or. en

Amendment 22
José Cepeda, Leire Pajín, René Repasi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 17 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

17 d. Welcomes that all Union nationalities are represented in the staff of the CJEU; notes however that certain nationalities are more represented than others, whereas some of them are largely over-represented; supports CJEU in stepping up its efforts to advertise vacancy notices as widely as possible through interinstitutional websites, social media networks and EPSO; notes from the follow-up report the CJEU's commitment to analyse relevant data for the implementation of targeted actions aiming at improving geographical representation among its staff including trainees; welcomes the CJEU efforts to raise awareness of the traineeship programmes among national administrations and permanent representations of underrepresented Member States; notes with satisfaction that for traineeships within the framework of the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), CJEU received in 2024 applications from three new Member States participating for the first time in its long-term training programme for national justice professionals;

Or. en