Prague Law Working Papers Series No I/2019 – New issue of Charles University in Prague Faculty of Law Research Papers

The new issue of Prague Law Faculty's open source electronic periodical offers a set of working papers on various topics. The following presentation provides general outline of their content. Their full versions can be downloaded free of charge from http://www.prf.cuni.cz

Lukáš Hrdlička and **Petra Šmirausová** dedicated their article to the **Proposal of the Investment Crowdfunding Platform Providers' Regulation.** They deal with a newly proposed EU regulation intended to regulate crowdinvestment and crowdlending platforms providers. Their analysis concentrates on current experience with crowdinvesting in the Czech Republic after the MiFID II. The article identifies and discusses certain troublesome aspects of the proposal regarding the fact that the underlying paradigm of the proposal is the principle-based regulation and a risk of legal uncertainty and less predictability. In the conclusion the authors underline that the proposed regulation as a part of the Capital Market Union aims to bring clearer regulation for crowdfunding platforms providers. Thus, the proposed regulation is based on the principle-based regulation paradigm that is associated with less legal certainty and predictability. Further clarification by the European Commission and the ESMA will be therefore needed. This clarification would also be welcomed because it might help national regulators and supervisors with regulating and auditing providers who conduct their activities under the MiFID II regime.

Jakub Hlista in the article titled **State Aid to banks in the EU** discusses how the EU legal framework concerning resolution of banks changed in the meantime after creating the Banking union and the relationship to the existing State aid rules and possible tensions of this relationship. For this purpose, the article briefly describes the process of resolution of banks according to the Banking Communication, BRRD and SRM and explains the circumstances under which the State aid rules apply. Besides that, it argues that the parallel existence of both sets of rules implies a potential conflict between the competences of the bodies that govern each of the two sets of rules. In conclusion, the article focuses on the possible implications of Brexit for this area. He concludes that all the consequences of Brexit on the resolution rules and the State aid rules can only be speculated at. However, one is rather likely: a change in the approach to State aid policy on the side of both the UK and the EU.

Sean Davidson and **Ivo Kozáček** in in their paper about **Setting the Standards for Legal and Ethical Koncipientship Training in the Czech Republic** consider justifiable aims of koncipientship and norms that koncipientship should meet. Koncipientship in this article refers to the 3-year training period that prospective lawyers must perform in order to be qualified as full barristers. It is known in vague terms that qualified barristers should be well-trained and consumers provided effective and adequate legal services; yet it has not been described clearly or precisely how to evaluate whether the koncipientship (and working conditions of koncipients) reasonably meets such goal. This is the authors seek in their article to provide framework and analysis for the norms for a desirable form of post-graduation legal training. They do this by first analysing the implications arising from the requirement to serve as a koncipient for three years, then they consider the requirement from the point of view of constitutional law, namely the right to choose a profession and engage in independent economic activity. In the third part of this essay they look in detail at what are the claimed legitimate aims of koncipientship and whether (and how) those component-aims can be achieved through koncipientship. They arrive at the conclusion that some of the claimed aims of koncipientship should not be considered legitimate at all while other (legitimate) aims could be served better if certain adjustments were taken. That is why in the final chapter they elaborate on the ways in which koncipientship can be re-evaluated.

Slavomíra Henčeková contributed an article on **The Normative Force of the Factual, as Derived from Examples in Czech Case-Law.** Her paper deals with the concept of the normative force of the factual, not only in the Czech case-law, but also generally in legal theory, and presents in this context

three main theses. Firstly, Jellinek s concept of the normative force of the factual does not necessarily contradict Hume's fork. Secondly, in the Czech jurisprudence, constitutional conventions provide the most suitable examples of the normative force of the factual. Thirdly, not only in the Czech Republic, but also in general, constitutional conventions have normative force, but not legal normative force, and what normative force they do deploy does not derive from facticity in and of itself. In her conclusion, author claims that reality or facts should be norm-creating elements, but they should not necessarily constitute norms in and of themselves. If we consistently do something in a particular manner, i.e., such behaviour is normal in a certain environment, it might well prove a double-edged blade, good but also bad, leading to both desired and undesired outcomes. Not everything 'proven' by society is good for society. Only when we generally accept that what usually repeats should also repeat further because it is what we want, does a norm arise.

Václav Šmejkal*

* Associate Professor. JUDr. Václav Šmejkal, Ph.D., Charles University Law Faculty, Prague and ŠKODA AUTO University, Mladá Boleslav