Science of Law Journal (2025)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/law.2025.040408
ISSN 2616-2296 Vol. 4 Num. 4

Preventive Mechanisms in German Environmental Public Interest Litigation: A Dual-Track Framework of Public Interest Representatives and Citizen Enforcement

Gu Yuxin[1,a,*]

[1]*Southwest Petroleum University, No. 8 Xindu Avenue, Chengdu, China*
[a]*15328261091@163.com*
**Corresponding author*

Keywords: Environmental Administrative Public Interest Litigation, Preventive Function, Public Interest Representative System, Environmental Group Litigation, Germany

Abstract: This article examines the preventive function realization pathways of Germany's environmental administrative public interest litigation system, which has emerged as a crucial mechanism for ensuring effective environmental governance. Through a dual-track framework combining the public interest representative system and environmental group litigation, Germany has institutionalized judicial oversight to preempt environmental risks at their source. The public interest representative system, anchored in statutory authority and procedural innovations (e.g., preventive injunction suits, relaxed standing rules, and evidence burden shifts), enables early judicial intervention in administrative decisions. Concurrently, environmental groups, empowered by broad standing under the Environmental Legal Remedies Act (2006) and Federal Nature Conservation Act, leverage their flexibility to challenge unlawful permits and planning approvals, including through groundbreaking "preventive injunction lawsuits" for projects in early stages. Key legislative and jurisprudential developments—such as the incorporation of the Aarhus Convention and EU directives—have expanded litigation scopes while balancing environmental protection with economic interests. By analyzing these mechanisms' synergies, the study highlights how Germany's system transforms constitutional environmental obligations into actionable judicial tools, offering a model for preventive environmental governance.

1. Introduction

As a pioneer of global industrialization, Germany paid heavy environmental costs during its 19th century industrial revolution. The rampant development of pillar industries such as coal, steel, and chemicals led to alarming environmental pollution, making Germany one of the first developed countries to face modern environmental governance challenges. In the late 1960s, with frequent environmental hazard incidents and growing public environmental awareness, Germany began systematically constructing its environmental protection legal framework. Guided by the concept of "natural environment as public property," Germany enacted a series of environmental laws

including the Federal Immission Control Act (BImSchG), Water Resources Management Act (WHG), and Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), gradually establishing a stringent environmental standards system. However, comprehensive legislation without effective implementation mechanisms still struggles to curb environmental degradation. German scholars generally agree that environmental administrative public interest litigation is the key institutional arrangement ensuring effective environmental law enforcement. This system's core function lies in judicial review of administrative environmental decisions, preventing abuse of discretion or neglect of statutory duties, thereby avoiding environmental damage at its source. This understanding prompted Germany to develop a distinctive environmental administrative public interest litigation system: strengthening public power supervision through the "public interest representative system" while empowering environmental organizations with "group litigation" qualifications, forming a public-private collaborative judicial oversight network.[1]

2. Public Interest Representative System

2.1. Legal Status and Functions of the Public Interest Representative System in Germany

The public interest representative system is a hallmark feature of German environmental administrative public interest litigation. Germany places great emphasis on protecting public interests in administrative litigation, as German scholars believe public and private interests cannot be measured by the same standards. Therefore, Article 35 of the German Administrative Court Act stipulates: "The Federal Administrative Court shall have a Federal High Prosecutor. The Federal High Prosecutor shall participate in all proceedings before the Federal Administrative Court to safeguard public interests." As judicial administrative officers, public interest representatives are bound only by government directives. Moreover, Federal High Prosecutors assist higher courts in applying and concretizing laws. Interpretations of Article 36 of the Administrative Court Act equate public interest representatives with Federal High Prosecutors, but unlike the latter, public interest representatives may also become parties to the litigation. Their duty is to represent public interests in litigation, maintain legal order, and provide opinions to courts.

2.2. Legislative Embodiment of Preventive Function: Expansion of Litigation Types

The German public interest representative system achieves environmental risk prevention through systematic legal construction, reflecting a paradigm shift from end-of-pipe treatment to process control. Its preventive function is rooted in the Environmental Legal Remedies Act's expansive provisions on litigation types. Article 2 explicitly includes preventive injunction suits within public interest representatives' litigation powers, enabling judicial intervention in administrative decision-making before environmental damage occurs. The system's advantage lies in ensuring full public interest representation during administrative decisions. With statutory duties and authority, public interest representatives possess high authority and professionalism when supervising administrative agencies. This arrangement not only prevents procedural violations and discretion abuse in environmental decisions but also facilitates early warning and intervention through judicial processes.

For example, during major environmental project approvals, public interest representatives can review environmental impact assessments, raise objections to non-compliant projects, and demand reassessments or plan adjustments through litigation. Such preventive measures effectively avoid environmental damage from improper administrative decisions. This procedural innovation breaks traditional rights-relief-oriented administrative litigation frameworks, establishing risk-prevention-focused objective litigation models.

Specifically, innovative designs in litigation requirements, especially groundbreaking reforms in plaintiff qualification standards, form the legal foundation for the system's preventive function. German legislators adopted dual breakthroughs in plaintiff qualifications: first, public interest representatives need not prove personal rights infringement—potential violations of environmental law's mandatory provisions suffice; second, evidence standards are lowered—public interest representatives need only provide "credible evidence" of potential environmental risks rather than meeting traditional administrative litigation's "high probability" standard. This arrangement brings potential environmental risks into judicial review earlier.

In practice, German administrative courts further refined litigation requirement standards through case law. For instance, interpreting "potential environmental law violations" to include both procedural and substantive violations significantly expanded preventive function application. Innovative evidence rule allocation is another highlight. The Environmental Damage Prevention Act established a plaintiff-favorable evidence allocation principle: when public interest representatives prove administrative acts have procedural violations or obvious factual flaws, the burden shifts to administrative agencies to prove decisions carry no significant environmental risks. This inversion mechanism alleviates public interest representatives' evidence difficulties amid information asymmetry, making judicial environmental risk determinations more objective and fair.[2]

2.3. Innovative Evidence Rules: Early Professional Evaluation Procedure

Special procedural designs in German environmental administrative public interest litigation constitute key mechanisms realizing its preventive function. This innovation manifests in two interrelated aspects: strengthened provisional legal protection and optimized evidence rules, together forming comprehensive preventive procedural safeguards.

Regarding provisional legal protection, Article 80(5) of the Administrative Court Act introduced groundbreaking suspension rules for public interest litigation. When public interest representatives request suspending administrative acts' effects, courts must prioritize reviewing three core elements: first, assessing potential ecological impacts per the Federal Nature Conservation Act's "significant environmental damage avoidance principle"; second, considering preventive measures' urgency, especially environmental damage's irreversible nature; third, balancing economic benefits against environmental protection. This special review standard elevates environmental considerations in judicial balancing.[3]

Evidence rule innovations mainly appear in Article 4 of the Environmental Legal Remedies Act, establishing "early professional evaluation procedures" requiring administrative agencies to submit complete environmental risk demonstration materials during initial litigation phases. This front-loaded evidence discovery design exposes potential environmental risks earlier for judicial review. The procedure mandates eight key materials during defense stages: complete environmental impact assessment reports, alternative solution comparative analyses, expert review opinions, public participation records, etc.[4]

The preventive function also appears in litigation phase mechanisms. Through Article 87b of the Administrative Court Act, German legislators created a "preliminary review-substantive hearing" two-phase structure.[5] This gradual arrangement avoids judicial resource waste while ensuring thorough review of major environmental risks.

In summary, Germany's public interest representative system in environmental administrative public interest litigation transforms the concept of environmental risk prevention into operational judicial mechanisms through meticulous procedural and substantive design. Its preventive function is manifested not merely through relaxed standing requirements or adjusted review standards, but

more profoundly through the German environmental legal system's comprehensive judicial regulation over the entire administrative decision-making process. At the litigation initiation stage, broad standing rules and preventive litigation types enable timely judicial intervention against potential risks. During proceedings, specialized evidentiary rules and review standards ensure professional assessment of environmental risks. At the enforcement stage, reinforced provisional legal protection mechanisms prevent actual damage from materializing. This systematic institutional framework achieves not only judicial control over specific administrative acts but also, through accumulated case law, establishes preventive environmental standards that guide administrative agencies to proactively enhance risk management in daily decision-making. As noted by German environmental law scholar Kloepfer in his seminal work, the essence of the public interest representative system lies in its institutionalized judicial procedures that translate the constitutional environmental protection obligation under Article 20a of the Basic Law into actionable legal techniques. This achieves a preventive transformation of environmental governance within the framework of checks and balances.

3. Environmental Group Administrative Public Interest Litigation System

3.1. Historical Development of German Environmental Group Litigation

The development of German environmental group litigation long suffered under traditional legal theories. Continuous legislative amendments eventually empowered and expanded environmental groups' litigation rights to protect public environmental interests. This process involved breaking through the protective norm theory, transforming German altruistic environmental group litigation from subjective to objective litigation. This shift resulted from decades of domestic environmental movement pressure, political greenization, EU law incorporation, and European Court of Justice precedents.[6]

Germany's environmental group public interest litigation system developed through bottom-up, local-to-federal legislative processes. It began at the 1978 52nd German Lawyers' Conference, where jurists concluded traditional administrative litigation inadequately protected environmental public interests, necessitating new group litigation systems.[7] This academic discussion provided crucial theoretical preparation for subsequent legislation. The following year, Bremen became the first state to introduce environmental group litigation clauses in Nature Conservation Act amendments, pioneering German environmental public interest litigation. Article 45a allowed government-recognized environmental organizations to sue against nature conservation regulation violations.[8]

Since the 1994 Basic Law established governmental environmental protection obligations, Germany has considered environmental law public law, with protection primarily a government duty rather than public right. However, government failures, power rent-seeking, or agency capture in environmental protection revealed that command-control or incentive-based models alone were insufficient, requiring third-party enforcement mechanisms beyond government and markets. Germany's long group litigation history and strong environmental organizations catalyzed environmental group litigation.[9]

The pivotal moment came with Germany's 1998 Aarhus Convention signing. Article 9(2) requires signatories to ensure qualified environmental organizations obtain judicial remedies for environmental violations.[10] As a signatory, Germany fulfilled this obligation by amending the Federal Nature Conservation Act in 2002, granting environmental groups administrative public interest litigation rights without authorization requirements. The federal-level environmental group administrative public interest litigation system thus emerged.[11]

The Federal Nature Conservation Act's confirmation of nature conservation group litigation, the

Aarhus Convention's signing and implementation, and the EU Public Participation Directive implementing the Convention prompted Germany to enact the Environmental Legal Remedies Act in 2006, further developing nature conservation group litigation and clearly establishing environmental group litigation systems. July 2009 amendments to the Federal Water Act and Federal Nature Conservation Act revised the Environmental Legal Remedies Act, unifying nature conservation group litigation under the Nature Conservation Act and environmental group litigation under the Environmental Legal Remedies Act's confirmation procedures, establishing jurisdiction.

German environmental group litigation divides into two types: self-interest group litigation and altruistic group litigation. The former remedies individual rights through court judgments, while the latter protects non-individual environmental interests, focusing on environmental public interests rather than individual victim rights.[12]

German environmental group administrative public interest litigation's plaintiff design combines strict norms with moderate openness. Environmental groups must apply to certification authorities for litigation standing, undergoing statutory review procedures. Article 3 of the Environmental Legal Remedies Act (UmwRG) shows plaintiff qualification standards developed gradually. A 2017 amendment added "professional capability" requirements for environmental expertise, improving litigation quality.[13]

3.2. Typology of Environmental Litigation

The standing of environmental groups in Germany is exceptionally broad. Article 2 of the Environmental Legal Remedies Act (Umwelt-Rechtsbehelfsgesetz, UmwRG) adopts a "general + enumerative" approach to define the scope of actionable administrative acts. This legislative model not only provides environmental groups with extensive litigation opportunities but also enhances legal operability through specific enumeration.

From the general provision perspective, the 2006 Environmental Legal Remedies Act explicitly states that any administrative decision or omission violating environmental laws can be challenged in court. This provision significantly expands the scope of environmental group litigation, enabling them to challenge various unlawful or improper administrative actions in environmental matters—not just specific types of decisions. Such a broad clause offers environmental groups flexible legal grounds to safeguard public environmental interests when confronting complex ecological issues.

In terms of enumerative provisions, the Environmental Legal Remedies Act emphasizes protection in key areas. For instance, it explicitly grants environmental groups the right to challenge permits for industrial facilities, waste incineration plants, or energy production facilities—projects often involving significant environmental impacts and risks. Additionally, violations of water law permits are also subject to litigation. Given that water is essential for life, its protection is crucial for sustainable ecological development. By including water permit violations in the scope of litigation, German law strengthens safeguards for water resources, ensuring administrative compliance with environmental regulations and preventing pollution or ecological damage caused by improper permits.

3.3. Scope of Actionable Administrative Acts

Furthermore, the 2006 Environmental Legal Remedies Act stipulates that any administrative decision or omission violating environmental laws—particularly concerning permits for industrial facilities, waste incineration plants, energy production facilities, or water law violations—can be challenged through public interest litigation. Notably, if a development project proceeds without a mandatory prior environmental impact assessment (EIA) or case-by-case preliminary review,

environmental groups may sue to revoke the permit—regardless of whether the omission materially affected the final decision.

A particularly significant development is the rise of preventive litigation. Under amendments to §64 of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), environmental groups can file "preventive injunction lawsuits" against major projects still in the planning phase. This provision breaks from traditional litigation models that require actual harm as a prerequisite, dramatically advancing the timing of judicial intervention. At the planning stage, environmental risks may not yet be fully apparent, but decisions made then have decisive impacts later. By allowing litigation at this early stage, German law establishes a robust safeguard for environmental public interests.

To file a "preventive injunction lawsuit", environmental groups must demonstrate that the project poses a "foreseeable significant environmental risk." This requirement balances strict environmental risk control with the need to avoid frivolous lawsuits disrupting legitimate administrative and economic activities. Groups must present scientific evidence and sound reasoning to convince courts of potential major environmental harm, thereby securing judicial orders to halt project advancement. This design ensures both environmental protection and a balanced approach to economic development.

Regarding certification procedures, Germany established a two-tier review mechanism. Groups first submit complete applications including charters, activity reports, and financial audits to the Federal Environment Agency (UBA) for formal review. Preliminary-approved groups undergo substantive review by an expert committee organized by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), focusing on professional capability and activity effectiveness. Certified groups enter official rosters valid for four years, requiring recertification thereafter. This dynamic management ensures plaintiff quality.

3.4. Procedural Rights and Limitations

Meanwhile, German law ensures ample public participation rights in environmental administrative decisions. For example, the Environmental Impact Assessment Act grants environmental groups opinion rights during mandatory environmental impact assessment processes for specific projects. The Environmental Legal Remedies Act further safeguards environmental organizations' opinion rights in administrative decisions, explicitly granting litigation rights when these rights are denied or delayed. Affected parties and environmental organizations also enjoy information rights and opinion rights during environmental restoration procedures. Therefore, public participation procedural defects are major grounds for environmental group litigation.

To encourage early problem-solving through participation and prevent litigation abuse, the Federal Nature Conservation Act sets two litigation conditions for environmental groups: first, challenged administrative acts must fall within the group's operational scope (i.e., decisions harming nature conservation interests stated in the group's charter); second, the group must have opposed the issue during participation or been denied opposition opportunities. These provisions prohibit litigation on irrelevant issues or without prior participation opinions.[14]

Under the Aarhus Convention and supplementary EU Public Participation Directive, qualified environmental groups need not claim rights infringement or interests to meet standing requirements. A May 12, 2011 European Court of Justice ruling on North Rhine-Westphalia's "Rheinau Coal Power Plant Permit Plan" found German legislation violated EU directives because the Aarhus Convention disregards individual rights damage for environmental group public interest litigation. Following this ruling, Germany promptly amended the Environmental Legal Remedies Act in November 2012 with three major changes: abolishing "rights infringement" requirements for looser "norm protection theory" standards; establishing "participation program relevance" principles

(groups need only prove participation or denied participation opportunities); and introducing six-month filing deadlines balancing legal certainty and environmental protection needs.

Abolishing "rights infringement" requirements was central to German environmental group litigation standing reforms, meaning groups need not prove specific individual harm—only potential public environmental damage or legal violations. This looser standard significantly expanded environmental group litigation scopes, enabling more effective supervision of administrative and corporate environmental conduct for early risk prevention, complying with the Aarhus Convention and EU Public Participation Directive while demonstrating Germany's international environmental responsibilities and openness.

Environmental group litigation's advantage lies in mobilizing social forces for environmental protection. As civil organizations, environmental groups possess flexibility and initiative to promptly identify and supervise administrative misconduct. Compared to public interest representatives, environmental groups better reflect public environmental demands. When administrative environmental permits, planning approvals, or other decisions involve procedural violations or discretion abuse, environmental groups can litigate to revoke or modify unlawful decisions, preventing potential environmental risks from materializing. Overall, Germany's public interest representative system and environmental group litigation complement each other, forming effective checks on administrative power. As statutory public institutions, public interest representatives possess high authority and professional expertise, enabling them to supervise and review administrative decision-making processes. In contrast, environmental organizations, as civil society actors, demonstrate greater flexibility and initiative in promptly identifying and articulating public environmental concerns. The combination of these two mechanisms not only expands the range of potential plaintiffs in environmental public interest litigation but also significantly enhances its preventive function. In practice, public interest representatives and environmental organizations often collaborate to advance environmental public interest litigation. For instance, in complex environmental projects, they may work together to assess and monitor environmental impacts. When administrative decisions are found to be unlawful or improper, they may jointly file lawsuits to request judicial review of the relevant administrative actions. Such coordination not only improves the efficiency and success rate of litigation but also strengthens public confidence and engagement in environmental protection.

4. Conclusion

Rapid industrialization often accompanies severe ecological degradation. As one of the first countries experiencing this contradiction, Germany accumulated rich environmental governance experience. Traditional models emphasize post-damage judicial remedies—compensating victims or sanctioning violators after environmental harm occurs. Germany's environmental administrative public interest litigation system breaks this limitation by significantly advancing judicial supervision timing through preventive measures avoiding environmental damage. This preventive function mainly manifests in judicial review's early intervention in administrative decision-making processes. When environmental permits, planning approvals, or other decisions involve procedural violations or discretion abuse, relevant parties can litigate to revoke or modify unlawful decisions, preventing potential risks from materializing. This preventive judicial supervision model not only enhances environmental law enforcement efficacy but also provides stronger legal environmental protection, offering important global environmental governance references.

References

[1] Si Linbo, Xu Fangfang. Review and Reference of German Ecological Accountability System[J]. Changbai Journal,

2016(5):58-65.
[2] Kloepfer, Michael. The Animal Protection Association Suit—An Introduction[J]. Natur und Recht 38 (2016):729-733.
[3] Schmidt-Aßmann in Schoch/Schneider/Bier. Administrative Court Law Commentary[J]. 36th Edition, 2023, §80 Rn.147-150.
[4] Kloepfer/Neugärtner. Environmental Law, 5th Edition[Z]. 2023, §8 Rn.118-120.
[5] Kloepfer/Neugärtner. Environmental Law, 5th Edition[Z]. 2023, §8 Rn.115.
[6] Wu Yu. The Evolution of German Environmental Group Litigation and Its Enlightenment to China[J]. Modern Law Science, 2017(2):155-165.
[7] Jürgen Lüthge. The Association Suit in Bremen's Nature Conservation Law[M]. NJW(1980):1037.
[8] Rengeling Hans-Werner. Handbook of European and German Environmental Law: A Systematic Presentation of European Environmental Law with Its Impact on German Law and Legal Policy Perspectives[J]. 2nd Edition, 2003, p.78.
[9] Xie Wei. The Development of German Environmental Group Litigation System and Its Enlightenment[J]. Law Review, 2013(2):110-115.
[10] Marc Pallemaerts. The Aarhus Convention at Ten: Interactions and Tensions between Conventional International Law and EU Environmental Law[J]. Europa Law Press, 2011, p.152.
[11] Bettina Werres. Information and Public Participation in Environmental Matters According to Directives 2003/4/EG and 2003/35/EG[M]. Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt(2005):611-619.
[12] Liu Huiru. Looking at the Europeanization Impact on German Environmental Law from Environmental Impact Assessment and Group Litigation Systems[J]. European and American Studies, 2011(2):623.
[13] Kloepfer/Neugärtner. Environmental Law[J]. 5th Edition, 2023, §8 Rn.487.
[14] Andrea Versteyl. Expansion of Public Participation and Legal Protection in Facility Licensing Law[J]. Lexxion Verlagsgesellschaft mbH 01(2008):2.