THE COURT OF AUDITORS AND THE ABSENCE OF JURISDICTION TO DETERMINATE WITHDRAWAL OF PAYMENTS IN ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTS

rdai.com/ojs/index.php/rdai/article/view/233



Giuseppe Giamundo Neto University of São Paulo (São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil) https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6763-185X

DOI: https://doi.org/10.48143/RDAI.14.ggn Keywords: Federal Court of Auditors, Constitutional Powers, Cautionary Measure, Administrative Contract, Withholding Payments

The adoption by the Federal Court of Auditors of a precautionary measure to withhold payments in administrative contracts is not guarded in the constitutional order. Withhold payments, even partially, is nothing more than halting the financial execution of the contract. And the original competence to stop administrative contract is the National Congress (cf. art. 71, § 1). Compelling the contracted individual to execute the same physical scope for a financial consideration lower than that which was obliged to submit his proposal and become the winner of the bidding contest also hurts art. 37, XXI, of the Federal Constitution, which ensures the maintenance of the effective conditions of the proposal submitted. On this ground, moreover, not even the National Congress would have the power to partially halt the financial execution of the contract (as is the case with withholdings). It is only up to him to stop the contract in its entirety, in the physical and financial dimensions together.

Author's Biography

Giuseppe Giamundo Neto, University of São Paulo (São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil)

PhD and Master in State Law from the University of São Paulo (USP). Lawyer in São Paulo. giuseppe@giamundoneto.com.br

References

AGUIAR, Ubiratan. The Courts of Auditors and the power of caution. Revista do Tribunal de Contas dos municípios do Ceará, n. 16, p. 169-177, Dec. 2004.

MELLO FLAG, Celso Antônio. Unpublished opinion contracted by the Brazilian Association of Infrastructure and Basic Industries on the constitutionality of precautionary adoption by the TCU.

DI PIETRO, Maria Sylvia Zanella. The role of the Courts of Auditors in the control of administrative contracts. Public Interest Magazine. Belo Horizonte, year 15, n. 82, Nov./Dec. 2013.

FERREIRA SON, Manoel Gonçalves. Comments on the Brazilian Constitution of 1988. Arts. 44 to 103. São Paulo: Saraiva, 1992. v. 2.

FIGUEIREDO, Lucia Valle. Administrative law course. 5. ed. São Paulo: Malheiros, 2011.

JUSTEN SON, Marçal. Comments on the Bidding and Administrative Contracts Act. 12. ed. São Paulo: Dialectics, 2008.

PEREZ, Marcos Augusto; SOUZA, Rodrigo Pagani de. Public Administration Control. Belo Horizonte: Fórum, 2017.

SILVA, José Afonso. Positive constitutional law course. 22. ed. São Paulo: Malheiros, 2003.

SILVA JÚNIOR, Bernardo Alves da. The exercise of precautionary power by the audit courts. Journal of the Court of Auditors of the Union, v. 40, n. 113, p. 33-40, Sep./Dec. 2008.

SUNDFELD, Carlos Ari; CÁMARA, Jacintho Arruda. Audit Court Control Competencies – Possibilities and Limits. In: SUNDFELD, Carlos Ari. Public procurement and their control. São Paulo: Malheiros, 2013. p. 204-206.

PDF

Published

2020-09-30

How to Quote

Giamundo Neto G. THE COURT OF AUDITORS AND THE ABSENCE OF JURISDICTION TO DETERMINATE WITHDRAWALS OF PAYMENTS IN ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTS. RDAI [Internet]. 30Sep.2020 [cited 8Jan.2021];4(14):341-358. Available from: https://rdai.com/ojs/index.php/rdai/article/view/233

v. 4 n. 14 (2020)

This journal is licensed by Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International.

Attribution-Share-Equal 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND-SA 4.0)

The submission and publication of articles are free of charge; peer-reviewed; the journal uses CrossCheck (antiplagiarism); and complies with the *COPE - Committee* on *Publication Ethics* Editors' Guide, in addition to the Elsevier and SciELO recommendations. Check out the Rules for submission and evaluation of the GDR.