

# European Criminal Justice Training Guidelines

2012 Update

Working Group 'Programmes' – Subgroup 'Penal'

Last update

:

25/05/2012

**The formulation of the present guidelines has been coordinated by the  
Academy of European Law – ERA  
(Cornelia Riehle & Jean-Philippe Rageade)**

Since its setting-up, the following have contributed:

***Centro de Estudos Judiciários (CEJ) – Portugal***

- Dr. Luís Pereira, Prosecutor, Head of the Department of International Relations

***ERA***

- Laviero Buono, Head of the Section „European Public and Criminal Law”
- Dr. Malte Beyer, Course director, Section „European Public and Criminal Law”
- Dr. Johanna Engström, Course director, Section „European Public and Criminal Law”
- Cornelia Riehle, Deputy Head of Section, Section „European Public and Criminal Law”

***Escuela judicial Consejo General del Poder Judicial – Spain***

- Dr. Carlos Pérez del Valle, Ordinary Professor
- Pedro Luis García Muñoz, Judge, Professor in the field of judicial investigation

***National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution – Poland***

- Wojciech Postulski, Judge, Head of The International Cooperation Department

***Studiecentrum Rechtspleging (SSR) – Netherlands***

- Nathalie Glime, Lawyer, Senior Course Manager for the Permanente Education and International Activities
- Hans Pieters, Senior Public Prosecutor, Criminal law lecturer

To the 2011 update, the following have contributed:

***ERA***

- Cornelia Riehle, Deputy Head of Section “European Criminal Law” (content)
- Clara García Parra, Student, University of Sciences Po (layout)

***Centro de Estudios Jurídicos – Spain***

- Patricia Fernandez Olalla, Prosecutor
- Isabel Guajardo Perez, Prosecutor

### *Studiecentrum Rechtspleging (SSR) – Netherlands*

- Nathalie Glime, Lawyer, Senior Course Manager for the Permanent Education and International Activities
- Hans Pieters, Senior Public Prosecutor, Criminal law lecturer

### *National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution – Poland*

- Wojciech Postulski, Judge, Head of The International Cooperation Department

To the 2012 update, the following have contributed

### *Studiecentrum Rechtspleging (SSR) – Netherlands*

- Nathalie Glime, Lawyer, Senior Course Manager for the Permanent Education and International Activities
- Hans Pieters, Senior Public Prosecutor, Criminal law lecturer

### *Centro de Estudios Jurídicos – Spain*

- Patricia Fernandez Olalla, Prosecutor
- Isabel Guajardo Perez, Prosecutor
- María de las Heras, Prosecutor

### *ERA*

- Cornelia Riehle, Deputy Head of Section “European Criminal Law” (content)

### *FRANCE*

- Elie RENARD, Head of the Office for International Mutual Assistance in criminal matters, with the support of the mission for the negotiation and implementation of international criminal law, Directorate for Criminal Affairs, Ministry of Justice.

### *MALTA*

- C Vincent A. De Gaetano, Judge of the European Court of Human Rights. Judicial Studies Committee of Malta.

# Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>Introductory Chapter</i> .....  | 6  |
| <br>   |    |
| <b>Chapter A</b>   |    |
| <b>General EU Law From The European Criminal Justice Angle</b> .....                                     | 13 |
| <i>I. The European system</i> .....  | 14 |
| <i>II. The effect of European Union law on national systems</i> .....                                    | 20 |
| <br>   |    |
| <b>Chapter B</b>   |    |
| <b>Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters in the EU</b> .....  | 24 |
| <i>I. The EU's competence in relation to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters</i> .....   | 27 |
| <i>II. The effect of Third Pillar instruments in national systems</i> .....                              | 29 |
| <i>III. Multi-annual programmes</i> .....  | 31 |
| <i>IV. Surrender of persons</i> .....  | 35 |
| IV.1. Extradition.....   | 35 |
| IV.2. European Arrest Warrant (EAW) .....  | 38 |
| <i>V. Mutual Legal Assistance</i> .....  | 43 |
| V.1. Mutual legal assistance related to evidence gathering.....  | 47 |
| V.2. Mutual legal assistance related to the trace, seizure and confiscation of the assets of crime ..... | 52 |
| <i>VI. Ne bis in idem, transfer of criminal proceedings and conflicts of jurisdiction</i> .....          | 55 |
| <i>VII. Enforcement of foreign criminal sentences</i> .....  | 59 |
| <i>VIII. Exchanging criminal records</i> .....   | 64 |
| <i>IX. Institution and agencies</i> .....  | 67 |
| IX.1 European Judicial Network (EJN).....  | 67 |
| IX.2 Liaison Magistrates .....   | 70 |
| IX.3 OLAF .....  | 72 |
| IX.4 Eurojust.....   | 75 |
| IX.5 European Police Office (Europol).....   | 79 |
| IX.6 European Public Prosecutor .....  | 82 |

**Chapter C****European Criminal Procedure**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>I. Procedural rights</i> .....              | 86  |
| <i>II. Victims / Restorative justice</i> ..... | 97  |
| <i>III. Data protection</i> .....              | 102 |

**Chapter D****European Criminal Law**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>I. Organised crime</i> .....   | 110 |
| <i>II. Money laundering</i> .....   | 112 |
| <i>III. Counterfeiting of the Euro</i> .....                              | 115 |
| <i>IV. Protection of the financial interests of the Communities</i> ..... | 117 |
| <i>V. Corruption</i> .....  | 120 |
| <i>VI. Illicit drug trafficking</i> .....                                 | 123 |
| <i>VII. Environmental crime</i> .....                                     | 126 |
| <i>VIII. Trafficking in human beings and sexual exploitation</i> .....    | 129 |
| <i>IX. Racism and xenophobia</i> .....                                    | 133 |
| <i>X. Terrorism</i> .....   | 150 |
| <i>XI. Cybercrime</i> .....   | 155 |
| <i>XII. Intellectual property rights, counterfeiting and piracy</i> ..... | 158 |
| <i>XIII. Employment of Illegal Migrants</i> .....                         | 162 |

**Chapter E****Police cooperation**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>I. Interpol</i> .....  | 164 |
| <i>II. Europol (see Chapter B)</i> .....                                    | 165 |
| <i>III. CEPOL</i> .....   | 165 |
| <i>IV. Information exchange</i> .....                                       | 167 |
| <i>V. Joint Investigation Teams (JITs)</i> .....                            | 174 |
| <i>VI. The Schengen Acquis and the Schengen Information System(s)</i> ..... | 177 |
| <i>VII. Joint cooperation centres</i> .....                                 | 184 |

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| <b>Chapter F</b> ..... | 125 |
|------------------------|-----|

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| <b>Human Rights</b> ..... | 186 |
|---------------------------|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>I. European Convention on Human Rights</i> ..... | 186 |
|---|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>II. The relationship between the ECHR and EU law</i> ..... | 197 |
|---|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>III. European Union documents</i> .....                          | 199 |
| <i>IV. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)</i> ..... | 201 |
| <b>Conclusions</b> .....  | 203 |
| <b>Chapter G</b> .....  | 205 |
| <b>Bibliography</b> .....   | 205 |

## *Introductory Chapter*

In this document, the main fields relevant for judicial training in the area of European criminal justice will be assessed.

To do so, all potential topics have been accumulated and listed under the following six chapters (each of them hereinafter referred to as 'Chapter'):

- A) General principles of EU law from the European criminal justice angle
- B) Judicial cooperation in criminal matters
- C) European criminal procedure
- D) European criminal law
- E) Police cooperation
- F) Human rights

Each Chapter consists of several sub-chapters (each of them hereinafter referred to as 'Sub-Chapter') which should, taken as a whole, present the complete area of relevance for judicial training in European criminal justice.

Within each Sub-Chapter, different topics will be identified (each of them hereinafter referred to as 'Topic') and assessed according to the following five main categories (each of them hereinafter referred to as 'Main Category'):

### **1. Introduction**

For each topic, the main features of the applicable European legal instrument will be briefly presented as well as its relevance for the judiciary and the recommended content of the training programme will be outlined.

### **2. Instruments and case law**

Under this point there will be a list of the relevant legal instruments as well as landmark decisions of the ECJ/CFI and national courts. The key points of the decisions will be explained very briefly.

### **3. Trainers**

For each Topic or Sub-Chapter, the guidelines will draw up a recommended profile for trainers. Trainers can be categorised into six main groups as outlined below. Recommendations of certain categories of trainers do not exclude other categories but serve as a reference to those that are especially important.

*A) International experts*

Examples of international trainers are representatives of the European Court of Human Rights, the Council of Europe, the OSCE, etc. (this list is not exhaustive).

*B) EU experts*

Examples of European experts are representatives of the EU organs such as the European Court of Justice, the Court of First Instance, the Council, Commission, and European Parliament. Further trainers might be representatives of the appropriate EU-agencies such as Eurojust, the European Judicial Network, Europol, and Frontex. European experts should, in particular, be deployed for specialised seminars, workshops, and study visits.

*C) National practitioners*

National experts can be defined as practitioners with a special knowledge of EU criminal justice, its implementation in their home member state, and experience of cross-border cooperation in this regard. Trainers might be representatives of the national ministries of justice and the interior, judges and prosecutors, administrators, representatives of the law enforcement and border guards, and defence lawyers. With this professional background and experience, national experts should in particular be deployed for specialised seminars and workshops.

*D) Scholars*

Academic experts would be university professors and associate professors, researchers, PhD candidates and assistant professors. Scholars would be representative of both national universities as well as 'EU universities' such as the College of Bruges, the European University Institute of Florence, etc. Academic experts should, in



particular, be deployed for basic courses and distance learning courses.

#### *E) Experts from training institutions*

Experts from the national training institutions can be defined as judges, prosecutors, magistrates and trainers working in the national judicial schools who are therefore very familiar with the special requirements in terms of contents, organisation, and pedagogy of judicial training. Experts of training institutions should in particular be deployed for basic seminars and distance learning courses.

#### *F) Experts from NGOs*

Experts from NGO can be defined as lawyers, researchers, PhD candidates employed national and European NGO's. Examples of EU-NGOs active in the field of European criminal justice are: Statewatch, Fair Trials Abroad, etc. Depending on the topic, experts from NGOs should, in particular be deployed for specialised seminars.

## **4. Trainees**

The potential trainees for each sub-topic are defined and assigned respectively. Trainees can be divided into the following categories:

#### *A) Senior judges*

This group covers judges that have long-standing experience in the field and are extremely familiar with practical problems and solutions in daily juridical work.

#### *B) Junior judges*

This group covers young judges just starting their career within the jurisdiction as well as persons that have commenced magistrate's training at a national training institution with the aim of becoming judges or public prosecutors. Having just completed university, members of this group usually have a very state-of-the art theoretical legal knowledge but very little practical experience. Examples of the latter group are the French 'auditeurs de justice'.

#### *C) Senior prosecutors*

This group covers judges with long-standing experience in the field who are extremely familiar with practical problems and solutions in daily juridical work.

#### *D) Junior prosecutors*

This group covers young judges just starting their career within the jurisdiction as well as persons that have commenced magistrate's training at a national training institution with the aim of becoming judges or public prosecutors. Having just completed university, members of this group usually have a very state-of-the-art theoretical legal knowledge but very little practical experience. Examples of the latter group are the French 'auditeurs de justice'.

#### *E) Future/trainee judges and prosecutors*

The following persons might fall within the group of future/trainee judges and prosecutors:

- Students at the end of their studies that have very good chances and proven interest in becoming a judge or prosecutor
- Post-graduate students in the relevant fields
- Trainees such as, for instance, the French *auditeurs de justice* or the German *Referendare* that have very good chances and proven interest in becoming a judge or prosecutor.

## 5. Methodology

A recommendation for the training method is given for each Topic or Sub-Chapter. Training methods can be divided as follows:

### *A) Training methods*

#### *A1) Training courses*

Training courses are defined as courses that run over several weeks (10–12) where training would take place regularly once a week. Training courses can be combined with *complementary e-learning courses*.

#### *A2) Basic seminars*

Basic seminars are defined as training events in which the overall structure of the respective field of law is presented. Their optimal length

should range between 3–5 days. The objective of these is to introduce participants to the topic and allow them to gain comprehensive understanding of the field. Basic seminars can be combined with *complementary e-learning courses*. In addition, a basic seminar can be *combined with a study visit* to, for instance, a European institution or agency, other judicial schools, etc.

### *A3) Specialised seminars*

Specialised seminars can be defined as training events in which a certain topic is presented in depth. The optimal length of such a seminar would be between 2–3 days. The objective of these should be to offer intensive training on a very specific topic. An in-depth training can include practical training methods such as case studies and workshops, the main training however would consist of presentations of the respective topics. Specialised seminars can be combined with *complementary e-learning courses*.

### *A4) Workshops*

Workshops are defined as events in which the focus is on practical training. The ideal length of a workshop would be 1–2 days. Training methods used in a workshop should range from case studies to moot courts and other role games.

### *A5) Study visits*

Study visits will offer participants the opportunity to obtain a realistic insight into the daily work of European institutions and agencies as well as their national counterparts such as courts, police cooperation centres etc. This experience will lead to a better understanding of the work of these institutions, the role they can play to support practitioners, obstacles that may emerge and can, in this way, further the (mutual) trust in and consequently usage of these institutions. EU institutions and agencies of special significance for the purposes of these guidelines are:

- European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)
- European Court of Justice (ECJ)
- Eurojust
- European Judicial Network (EJN)
- Europol
- International Criminal Court (ICC)

### *A6) Distance learning courses*

Within the framework of so-called e-learning, there are additional possibilities for distance learning courses. These courses can last for between 2 and 4 weeks. Courses can cover the area of basic courses as defined above, as well as provide in-depth courses although the main focus should be on basic courses that offer a very comprehensive overview of European criminal justice. Methods used in these courses can be: explanatory papers to be read, multiple-choice tests, case studies etc. *Furthermore, self-paced or self-directed distance learning could be offered, meaning training sessions that the trainee completes individually, at their own speed and in their own time, such as interactive, internet-based or CD-ROM training.* The distance e-learning programme can be completed by a final session which trainees attend.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Basic seminars, specialised seminars and workshops can be backed up and complemented by e-learning programmes.

**B1)** Within the framework of *basic seminars*, these programmes could consist of introductory papers that the trainee reads beforehand and is then tested by multiple-choice questions.

**B2)** For *specialised seminars*, the e-learning tool can be used to permit participants to start the course at the same level of knowledge by offering them initial introductory training at home. Again, training can consist of explanatory papers on the topic and multiple-choice questions.

**B3)** In the framework of *workshops*, the e-learning tool can provide a method to prepare participants in-depth, so that during the workshop, time can be exclusively devoted to the problems of solving actual cases.

### *C) Priority*

The assessment of priorities in this updated guideline will, for the first time, base itself on the joint conclusions drawn in the EJTN workshop 'A joint

framework for European criminal justice training in the EU – A workshop to set up common guidelines' that was conducted by the EJTN Sub-group 'Penal' in The Hague from 7–8 December 2009 together with ca. 26 trainers and experts specialised in criminal justice representing 15 judicial schools. Priorities refer to the years 2010–2011.

Three different priorities are assigned to each sub-topic:

- C1) Top priority*
- C2) Priority*
- C3) Recommended*

Again, it is essential to emphasise that these assignment of a sub-topic to a category might change considerably depending on the developments of EU criminal justice legislation.

#### *D) Format*

Depending on the objective of the course, different training formats may be necessary. Potential formats are:

- D1) Local*
- D2) Regional*
- D3) National*
- D4) Trans-national*
- D5) EU-wide*

A training event that is either a basic seminars or a specialised seminars focussing on the national implementation of a European law should preferably be held at *district, regional, or national* level, depending both on whether a nation-wide approach is required as well as on mere practical reasons such as the size of a country and number of trainees.

Especially with regard to criminal justice in the EU, cross-border cooperation is becoming more and more important. Especially workshops, but also basic and specialised seminars that are held at *trans-national level*, can provide immense added value. They further understanding of the problems within

and between different EU legal systems, enhance mutual trust and provide a network of contacts.

*Chapter A*  
*General EU Law From The European Criminal*  
*Justice Angle*

## *1. The European system*

### 1. Introduction

The European Judicial System has seen new light with the coming-into-force of the [Lisbon Treaty](#) on 1 December 2009. The Lisbon Treaty now is the latest consolidated version of the EU treaties replacing the Nice Treaty to govern the way in which the EU operates. It is composed of two treaties: the "[Treaty on European Union](#)" and the "[Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#)".

The [Lisbon Treaty](#) is intended to make the EU more adapted to its growing size and to the cross-border challenges which it is increasingly facing. It also aims at ensuring more democracy in the EU by enhancing the role of the European Parliament and that of national parliaments, it creates the positions of President of the European Council and High Representative for the Union in Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, it sets up a European External Action Service to support the High Representative, etc.

The Treaty also brought by the greatest reform that the area of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters has seen since the Maastricht Treaty of 1992. Changes brought by the [Lisbon Treaty](#) include:

- The EU's three pillars are abolished in favour of a single structure. This brings the whole of Justice and Home Affairs back together. Formerly in two different pillars, asylum, immigration, visa policy, border control, judicial cooperation in civil matters, and police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters can be found under "[Title V - Area of Freedom, Security and Justice](#)" of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
- The right to propose legislation now belongs either to the Commission or a quarter of the member states.
- Unanimity voting in the Council and mere consultation of the European Parliament have been largely replaced by 'qualified majority' voting in the Council and co-legislation ('co-decision') between the Council and the European Parliament.

- New legislative acts will be adopted as regulations, directives or decisions, instead of framework-decisions and decisions before the [Lisbon Treaty](#).
- The European Court of Justice gains additional powers.

However, certain exceptions to qualified majority and co-decision remain. For instance, the possibility of setting up of a European Public Prosecutor's Office requires unanimity in the Council and the European Parliament's consent. Also, measures concerning operational cooperation between police authorities, conditions and limitations under which the competent authorities of a member state may carry out cross-border activities by operating on the territory of another member state in liaison and agreement with that state, require unanimity in the Council and the European Parliament's consultation.

### *Training contents*

Training in the European judicial system aims at familiarising trainees with the work of the European Court of Justice, and especially understanding the new role of the ECJ within the area of criminal justice.

- The basic structure of the judicial system (ECJ, CFI and CST + further potential judicial bodies)
- Legislative instruments
- Remedies and actions available in relation to criminal justice
- The preliminary references proceedings.
- The urgent preliminary ruling proceeding (Article 23a ECJ Statute; Article 104 b Rules of Procedure of the Court)

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic documents*

1. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. [First Annual Report on the implementation of the EU Internal Security Strategy](#) (25 November 2011) COM(2011) 790 final
2. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. [The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe](#) (22 November 2010) COM(2010) 673 final



3. Draft [Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: "Towards a European Security Model"](#) (23 February 2010) 5842/2/10
4. [The Stockholm Programme – an open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens](#) (OJ C 115/1, 4 May 2010)
5. Delivering an area of freedom, security and justice for Europe's citizens. [Action Plan Implementing the Stockholm Programme](#) (20 April 2010) COM (2010) 171 final
6. [The Treaty of Lisbon and the Court of Justice of the European Union, PRESS RELEASE Court of Justice of the European Communities No 104/09, 30 November 2009](#)
7. [Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (OJ C 83/1, 30 March 2010)
8. [Treaty of Lisbon](#) amending the [Treaty on European Union](#) and the [Treaty establishing the European Community](#) (OJ C 306/1, 17 December 2007)
9. [Statute of the Court of Justice \(consolidated version\)](#), (OJ C 83/210, 30 March 2010)
10. [Rules of procedure of the Court of Justice \(consolidated version\) \(1 July 2011\)](#) (see [http://curia.europa.eu/jcms/jcms/Jo2\\_7031/](http://curia.europa.eu/jcms/jcms/Jo2_7031/))
11. [Amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice](#) of 24 May 2011 (OJ L 162/17, 22 June 2011)
12. [Consolidated version of the Rules of Procedure of the Court of Justice](#) (OJ C 177/1, 2 July 2010)

*b. Documents relating to the system of preliminary references*

1. [Information note on references from national courts for a preliminary ruling](#) (OJ C 160/1, 28 May 2011)
2. [Jurisdiction of the Court of Justice to give preliminary rulings on police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters](#), March 2008 (Table of countries that have accepted the Court's jurisdiction under Article 35 TEU).

*c. Case-law*

1. The need of judicial control and protection by the European Court of Justice
  - Case 25/62 *Plaumann* [1963] ECR 207

- Case C-294/83 *Parti écologiste 'Les Verts' v. European Parliament* [1986] ECR I-1339
- Case C-50/00 *P-Unión de Pequeños Agricultores v. Council* [2002] ECR I-6677
- Case C-355/04 *P-Segi and Others v. Council* [2007] ECR I-1657
- Joined cases C-402/05 and C-415/05 *P-Kadi and Al Barakaat International Foundation v. Council and Commission*, [2008] I-6351
- Case C-344/04 *IATA and ELFAA* [2006] ECR I-403
- Case C-432/05 *Unibet* [2007] ECR I-2271
- Joined cases C-188/10 and C-189/10 *Melki and Abdeli* [2010] ECR I-5665
- Case C-366/10 *Air Transport Association of America and Others* [2011]

## 2. On preliminary references

### *On the admissibility and jurisdiction under Article 35 EC*

- Case C-105/03 *Pupino* [2005] ECR I-5285
- Case C-303/05 *Advocaten Voor de Wereld* [2007] ECR I-3633.
- Case C-467/05 *Dell'Orto* [2007] ECR I-5557
- Case C-404/07 *Katz* [2008] ECR I-7607
- Case C-296/08 *PPU Santesteban Goicoechea* [2008] ECR I-6307
- Joined cases C-483/09 and C-1/10 *Gueye and Salmerón Sánchez* [2011]
- Case C-507/10 *X* [2011]

### *On the admissibility and jurisdiction of preliminary references in general*

- Case 244/80 *Foglia v. Novello* [1981] ECR 3045
- Joined cases C-297/88 and C-197/89 *Dzodzi* [1990] ECR I-3763
- Case C-302/04 *Ynos* [2006] ECR I-371
- Case C-217/05 *Confederación Española de Empresarios de Estaciones de Servicio* [2006] ECR I-11987
- Case C-119/05 *Lucchini* [2007] ECR I-6199
- Case C-64/06 *Telefonica O2 Czech Republic* [2007] ECR I-4887
- Case C-314/08 *Filipiak* [2009] ECR I-11049
- Case C-260/07 *Pedro IV Servicios* [2009] ECR I-2437
- Case C-96/08 *CIBA* [2010] ECR I-2911

- Joined cases C-188/10 and C-189/10 *Melki and Abdeli* [2010] ECR I-5665
- Case C-409/06 *Winner Wetten* [2010]
- Case C-283/10 *Circul Globus București* [2011]
- Case C-41/11 *Inter-Environnement Wallonie and Terre Wallone* [2012]

*Definition of Court or tribunal and last instance*

- Case C-54/96 *Dorsch Consult* [1997] ECR I-4961
- Case C-99/00 *Lyckeskog* [2002] ECR I-4839
- Case C-210/06 *Cartesio*, [2008] ECR I-9641
- Case C-173/09 *Elchinov* [2010]
- Joined cases C-188/10 and C-189/10 *Melki and Abdeli* [2010] ECR I-5665
- Case C-104/10 *Kelly* [2011]
- Opinion of the Court 1/09 of 8 March 2011

*The obligation to refer matters to the ECJ*

- Joined cases 28-30/62 *Da Costa* [1963] ECR 63
- Case 283/81 *C.I.L.F.I.T.* [1982] ECR 3415
- Case 314/85 *Foto-Frost* [1987] ECR 4199
- Case C-495/03 *Intermodal Transports* [2005] ECR I-8151
- Case C-461/03 *Gaston Schul Douane expéditeur* [2005] ECR I-10513
- Case C-458/06 *Gourmet Classic* [2008] ECR I-4207
- Case C-260/07 *Pedro IV Servicios* [2009] ECR I-2437

*On the urgent preliminary rulings procedure*

- Order C-66/08
- Case C-195/08 *PPU Rinau* [2008] ECR I-5271
- Case C-296/08 *PPU Santesteban Goicoechea*, [2008] ECR I-6307
- Case C-388/08 *PPU Leymann*, [2008] ECR I-8993
- Case C-357/09 *PPU Kadzoev* [2009] ECR I-11189
- Case C-403/09 *PPU Detiček* [2009] ECR I-12193
- Case C-211/10 *PPU Povse* [2010] ECR I-6669
- Case C-400/10 *PPU McB* [2010]
- Case C-491/10 *PPU Aguirre Zarraga* [2010]

- Case C-497/10 *PPU Mercredi* [2010]
- Case C-61/11 *PPU El Dridi* [2011]

### 3. Trainers

The trainers' profiles recommended for this topic are those of international experts, preferably from the European Court of Justice, scholars and national practitioners with experience of preliminary references.

### 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended to junior judges and future/trainee judges. Senior judges might however also benefit from the training, especially in view of the developments that have taken place in relation the urgent preliminary ruling procedure and the changes that the Lisbon Treaty will bring in the future.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training can be carried out in the form of a basic seminar but it might not be necessary to dedicate a whole seminar to the topic. It could successfully be allocated to part (half a day, or a day) of another training course. One could imagine organising workshops on e.g. how to formulate preliminary questions, and to undertake a study visit to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

The basic seminar can be accompanied by complementary e-learning tools.

#### *C) Priority*

It is of fundamental importance that judges are familiar with the European judicial system and especially the preliminary rulings procedure, and this training should therefore be a top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format*

Training can be carried out in a local, regional or national setting or on a trans-national or EU-wide basis.

## *II. The effect of European Union law on national systems*

### **1. Introduction**

European law primarily is effective in national systems through the national legislator implementing the European Instruments which later are applied by national administrations and courts. The Court of Justice has however developed doctrines to increase further the effectiveness of Community law, such as the principles of supremacy, direct effect obliging judges to directly apply Community law instruments even if these have been incorrectly implemented or not implemented at all by the national legislator. The Court has also developed the doctrine of indirect effect (i.e. that national law must be interpreted, as far as possible, in the light of European law) and the doctrine of State liability, making the member states liable for damages for breaches against Community law rules.

When it comes to criminal law, under the Lisbon Treaty, *Framework Decisions* will no longer exist but be replaced by *Directives*. The impact of Directives and the question of them having direct effect also in the field of criminal law will give raise to many questions and discussions among European criminal justice experts. However, given that there is still a transitional period, next to the mentioned new questions, the existing questions regarding the application of the doctrine of direct effect and primacy to former Third Pillar measures will still remain important for a couple of years. In 2005, the Court of Justice delivered a seminal judgment, C-105/03 *Pupino*, in which it held that, even though the Treaty excludes that Third Pillar Framework Decisions can have direct effect, these are *not prevented from having indirect effect*.

### *Training contents*

- Basic Community law doctrines of supremacy, direct effect, indirect effect and State liability
- The former difference between the effect of Community law measures and 'Third Pillar' measures
- Difference between direct effect and indirect effect

- State liability doctrine
- Changes introduced by the EU Reform Treaty (Lisbon Treaty) and the result for the effect of criminal justice instruments – State liability and direct effect also in criminal matters in the future

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic Instruments*

1. [Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (OJ C 83/1, 30 March 2010)

### *b. Case law*

#### *Supremacy*

1. Case 6/64 *Costa v. ENEL* [1964] ECR 1203
2. Case 106/77 *Simmenthal* [1978] ECR 629
3. Case C-314/08 *Filipiak* [2009] ECR I-11049
4. Joined cases C-188/10 and C-189/10 *Melki and Abdeli* [2010] ECR I-5665
5. Case C-409/06 *Winner Wetten* [2010]

#### *Direct effect*

1. Case 26/62 *Van Gend en Loos* [1963] ECR 3
2. Case 41/74 *Van Duyn v. Home Office* [1974] ECR 1337
3. Case C-91/92 *Faccini Dori v. Recreb s.r.l.* [1994] ECR I-3325
4. Case C-201/02 *Wells* [2004] ECR I-723
5. Case C-119/05 *Lucchini* [2007] ECR I-6199
6. Joined cases C-152/07 to 154/07 *Arcor and Others* [2008] ECR I-5959
7. Case C-314/08 *Filipiak* [2009] ECR I-11049
8. Case C-409/06 *Winner Wetten* [2010]
9. Case C-555/07 *Küçükdeveci* [2010] ECR I-365
10. Case C-91/08 *Wall* [2010] ECR I-2815
11. Case C-41/11 *Inter-Environnement Wallonie and Terre Wallone* [2012]

#### *Indirect effect*

1. Case 80/86 *Kolpinghuis Nijmegen* [1987] ECR 3969
2. Case C-106/89 *Marleasing* [1990] ECR I-4135
3. Case C-397/01 to 403/01 *Pfeiffer and Others* [2004] ECR I-8835

4. Case C-105/03 *Pupino* [2005] ECR I-5285
5. Case C-241/06 *Lämmerzahl* [2007] ECR I-8415
6. Case C-435/06 *C* [2007] ECR I-10141
7. Case C-555/07 *Küçükdeveci* [2010] ECR I-365
8. Case C-173/09 *Elchinov* [2010]
9. Case C-256/09 *Purrucker* [2010] ECR I-7349

### *State liability*

1. Joined cases C-6/90 and C-9/90 *Francovich* [1991] ECR I-5357
2. Joined cases C-46/93 and C-48/93 *Brasserie du Pêcheur and Factortame* [1996] ECR I-1029
3. Joined cases C-178/94, C-179/94 and C-188 to 190/94 *Dillenkofer* [1996] ECR I-4845
4. Case C-224/01 *Köbler* [2003] ECR I-10239
5. Case C-445/06 *Danske Slagterier* [2009] ECR I-2119
6. Case C-118/08 *Transportes Urbanos y Servicios Generales* [2010] ECR I-635

## 3. Trainers

Trainers could be scholars and/or experts from training institutions.

## 4. Trainees

Training on this issue is fundamental to everyone who applies Community and Union law in his/her work. It should encompass all groups of 'judicial staff', i.e. senior judges and senior prosecutors if need be, as well as junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors. Training of senior staff is particularly necessary in view of the changes brought about by the Lisbon Treaty and the potential direct effect of legal instruments.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training can be carried out in the form of training courses, basic seminars and distance learning courses but it might not be necessary to dedicate a whole seminar to the topic. It can successfully be allocated as part (half a day, or a day) of another training course. One could also imagine (especially

once the Lisbon Treaty enters into force and criminal matters are subject to the general legislative regime) organising a workshop in which judges/prosecutors can become better acquainted with the doctrines of direct effect and State liability).

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Preparatory e-learning would be a good complement.

#### *C) Priority*

It is important that judges are acquainted with the fundamental doctrines of EU law and this training should therefore be a top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

Preferably in the national setting in order for judges to be able to understand the effect of Union law and the different doctrines in the practical setting of their own legal system.



## *Chapter B*

# *Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters in the EU*

### *Introduction: From mutual legal assistance to mutual recognition*

The classic concept of judicial cooperation in criminal matters is grounded on the sovereignty principle under which a sovereign State will only commit itself to cooperate with another sovereign State in the framework of pre-established conditions of its own acceptance. The rules under which this cooperation is requested (or granted) may be found either in the texts of the binding international legal instruments legally ratified by States or, in the absence of the latter, on the terms of ad-hoc agreements specifically drafted for that end under the well-known reciprocity rule. In any case, some doctrine, highlighting the strong political factor that presides to this type of international cooperation claims that it has been characterised by the "request" principle: one sovereign state makes a request to another sovereign state which then decides whether or not to comply with it. This traditional system, where direct contact between the judicial authorities of the countries involved is not admitted, has often proved slow, complex and completely unsuitable to answer nowadays challenges.

The idea of introducing a system of mutual recognition of decisions and enforcements of judgments in criminal matters, following the system already used in civil matters, has been discussed in the European Union since 1998. At the Tampere European Council in October 1999 it was decided that the principle of mutual recognition should become the cornerstone of judicial cooperation in both civil and criminal matters within the European Union. In its programme of measures to implement the principle of mutual recognition of decisions in criminal matters, the Commission noted that the principle is founded on notions of equivalence and trust. The programme refers to decisions under criminal law (all rules laying down sanctions or measures to rehabilitate offenders) which are final (i.e. decisions by courts and certain

administrative tribunals, the outcome of mediation procedures and agreements between suspects and prosecution services). Some forms of mutual recognition have already been embodied in the instruments of judicial cooperation adopted, before the Maastricht Treaty, in various forums, and subsequently in the European Union framework. Other aspects of mutual recognition have not been addressed in an international context, in particular those concerning pre-trial orders or the taking into account, in producing a court decision, of any foreign criminal judgments, especially in order to assess a person's criminal record and whether he/she is a persistent offender.

The first step in applying the principle of mutual recognition for decisions in criminal matters was made with the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant in 2001. Other instruments followed being the latest ones the adoption of the Framework Decisions regulating, in one's hand, the so-called European Evidence Warrant published in December 2008 and, on the other, the Framework Decision of 23 October 2009 on the application of the principle to the decisions on supervision measures as an alternative to provisional detention.

The main areas in which member states are currently focusing their efforts to gradually achieve mutual recognition of criminal decisions in the European Union include the following:

- taking into account final criminal judgments already delivered by the Courts in another member state
- enforcement of pre-trial orders
- sentencing
- post-sentencing follow-up decisions
- peer evaluation

[The Stockholm Programme adopted by the Council in May 2010](#) sets out the European Union's (EU) priorities for the area of justice, freedom and security for the period 2010–14. Building on the achievements of its predecessors the Tampere and Hague programmes, it aims to meet future challenges and further strengthen the area of justice, freedom and security with actions focusing on the interests and needs of citizens.

In order to provide a secure Europe where the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens are respected, the Stockholm Programme focuses on the following priorities:

#### Europe of rights

European citizenship must be transformed from an abstract idea into a concrete reality. It must confer on EU nationals the fundamental rights and freedoms set out in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. EU citizens must be able to exercise these rights within as well as outside the EU, while knowing that their privacy is respected, especially in terms of protection of personal data. The Europe of rights must be an area in which:

- citizens and their family members may exercise in full the right to free movement;

- diversity is respected and the most vulnerable groups of people (children, minorities such as Roma, victims of violence, etc.) are protected, while racism and xenophobia are tackled;

- the rights of suspected and accused persons are protected in criminal proceedings;

EU citizenship promotes citizens' participation in the democratic life of the EU through transparent decision-making, access to documents and good administration, as well as guarantees citizens the right to consular protection outside the EU.

#### Europe of justice

A European area of justice must be realised throughout the EU. Access to justice for citizens must be facilitated, so that their rights are better enforced within the EU. At the same time, cooperation between judicial authorities and the mutual recognition of court decisions within the EU must be further developed in both civil and criminal cases. To this end, EU countries should make use of e-Justice (information and communication technologies in the field of justice), adopt common minimum rules to approximate criminal and civil law standards, and strengthen mutual trust. The EU must also aim to achieve coherence with the international legal order in order to create a secure legal environment for interacting with non EU-countries.

#### Europe that protects

The Stockholm Programme recommends the development of an internal security strategy for the EU, with a view to improving the protection of citizens and the fight against organised crime and terrorism. Within the spirit of solidarity, the strategy will aim to enhance police and judicial cooperation

in criminal matters, as well as cooperation in border management, civil protection and disaster management. The internal security strategy will consist of a pro-active, horizontal and cross-cutting approach with clearly divided tasks for the EU and its countries. It will focus on the fight against cross-border crime, such as:

trafficking in human beings;

sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography;

cyber crime;

economic crime, corruption, counterfeiting and piracy;

drugs.

In the fight against cross-border crime, internal security is necessarily linked to external security. Therefore, account must be taken of the EU external security strategy and cooperation strengthened with non-EU countries.

## *1. The EU's competence in relation to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters*

### **1. Introduction**

The [Lisbon Treaty](#) abolishes the “pillar structure” of EU legislation. Matters which were previously dealt with under the third pillar, such as judicial cooperation in criminal matters and police cooperation, will be treated under the same kind of rules as those of the single market.

The European Union only has the powers expressly conferred on it and hence does not have any universal competence to legislate on all criminal and police matters. Its competence is limited to the enumerated areas and aims mentioned in Articles [82 to 89 TFEU](#). As regards judicial cooperation, the EU's action is based on the principle of mutual recognition of judgments and judicial decisions, and includes the approximation of the laws and regulations of the Member States in some specific areas such as rights of victims of crimes, terrorism, trafficking in human beings.... It is a domain of shared competence between Commission and member States, and EU action is subject to the subsidiarity principle.

#### *Training content*

- Basic understanding of the EU's competence in relation to criminal and police matters

- Knowledge of the various legal instruments and their differences
- Basic understanding of the legislative procedures relating to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, articles 82 to 89](#)
- b. Documents on the correct legal basis for adopting criminal instruments
- c. Criminal competence under the former first pillar:
  - Case C-176/03 Commission v. Council [2005] ECR I-07879
  - Case C- 440/05 Commission v. Council [2007] ECR I-0000

## 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be scholars or national practitioners (for example from the Ministry of Justice) or experts from training institutions.

## 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and future/trainee judges.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

The training can be carried out in the form of a basic seminar but it might not be necessary to dedicate a whole seminar to the topic. It can successfully be allocated as part (one lecture) of another training course.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

The basic seminar can be accompanied by preparatory e-learning tools.

### *C) Priority*

It is strongly recommended that judges and prosecutors have a rudimentary knowledge of this matter.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers

of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

The training can be carried out in a local, regional or national setting.

## *II. The effect of EU instruments in national systems*

(see also above I.II)

### **1. Introduction**

Apparently the European system of penal law as a closed body of criminal legislation is still a utopia. The efforts of the European Union to approximate national legislation in several fields certainly indicate a certain degree of development towards a European system of penal law. The use of criminal sanctions in a number of former First Pillar areas such as the environment or consumer protection arising from recent decisions by the European Court of Justice leads us to the question: how far has the Court in Luxemburg gone in attributing competence in criminal law to the European Union and how far will the Court and the EU go in the future. Experience with the implementation of European criminal law instruments is another field that should be covered. Experience shows that there are different consequences in each member state, because traditions of legislation, interpretation and theoretical development of criminal law are very different. It is very important in this context that criminal law be approximated as well as the efforts of the EU in this field, as exemplified by the Corpus Juris.

#### *Training content*

Training on European criminal law should also include a methodological introduction (general questions of European criminal law). As pointed out above, the implementation of European instruments relating to criminal law is very different in each member state and this situation needs to be clarified (For example: is the offence punishable in every member state? And is the degree of punishment the same?).

Training should include:

- Community competence for criminal law: positions and comments

- Overview of the methodological background and member state criminal law
- Practices and experience of national implementation of EU Directives and the Framework Decisions on criminal law
- European experience of the interpretation of EU legislation
- Case studies

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic documents*

- [Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and of the Treaty establishing the European Community](#) (consolidated text), (OJ C 321E; 29.12. 2006)
- [Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union](#) (The Lisbon Treaty)
- The Implementation of the Corpus Juris in the Member States, Delmas-Marty/Vervaele (edit.), 4 volumes, Intersentia, ISBN 90-5095-097-3.

### *b. Case law*

1. Case C-440/05, ship-source pollution, annulment Framework Decision 2005/667/JHA, Judgment of 23 October 2007
2. Cases C-303/05 *Advocaten Voor de Wereld* [2007] ECR I-3633
3. Case C-103/05 *Pupino* [2005] ECR I-5285

## 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners, and scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Training in this field should be addressed to practitioners who have a good understanding of their criminal system and who can exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it. Thus training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

*B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update trainees, as the instruments are numerous and changes to the regulation framework are frequent.

*C) Priority:* Training should have priority.

*D) Format:*

Training should take place on a national, trans-national and EU-wide level

### *III. Multi-annual programmes*

#### **Tampere, The Hague, Stockholm programmes**

To draw up policy guidelines and practical objectives for the area of justice and home affairs, with a timetable for their attainment, the European Council established multi-annual programmes of action. The first of these was approved at Tampere in 1999. The European Council approved a programme of action for creating an 'area of freedom, security and justice', covering civil and criminal justice, visas, asylum and immigration, and police and customs cooperation. The 'Tampere programme' was a five-year agenda that came to an end in 2004.

The successor to the Tampere Programme was adopted in November 2004 in The Hague under the Dutch Presidency. The Hague Programme is a five-year programme for closer co-operation in justice and home affairs at EU level from 2005 to 2010. It aims to make Europe an area of freedom, security and justice. Immigration and asylum topped the Hague agenda alongside the prevention of terrorism. EU leaders agreed to use qualified majority decision-making and co-decision in the fields of asylum, immigration and border control issues. Legal immigration remains subject to unanimity. In the fields of justice and security, the Hague Programme highlighted the following key measures: police information to be available to all EU countries, address the factors that contribute to fundamentalism and to the involvement of individuals in terrorist activities; make greater use of Europol and Eurojust, ensure greater civil and criminal justice cooperation across borders and the full application of the principle of mutual recognition.



As The Hague Programme was coming to an end in 2009, the Portuguese Presidency of the Council settled-up a high level advisory groups – Future Groups – to provide ideas and solutions for the future of EU criminal justice. On the basis of their reports, the European Commission launched a public consultation in September 2008 on defining priorities for what was to be the new Stockholm Programme. The latter was finally adopted early December 2009 and reflects the existing and future problems in the spheres of justice and internal affairs for the years 2010–2014. In the field of criminal justice, the Stockholm Programme focused on the following issues:

- Promotion of citizenship and fundamental rights: in the area of freedom, security and justice, above all, shall be an area in which fundamental rights are protected. One important aspect in this area for example is the rights of suspected and accused persons in criminal proceedings.
- Right to privacy of the individual in today’s information society: existing data protection instruments shall be evaluated and present initiatives for improvement presented.
- A Europe of law and justice: furthering the implementation of the principle of mutual recognition in criminal law (and civil) law is one of the main objectives. [One example is the idea to introduce a European Protection Order \(directive adopted by the Parliament and the Council on 13 december 2011\)](#) and a European Investigation Order. The European judicial area should also allow citizens to assert their rights anywhere in the EU and access to justice should be facilitated.
- A Europe that protects: an internal security strategy strengthening cooperation in law enforcement, border management, civil protection, disaster management as well as judicial cooperation in criminal matters should make Europe more secure. Trafficking in human beings has been given particular attention in the Programme. [The European Council has called for new legislation on combating trafficking](#) (which has led to the adoption of a directive on 5 april 2011) and protecting victims as well as enhanced cooperation with Europol, Eurojust and specific third states.
- The role of Europe in a globalised world – the external dimension: an implementation of the objectives of the Stockholm Programme cannot be successful without the external dimension of the EU’s policy in the area of freedom, security and justice. This policy should also be integrated into

the general policies of the EU and should be coherent with all other aspects of the EU's foreign policy.

To implement the Stockholm Programme, the Commission has published an Action Plan.

The European Council also adopted on 30 November 2009 the [Roadmap for strengthening procedural rights of suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings](#), advocating a “step by step” approach. This roadmap aims at setting out minimum rules, in particular the right to interpretation and translation, the right to information about rights, the right to legal aid and the right of access to a lawyer.

### **Justice Forum**

In order to discuss EU justice policies and practice, the Commission set up a multi-disciplinary and collaborative Justice Forum. The Justice Forum aims at providing a permanent mechanism for consulting stakeholders, receiving feedback and reviewing EU justice policies and practice transparently and objectively. The Justice Forum was officially launched on Friday 30 May 2008. The forum convenes practitioners and civil stakeholders, giving them the opportunity to discuss the implementation, evaluation, and consequences of Justice and Home Affairs instruments of the EU together with EU authorities. The forum meets four times per year in Brussels. Subgroups were built to discuss specific issues in a more in-depth manner.

See:

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/news/information\\_dossiers/justice\\_forum/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/information_dossiers/justice_forum/index_en.htm)

### *Training content*

The multi-annual programmes provide for the key topics that the EU will address in the area of justice and home affairs in the respective periods. The programmes serve as guidelines for evolving and forthcoming measures to be expected in this field and therefore, potential topics for training can already be assessed.

Furthermore, the development and content of the programmes serve as important *background knowledge* to better understand the developing area of freedom, security and justice.

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a) [The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe \(22.11.2010; COM\(2010\) 673 final\)](#)
- b) [Action Plan Implementing the Stockholm Programme; Brussels, 20.4.2010; COM\(2010\) 171 final](#)
- c) [The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens \( OJ C 115 4/5/2010 P.1\)](#)
- d) [JHA Trio Presidency Programme January 2010 – June 2011 \(5008/10, 4/1/2010\)](#)
- e) [The Hague Programme: Strengthening Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union \(OJ C53/01, 3.3.2005\)](#)
  - 1. [Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Justice, Freedom and Security in Europe since 2005: An evaluation of The Hague programme and action plan Brussels, \(COM\(2009\) 263 final; 10.6.2009\)](#)
  - 2. [Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Report on Implementation of the Hague Programme for 2007 \(2.7.2008; COM\(2008\) 373 final\)](#)
  - 3. [Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Report on the implementation of The Hague programme for 2006 \(COM\(2007\) 373 final; 3.7.2007\)](#)
  - 4. [Council and Commission Action Plan implementing the Hague Programme on strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union \(OJ C 198; 12/8/2005\)](#)
  - 5. [The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union \(16054/04; 13 December 2004\)](#)
- f) [Tampere European Council 15 and 16 October 1999 – Presidency Conclusions](#)
- g) [Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament – Area of Freedom, Security and Justice: Assessment of the Tampere programme and future orientations, \(COM\(2004\) 4002 final; 2.6.2004\)](#)
- h) [Resolution of the Council of 30 November 2009 on a Roadmap for strengthening procedural rights of suspected or accused persons in criminal proceedings, \(OJEU 4.12.2009 C 295/01\)](#)

## *IV. Surrender of persons*

### IV.1. Extradition

#### 1. Introduction

Extradition in Europe has been primarily shaped by the Council of Europe's Convention on Extradition of 1957 which served as the 'mother convention' for most other European laws on extradition. This European Convention for Extradition provides for extradition of persons being requested either to stand trial or serve a sentence of imprisonment in a foreign country. The Convention does not apply to political or military offences and any Party may refuse to extradite its own nationals to a foreign country. With regard to fiscal offences, extradition may only be granted if the parties have so decided in respect of any such offence or category of offence. The first additional Protocol to the Convention of 1975 excludes war crimes and crimes against humanity from the category of non-extraditable political offences. It also specifies certain cases in which extradition may be refused on the ground that the person charged with the offence has already been tried. The second additional Protocol is designed to facilitate the application of the Convention, in particular to include fiscal offences among the category of extraditable offences. The Protocol also contains additional provisions on judgments in absentia and amnesty. In November 2010, the Third Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition was signed introducing a simplified procedure for extradition.

Two other Conventions have been signed in the EU framework regarding extradition – [the 1995 Convention on the Simplified Extradition Procedure and the 1996 Convention related to Extradition. The introduction, in 2004, of the mechanism of the European Arrest Warrant](#), valid throughout the European Union, which has replaced the extradition procedure between EU-Member states (*see below*). Nevertheless, the Council of Europe's as well as the EU's Conventions on extradition still play an important role not only as important background documents to better understand the EAW but also, and mainly, because the former remain being the in-force legal basis for extradition between the EU and Council of Europe's non-EU member states.

Finally, considerable new developments have been achieved at the end of 2009 with the conclusion of a new [agreement on extradition between the European Union and the United States of America](#), which came into force on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.

### *Training content*

Training on extradition should cover the following issues:

1. Definition and historical evolution
2. Extradition limits
  - 2.1. Related to the person
    - 2.1.1. Nationality
    - 2.1.2. Refugees
    - 2.1.3. The non-discrimination rule
    - 2.1.4. Immunities
    - 2.1.5. Humanitarian concerns
  - 2.2. Related to the crime
    - 2.2.1. The double criminality rule
    - 2.2.2. The seriousness of the crime
    - 2.2.3. The nature of the crime
    - 2.2.4. The applied penalty
      - 2.2.4.1. The death penalty
      - 2.2.4.2. Life imprisonment
      - 2.2.4.3. Other cases
    - 2.2.5. The principles of res judicata and ne bis in idem
    - 2.2.6. Conflicts on jurisdiction
  - 2.3. The reciprocity rule
3. Extradition effects
  - 3.1. Relating to the requested State
  - 3.2. Relating to the requesting State
    - 3.2.1. The speciality rule
      - 3.2.1.1. Definition
      - 3.2.1.2. Exceptions
4. International law
  - 4.1. The European experience – The Council of Europe
  - 4.2. The EU Approach

- 4.2.1. The Schengen Agreements
  - 4.2.1.1. The SIS
- 4.2.2. The former EU Conventions on Extradition
- 4.2.3. The Council of Tampere
- 4.3. Main bilateral treaties
- 5. The extradition procedure
  - 5.1. Our country as the requesting State
  - 5.2. Our country as the requested State
  - 5.3. Other actors of the Extradition Procedure
    - 5.3.1. SIS national office
    - 5.3.2. INTERPOL

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *Council of Europe*

1. [1996 Convention related to Extradition](#)
2. [1995 Convention on the Simplified Extradition Procedure](#)
3. [Third Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition \(Strasbourg, 10.XI.2010\)](#)
4. [Second Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition \(Strasbourg, 17.III.1978\)](#)
5. [Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition \(Strasbourg, 15.X.1975\)](#)
6. [European Convention on Extradition \(Paris, 13.XII.1957\)](#)

### *EU*

1. [Council Decision 2009/933/CFSP of 30 November 2009 on the extension, on behalf of the European Union, of the territorial scope of the Agreement on extradition between the European Union and the United States of America](#)
2. [Council Decision 2009/820/CFSP of 23 October 2009 on the conclusion on behalf of the European Union of the Agreement on extradition between the European Union and the United States of America and the Agreement on mutual legal assistance between the European Union and the United States of America](#)
3. [Agreement on extradition between the European Union and the United States of America of 25 June 2003 \(OJ L 181, 19.7.2003, p. 27-33\)](#)

4. [Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States \(OJ L 190/1, 18.07.2002\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers for the broad subject of extradition should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

The subject can be recommended for young/trainee judges and prosecutors as well for future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

The training method used for the general subject of extradition should be basic seminars, possibly combined with workshops.

The subject, together with training on the EAW, is also recommended for training courses and distance learning.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training on this legal instrument can be completed by e-learning.

#### *C) Priority*

Training on the topic should have top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes national and EU-wide training.

## IV.2. European Arrest Warrant (EAW)

### 1. Introduction

The European Arrest Warrant (EAW) has been designed to replace the current extradition system by requiring each national judicial authority (the executing judicial authority) to recognise, ipso facto, and with a minimum of formalities, requests for the surrender of a person made by the judicial authority of another member state (the issuing judicial authority).

As of [1 July 2004, the Framework Decision](#) has therefore replaced the existing texts, such as:

- [The 1957 European Extradition Convention](#) and the [1978 European Convention on the suppression of terrorism as regards extradition](#)
- the agreement of 26 May 1989 between 12 member states on simplifying the transmission of extradition requests
- [the 1995 Convention on the simplified extradition procedure](#)
- [the 1996 Convention on extradition.](#)

The European Arrest Warrant only applies within the territory of the EU. Relations with third countries are still governed by extradition rules.

The Framework Decision defines the "European Arrest Warrant" as any judicial decision issued by a member state with a view to the arrest or surrender by another member state of a requested person, for the purposes of: conducting a criminal prosecution; executing a custodial sentence; executing a detention order. The warrant applies where a final sentence of imprisonment or a detention order has been imposed for a period of at least four months; for offences punishable by imprisonment or a detention order for a maximum period of at least one year. In June 2008, the Council published a handbook on the practicalities of executing an EAW. In 2010, a revised version of the EAW handbook has been published. Furthermore, several evaluation reports on the practical application of the EAW in the Member States are available. On 11 April 2011, the Commission published its third report on the implementation of the Council Framework Decision on the EAW. Although since its coming-into-force on 1 January 2004, available statistics contrast favourably with the pre-EAW position (e.g. the average surrender time has dropped from a one-year average to an average of 14–17 days for requested persons that did consent to their surrender, and to 48 days for those surrendered without consent), the latest Commission report also reacts to the rising concerns in relation to the operation of the EAW and in particular its effects on fundamental rights.



### *Training content*

Training on the EAW should cover:

1. The main principles of the Council's Framework Decision of June 13th, 2002
2. Scope and fields of application
3. Grounds for refusal
4. The request for guaranties
5. The speciality rule
6. The request for the surrender procedure (issuing an EAW)
7. The execution procedure (executing a foreign EAW)

Supports:

1. Case studies
2. National and ECJ case law (evaluation reports)
3. Handbook

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic instrument*

- [Standard Form on EAW Decision](#)
- [Commission Staff working document, Accompanying document to the third Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation since 2007 of the Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States \(\(COM\(2011\) 175 final\) SEC\(2011\) 430 final; 11.4.2011\)](#)
- [Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation since 2007 of the Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States \(\(SEC\(2011\) 430 final; COM\(2011\) 175 final; 11.4.2011\)](#)
- [Revised version of the European handbook on how to issue a European Arrest Warrant \(17195/1/10; 17.12.2010\)](#)
- [Replies to questionnaire on quantitative information on the practical operation of the European arrest warrant – Year 2007 \(10330/08; 11.06.2008\)](#)

- [Report from the Commission on the implementation since 2005 of the Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States \(COM\(2007\) 407 final; 11.7.2007\)](#)
- [Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States, OJ L 190/1, 18.07.2002](#)
- [Statements made by certain Member States on the adoption of the Framework Decision](#)
- [Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Iceland and the Kingdom of Norway on the surrender procedure between the Member States of the European Union and Iceland and Norway – Declarations \(OJ L 292, 21.10.2006, p. 2-19\)](#)
- [Final version of the European handbook on how to issue a European Arrest Warrant \(8216/2/08; 24 June 2008\)](#)

*b. Case law*

1. [C-306/09 I.B.](#)
2. C-261/09 Mantello
3. C-83/08 Leymann and Pustovarov (Art 27 para 2 EAW FD; scope of the speciality rule)
4. C-296/08 Goicoechea (Art. 31 and 32 EAW FD; relationship between EAW and 1996 Extradition Convention)
5. C-123/08 – Wolzenburg – Ruling of 6 October 2009 – Optional non-execution of an EAW – interpretation of Article 4(6)
6. C-66/08 Szymon Kozlowski (Art. 4 No. 6 of the EAW FD; definition of ‘staying’ and ‘resident’)
7. C-303/05 Wereld/Ministerraad, Judgment of the Court of 3 May 2007
8. Irish Supreme Court, Judgment of 23.7.2010
9. [German Oberlandesgericht, Judgement EAW, 25.2.2010](#)
10. Czech Constitutional Court, Judgement EAW, 03.05.2006 (<http://www.eurowarrant.net>)
11. Cypriot Constitutional Court, Judgement EAW, 07.11.2005 (Council doc 14281/05)
12. P 1/05 (judgment), Polish Constitutional Court, EAW, 27.04.2005

13. German Federal Constitutional Court, Judgement EAW, BverfG, 2 BvR 2236/04, 18.07.2005
14. Tribunale di Bolzano, Sezione per il riesame, Ordinanza 28 luglio 2005 Nr. 44/05 Reg. Riesami

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended for the EAW are EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

The issue of the EAW is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Being the first instrument of mutual recognition in the EU to come into force, the EAW is not only a new phenomenon in the judicial landscape but will also form the pattern for potential further instruments to come, such as, e.g., the European Evidence Warrant. The EAW should be part of basic seminars on European criminal justice and especially on extradition.

Particular attention, however, should be paid to specialised seminars or workshops on the EAW.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training on this legal instrument can be completed by e-learning.

#### *C) Priority*

Training on the EAW should be given top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes national, trans-national and EU-wide training.

## *V. Mutual Legal Assistance*

The following Sub-Chapter on mutual legal assistance will deal with the legal instruments that have been initially set up within the framework of the Council of Europe. Some of their rules have been afterwards either completed or replaced by EU instruments. Therefore, to understand the background of many of the EU instruments as well as to complete the knowledge of the regulations applicable to mutual legal assistance within the EU, it is important to raise the awareness and legal knowledge of both the Council of Europe and EU instruments.

The first and major instrument for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters at European level was created in 1959 and since then amended twice by two additional Protocols. Under this Convention, parties agree to afford each other the widest measure of mutual assistance with a view to gathering evidence, hearing witnesses, experts and prosecuted persons, etc. The Convention sets out rules for the enforcement of letters rogatory by the authorities of a party ('Requested Party') which aim to procure evidence (hearing of witnesses, experts and prosecuted persons, service of writs and records of judicial verdicts) or to communicate the evidence (records or documents) in criminal proceedings undertaken by the judicial authorities of another party ('Requesting Party'). The Convention also specifies the requirements that requests for mutual legal assistance and letters rogatory have to meet (transmitting authorities, languages, grounds for refusal).

[The first additional Protocol to the Convention](#) (of March 17<sup>th</sup>, 1978 entered into force on the 12<sup>th</sup> April 1982) completes the convention by withdrawing the possibility to refuse assistance solely on the grounds that the request concerns an offence which the requested party considers a fiscal offence. It extends international cooperation to the service of documents concerning the enforcement of a sentence and similar measures. Thirdly, it adds provisions relating to the exchange of information on judicial records

[The second additional Protocol](#), dated of 2001 (entry into force on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004), modernises the provisions of the Convention by extending the range of circumstances under which mutual legal assistance may be requested, facilitating assistance and making it quicker and more flexible. Thus, it parallels completely the [Convention of 29 May 2000 in MLA in](#)

[Criminal Matters between the member states of the EU](#) and in other provisions follows the Schengen Convention of 14 June 1990.

In drawing up the 2000 EU Convention, the Council relied on the Council of Europe's Convention on MLA in Criminal Matters of 1959. The primary aim of the Convention was to develop and modernise the existing provision of mutual assistance by extending the range of circumstances in which assistance may be requested, by facilitating assistance to make it quicker and more effective, and by developing new measures to facilitate and further cross-border investigations. It also introduces new techniques applicable for mutual assistance (video and telephone conferences). It adopts rules on data protection.

The 2001 Protocol to the EU Convention is an integral part of the Convention of 29 May 2000. It provides for supplementary measures such as requests for information on banking transactions to combat crime in general and organised crime in particular.

Due to the complete new quality of cooperation between the member states of the EU on the basis of the principle of mutual recognition, *mutual legal assistance* and *mutual recognition* are *separately presented* in these guidelines.

*Training content:*

Training on the Council of Europe Convention and its Protocols on mutual legal assistance should include the following fields:

- Rules for the enforcement of letters rogatory
- Service of writs and recording of judicial verdicts
- Appearance of witnesses, experts and prosecuted persons
- Judicial records
- Procedure
- Laying of information in connection with proceedings
- Exchange of information from judicial records

Training on the EU Convention and its Protocol should include the following fields:

- Relationship to other Conventions on mutual assistance and the Schengen Acquis
- Transmission of requests for mutual assistance
- Requests for certain specific forms of mutual assistance (temporary transfer of persons held in custody for purpose of investigation, video and telephone conferences)
- Interception of telecommunications
- Control deliveries
- Infiltration and undercover operations
- Mutual legal assistance with third states, e.g. the USA

Training on the 2001 Protocol will explain the special regulations for banking transactions

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

1 [Second Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters \(Strasbourg, 8.XI.2001\)](#)

1. [Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters \(Strasbourg, 17.III.1978\)](#)
2. [European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matter \(Strasbourg, 20.IV.1959\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member states of the European Union \(of May 29, 2000\), OJ C 197/3, 12.07.2000](#)

- a. [Council Decision 2009/820/CFSP of 23 October 2009 on the conclusion on behalf of the European Union of the Agreement on extradition between the European Union and the United States of America and the Agreement on mutual legal assistance between the European Union and the United States of America](#)
- b. [Agreement between the European Union and Japan on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, OJ L 39, 12.2.2010, p. 20-35.](#)

- c. [Agreement on mutual legal assistance between the European Union and the United States of America, OJ L 181/34, 19.7.2003](#)
- d. [Explanatory report on the Protocol to the Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member states of the European Union, OJ C 257/1, 24.10.2002](#)
- e. [Protocol to the Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member states of the European Union, OJ C 326/2, 21.11.2001](#)
- f. [Explanatory Report on the Convention of 29 May 2000 on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member states of the European Union, OJ C 379/7, 29.12.2000](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended for the Conventions and their Protocols should be international experts, EU experts, and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Training on the Conventions can be especially recommended to junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

The Conventions are the main overall instruments for mutual legal assistance in the EU. Hence, general knowledge of the instruments should be provided. The methods recommended for this area are training courses, basic seminars and distance learning courses.

The individual sub-topics of the Conventions as well as training on the Protocol can be dealt with in specialised seminars and workshops (*see below*).

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training on this legal instrument can be completed by e-learning.

#### *C) Priority*

Given the functions outlined above, training on the Convention and its Protocol should have top priority.

#### *D) Format*

The training format recommended for the Convention includes local, regional, and national training.

## **V.1. Mutual legal assistance and mutual recognition related to evidence gathering**

### **1. Introduction**

Obtaining evidence was traditionally done by using various international and EU instruments. As said, the basic framework was provided by the Council of Europe Convention on Mutual Assistance of 1959 and its additional Protocols and, within the EU, the supplementary rules introduced by the Schengen Conventions and the EU Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters and its Protocol. The drawbacks of the system resulting from these arrangements have been, until now, a consistently slow and inefficient procedure, a variety of different rules and legal barriers arising from grounds of refusal (see above). In its programme of measures to implement the principle of mutual recognition of decisions in criminal matters, the Commission outlined the following aim: to ensure that evidence is admissible, to prevent its disappearance and to facilitate the enforcement of search and seizure orders so that evidence can be quickly secured in a criminal case. The programme looked to find feasible ways to ensure that the reservations and declarations provided for in Article 5 of the 1959 Convention, supplemented by Articles 51 and 52 of the CISA, the grounds for refusal of mutual aid provided for in Article 2 of the 1959 Convention, supplemented by Article 50 CISA are not invoked, at least in the extent until now allowed, in the relations between EU member states. Furthermore, steps should be taken to draw up an instrument on the recognition of the freezing of evidence. This was implemented by the Framework Decision on the execution of orders freezing property and evidence of 2003, although the transfer of the evidence seized has continued to be regulated under the classical mutual assistance procedures; however, in 2006, the European Commission presented a proposal to create a [European Evidence Warrant \(EEW\) which was adopted in December 2008 \(Council Framework Decision 2008/978/JHA of 18 December 2008 on the European evidence warrant for](#)



[the purpose of obtaining objects, documents and data for use in proceedings in criminal matters](#)). The EEW applies the principle of mutual recognition to obtaining certain types of evidence for use in criminal proceedings. It does not address to the taking of evidence (in whatever manner) from suspects, defendants, witnesses or victims. EU-Member States were asked to implement the warrant into national laws by January 2011.

However, for quite some time, the developed mechanisms with regard to gathering foreign evidence in the EU have been criticised for being fragmented and complicated. The limited scope of the Framework Decision on the execution of orders freezing property or evidence under which the transfer of the evidence is still subject to the rules of mutual legal assistance as well as its reluctant implementation by the Member States has resulted in many practitioners not seeing added value in the use of the instrument and thus, continue to apply the traditional ways of mutual legal assistance. An even more critical approach has been taken with regard to the Framework Decision on the European Evidence Warrant. Its limited scope only covering certain evidence that already exists as well as speculations about the likely issuing of either a second Evidence Warrant or a single comprehensive document covering all types of evidence has caused legislators to place its implementation low on their agendas and practitioners to prefer using the traditional procedures of mutual legal assistance.

Thus, at the end of April 2010, eight Member States (Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Spain, Luxembourg, Austria, Slovenia, and Sweden) have launched an initiative for a Directive introducing a 'European Investigation Order (EIO)' in criminal matters. The EIO shall cover, as far as possible, all types of evidence and replacing all existing instruments in the area and form a major step in the field of mutual recognition in criminal matters in the EU.

The December 2011 JHA-Council reached a general approach on this proposal.

### *Training content*

#### 1. Sources

- 1.1.1. The CE 59 Convention and its Protocols.
- 1.1.2. The added rules of the Schengen Agreements.
- 1.1.3. The EU 2000 Convention
- 1.1.4. Other treaties

1.1.5. The national law in international cooperation in criminal matters

1.1.6. The procedure in the European Union:

- The Council's Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA of July 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- The Council's Framework Decision 2008/978/JHA of 18 December 2008 on the European evidence warrant
- Development with regard to the European Investigation Order

2. Grounds for refusal
3. The formalities of the international demand
4. The possible ways to send a request
5. Services and notices
6. The procedure
7. The legality of evidence obtained abroad
8. Outlook: national implementation concepts of the EEW

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

- [Second Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters \(Strasbourg, 8.XI.2001\)](#)
- [Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters \(Strasbourg, 17.III.1978\)](#)
- [European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matter \(Strasbourg, 20.IV.1959\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Green Paper on obtaining evidence in criminal matters from one Member State to another and securing its admissibility](#)
2. [Council Framework Decision 2008/978/JHA of 18 December 2008 on the European evidence warrant for the purpose of obtaining objects, documents and data for use in proceedings in criminal matters \(OJ L 350/72; 30.12.2008\)](#)
3. [Council Framework Decision of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the European Union of orders freezing property or evidence \(OJ L 196/45; 2.8.2003\)](#)
4. [Joint Action 98/427/JHA 29.6.98 on good practices on MLA request](#)

*c. European Investigation Order (EIO)*

1. [Council of the European Union, Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of Spain, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Slovenia and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters – Opinion of Eurojust regarding the draft Directive \(DGH 2B LIMITE COPEN 26 EUROJUST 22 EJM 15 CODEC 270 6814/11; 4.3.2011\)](#)
2. [Council of the European Union, Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of Spain, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Slovenia and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters – Follow-up document of the meeting of the Council on 8–9 November 2010 and the Working Party on 11–12 January 2011 \(DGH 2 B LIMITE COPEN 10 EJM 5 EUROJUST 9 CODEC 91; 31.1.2011\)](#)
3. [Council of the European Union, Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of Spain, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Slovenia and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters – progress report \(DGH 2 B COPEN 266 EJM 68 EUROJUST 135 CODEC 1369; 26.11.2010\)](#)
4. EIO Initiative – Commission Comments (10 September 2010; 13446/10)
5. Answers to the questionnaire related to the types of procedure to be covered by the application of the EIO initiative (31 August 2010; 13050/10)
6. EIO Initiative – Follow-up document of the meeting on 27–28 July 2010 (30 August 2010; 12862/10)
7. Discussion paper on the European Investigation Order (8 July 2010; 11842/10)
8. EIO Initiative – Financial Statement (23 June 2010; 9288/10)
9. EIO Initiative – Detailed Statement (23 June 2010; 9288/10)

10. [EIO Initiative – Explanatory Memorandum \(Brussels, 3 June 2010; 9288/10\)](#)
11. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters: – Answers to the questionnaire on interception of telecommunications \(DG H 2B COPEN 205 EUROJUST 100 EJM 44 CODEC 975 14591/10; 12.10.2010\)](#)
12. [Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of Spain, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Slovenia and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters – Answers to the questionnaire related to issuing authorities in application of the initiative for a Council Framework Decision on the European Investigation Order \(DG H 2B COPEN 170 EJM 32 EUROJUST 81 CODEC 754 13049/1/10 REV 1; 4.10.2010\)](#)
13. [Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of Spain, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Slovenia and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters \(21 May 2010; 9288/10\)](#)
14. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters; Brussels \(29 April 2010; 9145/10\)](#)
15. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters; Text agreed as a general approach. 18228/1/11 REV 1 COPEN 356 EUROJUST 212 EJM 181 CODEC 2339](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainer should be international experts, EU experts, and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Training is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training on the international legal instruments to obtain evidence should preferably take the shape of specialised seminars and workshops.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning can be used.

### *C) Priority*

Training on the subject should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format*

Training should be offered on a national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## V.2. Mutual legal assistance related to the trace, seizure and confiscation of the assets of crime

### 1. Introduction

As financial gain remains the main objective of crime in general and of criminal organisations, arrest and conviction alone without the confiscation of illicit proceeds, are not enough to combat organised crime. At EU level the necessity to set up appropriate mechanisms to improve the identification, freezing, seizure and confiscation of the assets of criminals has been addressed in several legislative instruments. In 2001, Council Framework Decision 2001/500/JHA of 26 June 2001 on money laundering, the identification, tracing, freezing, seizing and confiscation of instrumentalities and the proceeds of crime was set up to restrict the scope for reservations relating to certain Articles of the CoE Convention on laundering and confiscation of the proceeds from crime. In 2006, the Framework Decision on the recognition of orders freezing property or evidence of 2003 was supplemented by Framework Decision on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders. In 2007, under the Council

Decision concerning cooperation between Asset Recovery Offices of the Member States in the field of tracing and identification of proceeds from, or other property related to, crime, Member States were asked to set up or designate a national Asset Recovery Office, and their cooperation and exchange of information regulated. Furthermore, a Criminal Assets Seizure Centre has been created within Europol with a view to helping the member states during the criminal assets identification phase to locate financial interests outside national boundaries. On March 12, 2012, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU presented [a new proposal for a Directive on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime in the European Union](#), aiming at simplifying the existing legislations applicable to extended confiscations and promoting the use of non conviction based confiscations.

*Training content:*

Legal assistance on the trace and seizure of illegal profits

1. Sources

1.1. The CoE 1990 Convention

1.2. The national law on international cooperation in criminal matters

1.3. The procedure in the European Union:

1.3.1. The Council's Framework Decision 2001/500/JHA

1.3.2. The Council's Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA

1.3.3. The Council's Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA

1.3.4. The Council's Decision 2007/845/JHA

2. Grounds for refusal

3. The formalities of an international demand

4. The possible ways to send a request

5. Services and notices

6. The procedure

## 2. Instruments and case-law

### *a. Council of Europe*

- [Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime \(Strasbourg, 8.XI.1990\)](#)
- [Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)

*b. EU*

1. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime in the European Union 2012/0036 \(COD\) ;](#)
2. [Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council based on Article 22 of the Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA of 6 October 2006 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders \(DG H 2B COPEN 187 EUROJUST 89 EJN 38 13507/10; 13.9.2010\)](#)
3. [Council Framework Decision 2009/299/JHA of 26 February 2009 amending Framework Decisions 2002/584/JHA, 2005/214/JHA, 2006/783/JHA, 2008/909/JHA and 2008/947/JHA, thereby enhancing the procedural rights of persons and fostering the application of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions rendered in the absence of the person concerned at the trial \(OJ L 81, 27.3.2009, p. 24–36\)](#)
4. [Council Decision 2007/845/JHA of 6 December 2007 concerning cooperation between Asset Recovery Offices of the Member states in the field of tracing and identification of proceeds from, or other property related to, crime \(OJ L 332/103; 18.12.2007\)](#)
5. [Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA of 6 October 2006 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders \(OJ L 328/59, 24.11.2006\)](#)
6. [Council Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the European Union of orders freezing property or evidence 2.8.2003 \(OJ L 196/45, 2.8.2003\)](#)
7. [Council Framework Decision 2001/500/JHA of 26 June 2001 on money laundering, the identification, tracing, freezing, seizing and confiscation of instrumentalities and the proceeds of crime \(OJ L 182/1, 5.7.2001\)](#)

**3. Trainers**

Potential trainers would be EU experts and national practitioners.

**4. Trainees**

Training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

The recommended training method would be specialised seminars and workshops

### *B) Complementary e-learning: recommended*

### *C) Priority:*

Training on these instruments should have priority

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format:*

Training should take place on a national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *VI. Ne bis in idem, transfer of criminal proceedings and conflicts of jurisdiction*

### 1. Introduction

The Council of Europe Convention on the Transfer of Proceedings in criminal matters was adopted in 1972. Yet, only thirteen Member States have ratified it. As a result, a number of other Member States rely only, for the purposes of enabling other Member States to bring proceedings, on the mechanism of the 1959 Council of Europe Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, in connection with [the Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters](#) between the Member States of the European Union from 2000. However, as this mechanism is far from providing the same effects as the one resulting from the Council of Europe's Convention indicated above, the most frequently tool used to that end consists in the establishment of bilateral ad-hoc agreements, under the reciprocity rule, when the national laws involved provide that possibility.

Between the Member States of the European Communities an agreement on the transfer of proceedings in criminal matters was also signed in 1990,



which has not, however, entered into force due to lack of ratifications. Accordingly, no common legal framework on the procedure of transfer of proceedings with e.g., criteria for requesting transfer, a procedure following a request, reasons for refusing a request and effects of a transfer, exists. In line with the aim of creating a common European area of freedom, security and justice, several Member States deemed it necessary to take action to eliminate the deficits of the absence of such framework. Their proposal for a Framework Decision aims to achieve the better determination of the place of the criminal proceedings and the increase transparency and greater objectivity in the way in which the place for the trial is chosen.

The principle of *ne bis in idem* is particular to criminal law; recognized at both national and international levels, initiating proceedings or reopening a judgment against the same person a second time is barred for the same offence or by courts of the same state. The principle of '*ne bis in idem*' is acknowledged in all member states of the EU. However, the international texts establishing this only guarantee this protection within national borders. The principle of *ne bis in idem* has therefore been included in several international conventions, the most important one being Article 54 of [the 1985 Convention on implementing the Schengen Agreement](#). Article 54 has been the object of several judgments of the European Court of Justice. The principle is further established in Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental rights. At EU level, in 2005, the Commission launched a Green Paper to start a process of reflection on conflicts of jurisdiction between the courts of the member states in criminal matters in the light of the *ne bis in idem* principle. To solve conflicts of jurisdiction between national courts, the Commission outlined the possibilities for the creation of a mechanism for allocating cases to an appropriate jurisdiction. In February 2009, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Slovenia, the Slovak Republic, and the Kingdom of Sweden introduced an initiative for a Framework Decision on the prevention and settlement of conflicts of jurisdiction in criminal proceedings. The Framework Decision aims to prevent parallel proceedings where two or more States have jurisdiction for conducting criminal proceedings for the same facts through means of an early exchange of information. In the cases, where the conflict of jurisdiction has already arisen, it puts forward guidelines for settlement of the respective conflict. The Framework Decision was adopted in December 2009. Finally, Eurojust's legal framework provides for a role of Eurojust in the settling of conflicts of jurisdiction.

## *Training content*

### *Ne bis in idem and conflicts of jurisdiction*

- Training should focus on the case law and jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice with regard to the principle of ne bis in idem.
- Scope, content and application of the proposed Framework Decision on transfer of proceedings in criminal matters

### *Transfer of criminal proceedings*

1. International competence of national Courts
2. International delegation of competence
  - 2.1. Conditions
  - 2.2. Procedure
  - 2.3. Effects
3. Scope, content and application of the Framework Decision on conflicts of exercise jurisdiction in criminal proceedings

## **2. Instruments and case law**

### *a. Council of Europe*

[European Convention on the transfer of proceedings in criminal matters \(Strasbourg, 15.V.1972\)](#)

[European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters \(Strasbourg, 20.IV.1959\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Council Framework Decision 2009/948/JHA of 30 November 2009 on prevention and settlement of conflicts of exercise of jurisdiction in criminal proceedings \(OJ L 328/42; 15.12.2009\)](#)
2. [Initiative of the Kingdom of Belgium, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Republic of Estonia, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the French Republic, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, Republic of Hungary, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Romania, the Republic of Slovenia, the Slovak Republic and the Kingdom of Sweden for a Council Framework](#)

[Decision 2009/.../JHA of ... on transfer of proceedings in criminal matters \(OJ C 219/7; 12.9.2009\)](#)

3. [Council Framework Decision 2009/829/JHA of 23 October 2009 on the application, between Member States of the European Union, of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions on supervision measures as an alternative to provisional detention \(OJ L 294/20; 11.11.2009\)](#)
4. [Green Paper on conflicts of jurisdiction and the principle of ne bis in idem in criminal proceedings \(COM\(2005\) 696\)](#)
5. Art. 54 Schengen Convention
6. [Art. 50 Charta of fundamental rights](#)
7. [Initiative of the Hellenic Republic with a view to adopting a Council Framework Decision concerning the application of the 'ne bis in idem' principle \(OJ C 100/24; 26.4.2003\)](#)
8. [Convention between the Member states of the European Communities on Double Jeopardy of 25 May 1987](#)
9. [Agreement of 6 November 1990 between the member states of the European Communities on the transfer of proceedings in criminal matters](#)

### *c. Case law*

1. Case 17885/04, *Orchowski*, Judgment of 22 October 2009
2. Case 22635/03, *Sulejmanovic*, Judgment of 16 July 2009
3. C-491/07, *Turansky*, Judgement of 22 December 2008
4. Case C-297/07, *Bourquain*, Judgment of 11 December 2008
5. [Case C-367/05, \*Norma Kraaijenbrink\*, Judgment of 18 July 2007](#)
6. [Case C-288/05, \*Jürgen Kretzinger\*, Judgment of 18 July 2007](#)
7. [Case C-150/05, \*Rechtbank 's-Hertogenbosch\* Judgment of 28 September 2006](#)
8. [Case C-467/04, \*Gasparini\*, Judgment of 28 September 2006](#)
9. [Case C-436/04, \*van Esbroeck\*, Judgment of 9 March 2006](#)
10. [Case C-469/03, \*Mario Miraglia\*, Judgment of 10 March 2005](#)
11. [Cases C-187/01 and C-385/01, \*Gözütok and Brügge\*, Judgment of 11 February 2003](#)
12. Case-493703, *Hiebeler*, Reference for a preliminary ruling

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be EU experts and scholars.

#### **4. Trainees**

Training on the conflicts of jurisdiction is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

#### **5. Methodology**

##### *A) Training method*

Training methods recommended are training courses, basic seminars and distance learning courses.

##### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training on this legal instrument can be completed by e-learning.

##### *C) Priority*

Training is recommended

##### *D) Format*

The training format recommended national and EU-wide training.

### ***VII. Enforcement of foreign criminal sentences***

#### **1. Introduction**

In 1970, the Council of Europe provided a coherent legal framework establishing the rules under which it would be possible to enforce foreign criminal sentences. Despite its excellent technical quality, the proposed mechanism was not accepted due to its extreme complexity which led, in the end, to an insignificant number of ratifications. More or less the same reasons made the following attempt of the EU Member States equally unsuccessful: although a Convention on the same issue was signed in Brussels on 13 November 1991 which intended to complete and develop the principles contained in the former Council's of Europe Convention, the same lack of enthusiasm prevailed regarding its ratification. More recently, the development of the principle of mutual recognition in criminal matters opened the way to two major instruments, already into force, and related to the enforcement of financial penalties (2005) and confiscation orders (2006).

Closely related to this issue, and being also proposed to be dealt with in this same module are also:

[The Framework Decision 2008/947/JHA](#) on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions lays down rules according to which a Member State, other than the Member State in which the person concerned has been sentenced, recognises judgments and, where applicable, probation decisions and supervises probation measures imposed on the basis of a judgment, or alternative sanctions contained in such a judgment, and takes all other decisions relating to that judgment, unless otherwise provided for in this Framework Decision. The Framework Decision does not apply to the execution of judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty which fall within the scope of [Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA](#) (see below); the recognition and execution of financial penalties and confiscation orders which fall within the scope of [Council Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA](#) on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to financial penalties (see above) and [Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA](#) on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders (see above). Member States were asked to implement the Framework Decision by December 2011.

[The Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA](#) on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union establishes rules under which a Member State, with a view to facilitating the social rehabilitation of the sentenced person, is to recognise a judgment and enforce the sentence. Member States were asked to implement the Framework Decision by December 2011.

Another development for the trial phase is the adoption of the Framework Decision on taking account of convictions in the Member States of the European Union in the course of new criminal proceedings of August 2008. This Framework decision determines the conditions under which, in the course of criminal proceedings in a Member State against a person, previous convictions handed down against the same person for different facts in other

Member States, are taken into account. Member States were asked to implement the Framework Decision by August 2010.

The other main field in this area is the transfer of sentenced persons. In 1983, the Council of Europe Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons provided for the transfer of sentenced persons while the first EU instrument, the 1991 Convention on the enforcement of foreign criminal sentences of 1991, only provided for the transfer of the enforcement of custodial and pecuniary penalties. The latest EU instrument that has been adopted in November 2008 on this topic is a Framework Decision on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union. One of the major novelties of this Framework Decision is the possibility to impose the transfer without the agreement of the person concerned.

### *Training content*

Training on the legislative instruments with regard to sanctions should currently distinguish between the instruments in force and those being adopted but not yet implemented.

Training on mutual recognition of confiscation orders and financial penalties should focus on the scope, content, pros and cons of the Framework Decisions, problems with the application, best practice and case studies.

Training on the adopted mutual recognition instruments from the pre-trial to post-trial phase would, at this point of time, focus more on discussions and debates on their added value, expected obstacles and problems arising within the individual national legal systems, improvements to be expected, impact on fundamental rights and the rights of the defence.

As – depending on the case – the instruments to enforce foreign sentences may also involve the application of the European Arrest Warrant and the [Framework Decision 2009/299/JHA](#) (judgements in absentia), training on these instruments should be included..

1. Admissibility
2. International request formalities

### 3. Procedure

#### 4. The special case of transfer of sentenced persons

##### 4.1. Concept

##### 4.2. Conditions

##### 4.3. Sources

###### 4.3.1. 1983 COE Convention

###### 4.3.2. The Additional Protocol

###### 4.3.3. The Agreement between UE member States

###### 4.3.4. The Schengen Agreements

###### 4.3.5. The national Law

##### 4.4. Transfer to foreign countries

###### 4.4.1. Conditions

###### 4.4.2. Procedure

###### 4.4.4. Effects

##### 4.5. Transfer to own country

###### 4.5.1. Conditions

###### 4.5.2. Procedure

###### 4.5.3. Effects

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. General Council of Europe*

[Convention on the international validity of criminal judgments \(The Hague, 28.V.1970\)](#)

### *b. General EU*

[Convention between the Member states of the European Communities on the enforcement of foreign criminal sentences of 13.11.1991](#)

### *c. Transfer of sentenced persons*

1. [Council Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union \(OJ L 327/27; 5.12.2008\)](#)
2. EU Agreement on the application of the convention of transfer of sentenced persons of 25.05.1987

3. [Council of Europe's Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons of 21.3.1983](#)
4. [Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons of 18 December 1997](#)

*d. Others*

1. [Council Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union](#)
2. [Notification of a declaration of the United Kingdom to the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union and the European Commission regarding the implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/675/JHA of 24 July 2008 on taking account of convictions in the Member States of the European Union in the course of new criminal proceedings \(DG H 2B COPEN 214 EUROJUST 106 EJM 46 14750/10; 11.10.2010\)](#)
3. [Council Framework Decision 2008/675/JHA of 24 July 2008 on taking account of convictions in the Member States of the European Union in the course of new criminal proceedings \(OJ L 2220/32; 15.08.2008\)](#)
4. [Framework Decision 2008/947/JA on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions \(OJ L 337/102; 16.12.2008\)](#)
5. [Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA of 6 October 2006 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders \(OJ L 328/59, 24.11.2006\)](#)
6. [Council Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA of 24 February 2005 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to financial penalties \(OJ L 76/16; 22.3.2005\)](#)
7. [Council Framework Decision of 24 February 2005 on Confiscation of Crime-Related Proceeds, Instrumentalities and Property \(OJ L 68, 1.3.2005, P. 49\)](#)



8. [Green paper on the approximation, mutual recognition and enforcement of criminal sanctions in the European Union \(presented by the Commission\), \(30.04.2004, COM \(2004\) 334 final\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are international experts, EU experts, national practitioners, scholars and experts of NGOs.

### 4. Trainees

Concerning the several legislative instruments on mutual recognition and enforcement of criminal sanctions in the EU that are currently being discussed, trainees should have a high level of experience in the fields to be able to contribute to the debate. Thus, training on this topic is mainly recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of specialised seminars and workshops.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

With regard to the proposed instruments, complementary e-learning is not recommended.

#### *C) Priority*

Training on the existing Framework Decisions should have priority, training on the proposals is recommended.

#### *D) Format*

Training on the existing Framework Decisions can take place at a national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

Training (discussions and debate) on the proposals should take place EU-wide.

## *VIII. Exchanging criminal records*

### 1. Introduction

The former system of storage and exchange of criminal records of offences committed by their nationals was under critical scrutiny in a number of member states. In June 2006, Germany, France, Spain, Belgium, the Czech Republic and Luxembourg presented their common project on networking of national criminal registers providing for a secure electronic connection of their systems of national criminal records. At EU level, in 2005, the Council adopted a Decision on the exchange of information extracted from criminal records. The Decision of 2005 defines and extends the obligation of the convicting member states to transmit notice of convictions to the member state of nationality of the sentenced person; it also lays down the framework for a computerised conviction information exchange system. There is also a manual for procedure available which is intended to be a factual document to assist practitioners in making requests for information extracted from the criminal record of another Member State.

Additionally, in February 2009, the Council adopted a Framework Decision on the organisation and content of the exchange of information extracted from the criminal record between Member States which aims at improving the exchange of information on criminal convictions handed down against nationals of the Members States. The Framework Decision lays the ground rules for the mandatory transmission of information on convictions to the country of the person's nationality as well as for the storage of such information by that country and for the retransmission, upon request, to other Member States.

Furthermore, the legal basis for a European Criminal records Information System (ECRIS) has been established. The ECRIS system is operational since april 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012. It allows automated exchange of data between central criminal records and creates an obligation for Member States to use correlation tables (offences and sanctions) to transmit information on convictions. The information system does not allow direct access to the criminal records but will speed up the transmission of requests and replies.

### *Training content*

- Joint network
- Shortcomings of exchanging criminal records under the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in criminal Matters

- Scope, content, limitation of The Council Decision on the Exchange of Information Extracted from Criminal Records. Information on the manual of procedure.
- Scope, content, limitation of the Proposal for a Framework Decision on the Organisation and Content of the Exchange of Information Extracted from Criminal Record
- Functioning of the ECRIS
- Data protection issues

## 2. Instruments and case law

1. [Council of the European Union, Draft Manual for practitioners – ECRIS – Request for contributions \(DGH 2 B LIMITE COPEN 84 JURINFO 21 EJUSTICE 34; 19.4.2011\)](#)
2. [Council Decision 2009/316/JHA of 6 April 2009 on the establishment of the European Criminal Records Information System \(ECRIS\) in application of Article 11 of Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA \(OJ L 93, 7 April 2009, p. 33\)](#)
3. [Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA of 26 February 2009 on the organisation and content of the exchange of information extracted from the criminal record between Member States \(OJ L 93/23; 07.04.2009\)](#)
4. [Council Decision on the exchange of information extracted from criminal records – Manual of Procedure \(5459/09; 16.01.2009\)](#)
5. [Proposal for a Council Decision on the establishment of the European Criminal Records Information System \(ECRIS\) in application of Article 11 of Framework Decision 2008/XX/JHA \(Brussels, 27.5.2008; COM\(2008\) 332 final\)](#)
6. [Council Decision on the exchange of information extracted from criminal records – Manual of Procedure \(15 January 2007; 6397/5/06 REV 5\)](#)
7. [Council Decision 2005/876/JHA of 21 November 2005 on the exchange of information extracted from the criminal record \(OJ L 322/33, 9.12.2005\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended for the exchange of criminal records are EU experts and national practitioners.

## 4. Trainees

Given the in-depth knowledge and practical experience needed for this specialised topic, trainees should primarily be senior judges.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Given the very in-depth knowledge that is needed for this topic, the recommended training method should be a specialised seminar and/or workshop.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

E-learning can complete training on this legal instrument.

### *C) Priority*

With regard to the increasing cross-border cooperation in this regard, training on exchanging criminal records should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes national and EU-wide training.

## *IX. Institution and agencies*

### **IX.1 European Judicial Network (EJN)**

#### **1. Introduction**

On the basis of the 1997 Action Plan to combat organised crime the Council adopted a Joint Action on the creation of a European Judicial Network. Inaugurated on 25 September 1998 by the Austrian Minister of Justice, the EJN was the first practical structured mechanism of judicial co-operation in the EU to become truly operational.

The EJN gained particular significance in the context of the proclamation of the principle of direct contacts between competent judicial authorities. The EJN is composed of contact points of the member states, as well as of the European Commission and of a Secretariat based in The Hague.

National contact points are designated by each member state among central authorities in charge of international judicial cooperation, judicial authorities and other competent authorities with specific responsibilities in the field of international judicial cooperation, both in general and for certain forms of

serious crime, such as organised crime, corruption, drug trafficking or terrorism. Contact points have the task of facilitating judicial cooperation between member states, particularly in order to combat different forms of serious crime.

Other functions are: to provide the legal and practical information necessary for local authorities to prepare an effective request for judicial cooperation, as well as coordinating functions in cases where a series of requests from local judicial authorities in a member state needs coordinated action in another member state.

In December 2008, the Joint Action was replaced by [Council Decision 2008/976/JHA](#) which is more detailed than the Joint Action but mainly confirms the current functioning of the EJM. It also clarifies the relationship with Eurojust.

At the 32nd plenary meeting of the EJM, held in Prague, from 24 to 26 June 2009, Guidelines were adopted to provide guidance for the structure of the EJM according to the EJM Decision, as well as for the organisation of regional meetings.

The European Judicial Network Manual was adopted in the 33rd Plenary meeting of the EJM on the 23–24 November 2009. The main purpose of this document is to identify actions required in order to achieve objectives regarding EJM as stated by European legal instruments. The second purpose of the EJM Manual is to locate responsibility for required action.

In February 2010, the EJM launched a new tool on its website called the 'EJM Forum'. The EJM Forum is a discussion platform for EJM contact points as well as all interested legal practitioners. Its first topic of discussion deals with the use and gathering of foreign evidence obtained through mutual legal assistance in criminal proceedings.

Beginning of June 2011, the EJM has launched its restructured and redesigned website. The new website includes various new tools such as a Library or updates on the Member States' implementation of relevant EU instruments.

Over the past years, the EJM has also developed its links with other regional networks involved in the field of judicial co-operation in criminal matters (IberRed, Indian Ocean Commission...) and with non-EU States (Switzerland, Norway, Russian Federation).

### *Training content*

Training on the EJM should cover the following topics:

- How the EJM can better facilitate judicial cooperation between member states;
- How the EJM can provide legal and practical information necessary for the local authorities to prepare an effective request for judicial cooperation;
- Coordinating functions in cases where a series of requests from local judicial authorities in a member state needs coordinated action in another member state;
- Use of the EJM 'Compendium', a tool that allows all the local judicial authorities to execute a complete letter of request;
- Information tools about videoconferencing and secure telecommunication networks.

## 2. Instruments and case law

- [EJM Website](#)
- [EJM Forum](#)
- [EJM Forum Registration](#)
- [Guidelines](#)
- [European Judicial Network Manual](#)
- [Council Decision 2008/976/JHA of 16 December 2008 on the European Judicial Network \(OJ L 348, 24 December 2008, p. 130\)](#)
- [Joint Action on the Creation of a European Judicial Network \(OJ L 191/4, 07.07.1998\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts, national practitioners and experts of training institutions.

## 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors as well as future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

The ideal training method is a combination of basic seminars and workshops. The basic seminar will explain the role and competences of the EJM while during the working groups participants might have practical exercises on the use of the EJM compendium.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

### *C) Priority*

With regard to the role and powers of the EJM, training and working groups on the subject for judges and prosecutors should be a top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes local, regional and national training as well as study visits.

## IX.2 Liaison Magistrates

### 1. Introduction

In the light of the differences between member states' legal and judicial systems, in 1996 the Council adopted an act to increase the speed and effectiveness of judicial cooperation and at the same time facilitates better mutual understanding between systems.

The Joint Action established a framework for the posting or the exchange of magistrates or officials with special expertise in judicial cooperation procedures, referred to as 'liaison magistrates', between member states, on the basis of bilateral or multilateral arrangements.

[The Council Decision of 16 December 2008](#) provided for the possibility for Eurojust to second liaison magistrates to third States.

The tasks of liaison magistrates normally include activities designed to encourage and accelerate all forms of judicial cooperation in criminal and, where appropriate, civil matters, in particular by establishing direct links with the relevant departments and judicial authorities in the host state. Under arrangements agreed between the home member state and the host member state, liaison magistrates' tasks may also include any activity connected with handling the exchange of information and statistics designed to promote mutual understanding of the legal systems and legal data bases of the states concerned and to further relations between the legal professions in each of those states.

### *Training content*

Training contents should cover:

- Role and powers of the liaison magistrates
- How to best increase the speed and effectiveness of judicial cooperation in criminal matters via liaison magistrates
- Problems of translation and interpretation of legal terms
- Accelerating all forms of judicial cooperation in criminal matters establishing direct links with judicial authorities in the host state: problems and limits

## **2. Instruments and case law**

- a. [Council Decision 2009/426/JHA of 16 Dec. 2008 on the strengthening of Eurojust and amending Decision 2002/187/JHA \(OJ L 138/14; 4.6.2009\)](#)
- b. [96/277/JHA: Joint Action of 22 April 1996 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, concerning a framework for the exchange of liaison magistrates to improve judicial cooperation between the Member states of the European Union \(OJ L 105/1, 27.04.1996\)](#)

## **3. Trainers**

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts, and national practitioners (liaison magistrates).

## **4. Trainees**

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, future/trainee judges and prosecutors as well as junior liaison officers.



## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

The ideal training method would be a combination of basic seminars and workshops. The basic seminar would explain the role and competences of liaison magistrates while during the working groups participants could carry out practical exercises led by liaison magistrates.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

### *C) Priority*

With regard to the role and powers of the liaison magistrates, training and working groups on the subject should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes national, trans-national and EU-wide training.

## IX.3 OLAF

(see in addition: Chapter D – Protection of the financial interests of the Communities)

### 1. Introduction

OLAF was set up in 1999 with a view to expanding the scope and enhancing the effectiveness of action to combat fraud and other illegal activities detrimental to the Community's interests.

OLAF was given hybrid status: it is formally part of the Commission, enabling it to exercise Commission powers, but it enjoys functional autonomy, designed to make it operationally independent.

OLAF replaced the Task Force for Coordination of Fraud Prevention, which succeeded the Unit for the Coordination of Fraud Prevention (UCLAF), created in 1988 by the Commission within its Secretariat-General.

OLAF carries out external administrative investigations as part of the fight against fraud, corruption and any other illegal activity, which adversely affects the EU's financial interests. OLAF also carries out internal

administrative investigations. Furthermore OLAF helps in strengthening cooperation with the member states in the field of fraud prevention and develops strategies for the fight against fraud (preparing legislative and regulatory initiatives in the areas of activity of the office, including initiatives relating to instruments covered by Chapters 1, 4 and 5 of Title IV of Part Three of the TFEU.).

In the field of European criminal justice, OLAF maintains direct contacts with the police and judicial authorities.

OLAF Director-General adopted 'the Manual' that describes Operational Procedures – OLAF's internal rules and procedures. They explain the processes of investigations, operations and follow-up. They are not intended to have any legal force.

On 17<sup>th</sup> March 2011 the European Commission adopted a proposal to reform OLAF by improving the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of OLAF, while safeguarding its investigative independence. An important aspect of the proposal is the strengthening of the procedural guarantees for any person under investigation by OLAF. Besides each Member State will be asked to designate a contact point, which would facilitate the cooperation of national authorities with OLAF. The Commission has also proposed that if an investigation is not completed within 12 months, the Office should inform the Supervisory Committee of the reasons to extend this deadline. Furthermore, the Commission proposes that OLAF should be mandated to conclude administrative arrangements with competent services in third countries, in coordination with the European External Action Service and the relevant Commission services.

### *Training content*

- Developing and implementing effective investigative techniques: how to improve cooperation between judicial authorities and OLAF?
- The use of administrative investigation reports as evidence in national criminal proceedings;
- What are the barriers to effective cooperation between judicial authorities and how can they be overcome? Role and powers of OLAF.
- Improving exchange of information and cooperation in the EU: the internal and external investigations conducted by OLAF and links with national authorities.
- OLAF examples of networking and good practice in Member States.

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [OLAF website](#)
- b. [Amended Proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation \(EC\) No 1073/1999 concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-fraud Office \(OLAF\) and repealing Regulation \(EURATOM\) No 1074/1999 \(Brussels, 17.3.2011; COM\(2011\) 135 final\)](#)
- c. [OLAF Manual – Operational Procedures \(1.12.2009\)](#)
- d. [Practical Agreement on arrangements of cooperation between Eurojust and OLAF \(24.09.2008\)](#)
- e. Administrative arrangement between the European police office (EUROPOL) and the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF)
- f. [Regulation \(CE\) 1073/1999 of 25 May 1999 concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-fraud Office \(OJ L 136, 31.05.1999\)](#)
- g. [Regulation \(Euratom\) 1074/1999 of 25 May 1999 concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-fraud Office \(OJ L 136, 31.05.1999\)](#)
- h. [Interinstitutional Agreement of 25 May 1999 between the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the Commission of the European Communities concerning internal investigations by the European Anti-fraud Office \(OLAF\) \(OJ L 136, 31.05.1999\)](#)
- i. [Commission Decision 1999/352 of 28 April 1999 establishing the European Anti-fraud Office \(OLAF\) \(OJ L 136, 31.05.1999\)](#)
- j. [Article 325 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#)

For further legislation on the protection of the financial interests of the Communities, combating fraud and corruption, see Chapter D 'European criminal law'

## 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended for this topic should be EU experts, and national practitioners.

## 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

The ideal training method is a combination of basic seminars and workshops. A combined training on OLAF, protecting the financial interest of the European Union, counterfeiting of the Euro and corruption could also be a topic for training courses and distance learning courses.

Main topics of the seminar might be:

- a. The system of protecting the financial interests of the EU;
- b. Prevention and enforcement within the EU: improving exchange of information and cooperation in corruption and fraud investigations
- c. Prevention of corruption in the framework of international organisations – best practices in the Commission

The working groups should focus on concrete OLAF fraud and corruption cases and on concrete experiences made by prosecutors in member states.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

### *C) Priority*

With regard to the role and powers of OLAF, training and working groups on the subject should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes local, regional and national training.

## IX.4 Eurojust

### 1. Introduction

Eurojust is a body of the European Union competent to act in investigations and prosecutions relating to serious crime concerning at least two member states. Its role is to promote coordination between competent authorities in the member states but also to facilitate the implementation of international mutual legal assistance and of extradition requests. Eurojust also has a key role to play in the fight against terrorism.

Each member state must appoint a 'National Member' to Eurojust: a prosecutor, judge or police officer (the latter must have competencies equivalent to the judge or the prosecutor). The National Member is subject to the national law of the member state which appointed them. Furthermore, each member state determines the length of the term of office (At least 4 years since the entry into force of the entry into force of the 2009 Eurojust Decision) as well as the nature of the judicial powers conferred on its national representative.

Regarding investigations and prosecutions (concerning at least two member states) in relation to serious crime, Eurojust has competence for promoting coordination between the competent authorities of the various member states and facilitating the implementation of international mutual legal assistance –or mutual recognition– instruments and of extradition requests.

Eurojust may fulfil its tasks through one or more of the national members or as a College. Eurojust may ask the authorities of the member states concerned, inter alia, to undertake an investigation or prosecution or/and to set up a joint investigation team.

In December 2008, a new Council Decision to strengthen Eurojust has been adopted which shall harmonise and increase the powers of Eurojust's national members, strengthen Eurojust's College and promote cooperation with the European Judicial Network (EJN). The Council Decision includes new powers for Eurojust's national members, the reinforcement of their status, on-call coordination, and increased exchange of information with their national authorities. Eurojust's College will be able to issue formal recommendations –based on the *comply or explain* principle– on conflicts of jurisdiction, as well as on conflicts in the area of application. Finally, Eurojust's relations with partners such as Europol, third states and liaison magistrates are strengthened. A major change with regard to the exchange of data with Eurojust will be the establishment of a Eurojust National Coordination System (ENCS).

Since 2009, Eurojust awards grants for the financing of JITs for two common types of expenses, namely travel and accommodation costs and translation and interpretation costs.

Finally, Eurojust has several cooperation agreements and Memoranda of Understanding with several third states (Croatia, Iceland, FYROM, Norway, Switzerland, USA), as well as institutions (Cepol, Europol, IBER-RED, OLAF and the UNODC), and has the possibility to delegate liaison magistrates to third countries.

### *Training content*

Training should cover:

- New tasks of Eurojust
- Harmonised competences of its National Members
- New Competences of the College
- The Eurojust National Coordination System (ENCS)
- Jurisdiction of Eurojust
- Cooperation between Eurojust and national authorities: how to work together?
- Strengthening cooperation between Eurojust and national authorities;
- Judicial control of Eurojust's activities
- Using Eurojust to help fight organised crime
- Using Eurojust in cross border cases;
- Developing Eurojust's coordination powers
- Relationships between Eurojust and other EU Institutions (Europol, EJM, OLAF, etc.)
- Concrete case studies (support of Eurojust, double criminality issues, compliance with time limits)
- Future role of Eurojust

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [Eurojust Website](#)
- b. [http://www.eurojust.europa.eu/jit\\_funding.htm](http://www.eurojust.europa.eu/jit_funding.htm)
- c. [Memorandum of Understanding between Eurojust and UNODC](#)
- d. [Memorandum of Understanding between Eurojust and CEPOL](#)
- e. [Agreement between Eurojust and Europol](#)
- f. [Council Decision 2009/426/JHA of 16 Dec. 2008 on the strengthening of Eurojust and amending Decision 2002/187/JHA \(OJ L 138/14; 4.6.2009\)](#)

- g. [Council Decision of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime, OJ L 063/1, 06.03.2002 \(consolidated version\)](#)
- h. [Practical Agreement on arrangements of cooperation between Eurojust and OLAF \(24.09.2008\)](#)
- d. [Council Decision 2003/659/JHA of 18 June 2003 amending Decision 2002/187/JHA setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime \(OJ 2003 L 245/44; 29.9.2003\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts, and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Due to the reforms within Eurojust, this topic can currently be recommended for all, senior and junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

The ideal training method is a combination of basic seminars and workshops as well as study visits.

The workshop discussion should focus on concrete case studies, preferably using former cases that have been dealt with by Eurojust, double criminality issues, compliance with time limits, etc.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

#### *C) Priority*

With regard to the role and powers of Eurojust, training and working groups on the subject should be a top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes local, regional and national training.

## **IX.5 European Police Office (Europol)**

### **1. Introduction**

On 1 January 2010 Europol acquired a stronger mandate and new capabilities to fight international serious crime and terrorism. Europol is the European Law Enforcement Agency.

The Europol Convention has been replaced by a Council Decision. Although differences to the Convention are fairly limited, it is hoped that further reforms for Europol will be less cumbersome and more quickly achieved. Additionally, the European Parliament will be involved. Differences include an extension of the competence of Europol (abolition of the requirement of the existence of a criminal organisation involved in the case concerned). Europol is founded by EU. Various Decisions of the Council and of the Management Board of Europol have been adopted on 30 November 2009 in order to implement the new Europol Decision (2009/934/JHA, 2009/935/JHA, 2009/956/JHA).

The objective of Europol is to improve police cooperation between the EU-member states to combat terrorism, unlawful drug trafficking and other serious forms of international organised crime. Europol takes action when one or two EU-member states are affected by serious international crime. Europol does not have executive powers. It cannot detain individuals nor can it conduct home searches. Its task is to facilitate the exchange of information, analyse it and coordinate operations involving several member states.

As part of police cooperation between the member states, Europol facilitates the exchange of information between them, it collates and analyses information and intelligence, it aids investigations, it maintains a computerised system of information collected, it helps to train members of the competent authorities and it facilitates technical assistance between member states.



*Training content*

- Role and tasks of Europol
- Cooperation between Europol and national authorities: how to work together?
- Strengthening cooperation between Europol and national authorities
- Judicial control of Europol's activities
- Using Europol to help fight organised crime
- Using Europol in cross border cases
- Relationships between Europol and other EU Institutions (Eurojust, EJM, OLAF, etc.)
- Participation of Europol in Joint Investigation Teams
- Europol information systems
- Concrete case studies
- The future of Europol: role and powers

**2. Instruments and case law**

- a. [Europol Website](#)
- b. [OCTA 2011](#)
- c. [Europol Work Programme 2011 \(11 October 2010; 10098/10\)](#)
- d. [The State of Internal Security in the EU – A Joint Report by EUROPOL, EUROJUST and FRONTEX](#)
- e. [Council Decision 2009/935/JHA of 30 November 2009 determining the list of third States and organisations with which Europol shall conclude agreements \(OJ L 325/12; 11.12.2009\)](#)
- f. [Council Decision 2009/936/JHA of 30 November 2009 adopting the implementing rules for Europol analysis work files \( OJ L 325/14;11.12.2009\)](#)
- g. [Council Decision 2009/968/JHA of 30 November 2009 adopting the rules on the confidentiality of Europol information \(OJ L 332/17; 17.12.2009\)](#)
- h. [Council Decision 2009/934/JHA of 30 November 2009 adopting the implementing rules governing Europol's relations with partners, including the exchange of personal data and classified information \(OJ L 325/6; 11.12.2009\)](#)
- i. [Decision of the Management Board of Europol of 8 July 2009 laying down the rules concerning access to Europol documents](#)

- j. [Council Decision of 6 April 2009 establishing the European Police Office \(Europol\)](#)
- k. [The Protocol drawn up on the basis of Article 43\(1\) of the Convention on the establishment of a European Police Office \(Europol Convention\) amending that Convention – \(the ‘Money Laundering Protocol’\) \(Official Journal C 358, 13/12/2000 P. 0002 – 0007\)](#)
- l. [The Protocol amending the Convention on the establishment of a European Police Office \(Europol Convention\) and the Protocol on the privileges and immunities of Europol, the members of its organs, the deputy directors and the employees of Europol – \(the ‘JIT Protocol’\) \(Official Journal C 312, 16/12/2002 P. 0002 – 0007\)](#)
- m. [The Protocol drawn up on the basis of Article 43\(1\) of the Convention on the Establishment of a European Police Office \(Europol Convention\), amending that Convention – \(the ‘Danish Protocol’\) \(Official Journal C 002, 06/01/2004 P. 0003 – 0012\)](#)
- n. [The Convention based on Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, on the establishment of a European Police Office \(Europol Convention\) \(Official Journal C 316, 27/11/1995 P. 0002 – 0032\)](#)
- o. [The Council Decision of 3 December 1998 supplementing the definition of the form of crime ‘traffic in human beings’ of the Convention on the establishment of a European Police Office \(Europol Convention\) \(Official Journal C 26, 30/01/1999 P. 0021\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts, and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training methods are basic seminars as well as study visits.

The seminar should give a comprehensive overview of the role and tasks as well as the reforms that are envisaged for Europol. Role and powers of police officers, judges and prosecutors should be analysed in this context.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

### *C) Priority*

Given the role and powers of Europol, training and working groups on the subject should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes local, regional and national training.

## **IX.6 European Public Prosecutor**

### **1. Introduction**

According to Article 86 TFEU in order to combat crimes affecting the financial interests of the Union, the Council, by means of regulations adopted in accordance with a special legislative procedure, may establish a European Public Prosecutor's Office from Eurojust. The Council shall act unanimously after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament.

The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be responsible for investigating, prosecuting and bringing to judgment, where appropriate in liaison with Europol, the perpetrators of, and accomplices in, offences against the Union's financial interests. It shall exercise the functions of prosecutor in the competent courts of the Member States in relation to such offences.

The regulations referred to in Article 86 TFEU shall determine the general rules applicable to the European Public Prosecutor's Office, the conditions governing the performance of its functions, the rules of procedure applicable to its activities, as well as those governing the admissibility of evidence, and the rules applicable to the judicial review of procedural measures taken by it in the performance of its functions.

In September 2010, Eurojust in cooperation with the Belgian Presidency organised a strategic seminar "[Eurojust and the Lisbon Treaty: towards more effective action](#)". Director General of the Directorate-General for Justice of the

European Commission, Françoise Le Bail, who attended the seminar, informed the participants that Vice-President and Commissioner, Viviane Reding, had already announced her intention to put forward a proposal for the establishment of an EPPO during her mandate.

In a Communication from May 2011 on the protection of the financial interests of the European Union by criminal law and by administrative investigations, the European Commission underlined that a thorough analysis will be conducted on the ways in which the European structures need to be reinforced to deal with criminal investigative measures: “a specialised European prosecution authority such as a European Public Prosecutor's Office could contribute to establishing a common level playing field by applying common rules on fraud and other offences against the financial interests of the Union in a consistent and homogeneous way, investigating, prosecuting and bringing to court the perpetrators of, and accomplices in offences against the Union's financial interests”

It seems likely that any initiative seeking to establish a European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) would limit its mandate to the Protection of Financial Interests of the Union.

In any event, the wording of article 86 TFUE (“from Eurojust”) raises numerous questions regarding the structure of the EPPO, whether centralised or decentralised, based on the college of Eurojust or on a more hierarchical structure.

### *Training content*

Training at this point in time would focus on policy debates on the pros and cons of such an Office:

- General institutional questions related to the establishment of the EPP
- The scope of competence of the EPP
- Cooperation between the EPP and national authorities: how to deal with mixed cases?
- Diversity of national rules on evidence – is the mutual admissibility of evidence feasible?
- Cooperation with other competent EU organs
- The EPP in the context of the reform of the European institutions

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [Communication from the commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the protection of the financial interests of the European Union by criminal law and by administrative investigations – An integrated policy to safeguard taxpayers' money, COM \(2011\) 293](#)
- b. [Eurojust and the Lisbon Treaty: Towards more effective action Conclusions of the strategic seminar organised by Eurojust and the Belgian Presidency \(Bruges, 20–22 September\) \(17625/10; 8.12.2010\)](#)
- c. [The European Public Prosecutor's Office in the European judicial area \(Brussels, 15 April 2010; 8614/10\)](#)
- d. Art. 86 of [Consolidated version of Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#)
- e. [Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007 \(OJ C 306/01; 17.12.2007\)](#)
- f. [Follow-up Report on the Green Paper on the criminal-law protection of the financial interests of the Community and the establishment of a European Prosecutor \(COM\(2003\) 128 final\)](#)
- g. [Green Paper on criminal-law protection of the financial interests of the Community and the establishment of a European Prosecutor \(COM \(2001\) 715 final; 11.12.2001\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts, national practitioners and scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Policy debates on this topic can be especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Specialised seminars in the form of policy debates.

*B) Complementary e-learning*

At this point in time, e-learning is not recommended.

*C) Priority*

Considering that the office so far is only under discussion, information on the state of play only is recommended.

*D) Format*

The training format recommended includes national and EU-wide training.

# *Chapter C*

## *European Criminal Procedure*

### *I. Procedural rights*

#### **1. Introduction**

With a view to facilitating application of the principle of mutual recognition, in 2003 the Commission issued a Green Paper in which it examined whether it was appropriate and necessary to introduce in EU member states common minimum standards for procedural safeguards for persons suspected or accused of, and prosecuted or sentenced for, criminal offences. In its Green Paper, the Commission came to the conclusion that, at this stage, priority should be given to the following fundamental rights: the right to legal assistance and representation; the right to an interpreter or translator; the right of vulnerable groups to proper protection; the right of nationals of other member states and of third countries to consular assistance; and the right to information about rights. In 2004, the Hague Programme reaffirmed the mutual recognition principle and called for measures to secure and strengthen it, including the establishment of minimum safeguards for persons facing criminal investigation. The Commission's proposal for a Framework Decision on certain procedural rights in criminal proceedings throughout the EU of 2004 is to be understood in this context. The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR), with which all EU member states comply, serves as the starting point for the regulations contained in the Framework Decision. The Framework Decision was to adopt certain fundamental judicial rights from the ECHR. Furthermore, it was to accord rights not provided for in the ECHR, for example to persons in respect of whom a European arrest warrant has been issued. Since a Framework Decision must be agreed to by all EU member states, the contents and scope of the minimum standards was to be reflected in the national legal systems, thereby enhancing compliance with these standards by criminal prosecution authorities and courts. Furthermore, the Court of Justice of the European Communities (ECJ) was to be authorised during on-going criminal proceedings to examine whether member states are complying with the requirements of the Framework Decision. Thus, such an examination could be undertaken only by the national courts or, after the

exhaustion of all domestic remedies, by the European Court of Human Rights.

However, a number of problems have been encountered in discussing the document. In May 2006, after 18 months of discussion, the Commission's proposal was replaced by a proposal drawn up by the Austrian Presidency. This proposal was again replaced by a draft text drawn up by the German Presidency. This text was more limited than the Commission's original proposal as certain member states could not accept the text as this would have meant very major changes to their criminal legislation. Nevertheless, no agreement had been reached.

One first new attempt in the direction to enhance the procedural rights in the EU was made in March 2009 with the adoption of Council Framework Decision 2009/2099/JHA. This Framework Decision modifies the existing ones on mutual recognition (EAW, financial penalties, confiscation orders, custodial sentences, supervision of probation measures) with regard to the ground for non-recognition related to cases where the decision to be executed was rendered in the absence of the person concerned at the trial. It aims at harmonising and bringing more details to these grounds for non recognition as well as to the exceptions.

Finally, in 2009, under the Swedish Presidency, EU justice ministers finally agreed on a roadmap to foster protection of suspected and accused persons in criminal proceedings. By means of a step-by-step approach, the roadmap outlines six measures (A. Right to interpretation and translation; B. Information on rights and information about the charges; C. Legal advice and legal aid; D. Communication with relatives, employers and consular advice; E. Special safeguards for vulnerable suspects and accused persons; F. Green Paper on Pre-Trial Detention) to be introduced one after the other in the years to come.

The year 2010 then saw the adoption of the first measure under the roadmap, a Directive on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings.

The adoption of the second measure, the Directive on the right to information in criminal proceedings introducing the so-called "Letter of



Rights” was expected for July 2011. Finally the Council adopted in April 2012 the [Directive on the right to information in criminal proceedings \(PE-CONS 78/11\)](#). On 13 December 2011, the European Parliament gave its green light to the compromise text reached between both institutions.

On 8 June 2011, the Commission has issued the third measure of the roadmap, a Proposal for a Directive on the right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and on the right to communicate upon arrest. The proposal is currently under discussion in the European Parliament and in the Council.

### *Training content*

The new Directives on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings and on the right to information in criminal proceedings will require in-depth training for judges.

The on-going debate on potential EU legislation as well as information about the pros and cons of such legislation should be included in the training on procedural rights.

Further training on procedural rights in the EU, should encompass the regulations set up under the European Convention of Human Rights and the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights (*see Chapter F ‘Human Rights’*).

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

- [European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950 \(ETS No. 5\)](#)

### *b. ECHR Case law:*

Right to a fair, speedy and impartial trial (Article 6 ECHR)

- *Case Shabelnik vs. Ukraine, 19 February 2009*
- *Case Panovits vs. Cyprus, 11 December 2008*
- *Case Salduz v. Turkey, 27 November 2008*

- *Cases Scordino, Riccardi Pizzati, Music, Giuseppe Mostacciuolo, Coccharella, Apicell, Ernesto Zullo and Giuseppa and Orestina Procaccini v. Italy, 29 March 2006*
- *Case Pisano v. Italy, 24 October 2002*
- *Cases T. and V. vs. United Kingdom, 16 December 1999.*
- *Case Incal v. Turkey, 9 June 1998*
- *Case Sekina v. Austria, 25 August 1993*
- *Case Hausschildt v. Denmark, 24 May 1989*
- *Case Brozicek v. Italy, 19 December 1989*
- *Case Salabiaku, 7 October 1988*
- *Case Ekbatani v. Sweden, 26 May 1988*
- *Cases Lutz, Englert, Nölkenbockhoff v. Germany, 25 August 1987*
- *Case Colozza and Rubinat v. Italy, 12 February 1985*
- *Case Campbell and Fell v. UK, 28 June 1984*
- *Case Goddi v. Italy, 9 April 1984*
- *Case Piersack v. Belgium, 1 October 1982*
- *Case Eckle v. Germany, 15 July 1982*
- *Case Engel and others v. the Netherlands, 8 June 1976*
- *Case Ringeisen v. Austria, 16 July 1971*

### ***1. The right to fair trial and the interpretative activity of the European Court of Human Rights:***

- *Case Doorson vs. Holland, 26 March 1996.*
- *Case Artico vs. Italy, 13 May 1980.*
- *Case De Wilde, Ooms y Versyp vs. Belgium, 18 June 1971.*
- *Case Wemhoff vs. Germany, 27 June 1968.*

### ***2. The right to judge predetermined by law.***

- *Case Dorozhko and Pozharskiy vs. Estonia, 24 April 2008.*
- *Case Mathony vs. Luxemburg, 15 February 2007.*
- *Case Whitfield, Pewter, Gaskin and Clarke vs. United Kingdom, 12 April 2005.*
- *Case Brudnicka and others vs. Poland, 3 March 2005.*
- *Case Pesador Valero vs. Spain, 17 June 2003.*

- *Case Kleyn and others vs. Holland, 6 May 2003.*
- *Case Castillo Algar vs. Spain, 28 October 1998.*
- *Case Pullar vs. United Kingdom, 10 June 1996.*
- *Case Procola vs. Luxemburg, 28 September 1995.*
- *Case Albert et Le Compte vs. Belgium, 10 February 1983.*

### ***3. The right to an independent and impartial tribunal.***

- 
- *Case Dorozhko and Pozharskiy vs. Estonia, 24 April 2008.*
- *Case Mathony vs. Luxemburg, 15 February 2007.*
- *Case Whitfield and others vs. United Kingdom, 12 April 2005.*
- *Case Brudnika vs. Poland, 3 March 2005.*
- *Case Pesador Valero vs. Spain, de 17 June 2003.*
- *Case Lavents vs. Latvia, 28 November 2002.*
- *Case Gosç vs. Turkey, 11 July 2002.*
- *Case Garrido Guerrero vs. Spain, 2 March 2000.*
- *Case Castillo Algar vs. Spain, 28 October 1998.*
- *Case Pullar vs. United Kingdom, 10 June 1996.*
- *Case Procola vs. Luxemburg, 28 September 1995.*

### ***4. The right to a criminal trial with all the guarantees.***

#### ***4.1 The right to a public trial.***

- *Case Campos Damasco vs. Portugal, 24 April 2008.*
- *Case Abrahamian vs. Austria, 10 April 2008.*
- *Case Z vs. Finland, 25 February 2007.*
- *Case Birnleitner vs. Austria, 24 February 2005.*
- *Case Ernst vs. Austria, 15 July 2003.*
- *Case Meftah and others vs. France, 26 July 2002.*
- *Cases T and V vs. United Kingdom, 16 December 1999.*
- *Case Pauger vs. Austria, 28 May 1997.*
- *Case Helmers vs. Sweden, 29 October 1991.*
- *Case Jan Ake Anderson vs. Sweden, 29 October 1991.*
- *Case Leconte, Van Leuven and De Meyere vs. Belgium, 10 February 1983.*

#### ***4.2 The right to presumption of innocence.***

- *Case Jalloh vs. Germany, 11 July 2006.*
- *Case X vs. France, 20 December 2005.*
- *Case Radio France vs. France, 30 March 2004.*
- *Case Hewitson vs. United Kingdom, 27 May 2003.*
- *Case M.M. vs. Holland, 8 April 2003.*
- *Case Allan vs. United Kingdom, 5 November 2002.*
- *Case Böhmer vs. Germany, 3 October 2002.*
- *Case Telfner vs. Austria, 20 March 2001.*
- *Case Valenzuela Contreras vs. Spain, 30 July 1998.*
- *Case Allenet de Ribemont vs. France, 10 February 1995.*
- *Case Kruslin vs. France, 24 April 1990.*
- *Case Barberà Messegue and Jabardo vs. Spain, 6 December 1988.*
- *Case Salabiaku vs. France, 7 October 1988.*

#### **4.3. The right to know the nature and cause of the accusation.**

- *Case Galuashvili vs. Georgia, 17 July 2008.*
- *Case Saadi vs. United Kingdom, 29 January 2008.*
- *Case Sipavicius vs. Lithuania, 21 February 2002.*
- *Case Dallos vs. Hungary, 1 March 2001.*
- *Case Vaudelle vs. France, 30 January 2001.*
- *Case Pélissier and Sassi vs. France, 25 March 1999.*
- *Case Steel and others vs. United Kingdom, 23 September 1998.*
- *Case Brozicek vs. Italy, 19 December 1989.*

#### **4.4 The right against self-incrimination.**

- *Case Sequeira vs. Portugal, 20 October 2009.*
- *Case Ramanauskas vs. Lithuania, 5 February 2008.*
- *Case Shanon vs. United Kingdom, 4 October 2005.*
- *Case Blanca Rodríguez Porto vs. Spain, 22 March 2005.*
- *Case Weh vs. Austria, 8 April 2004.*
- *Case Allan vs. United Kingdom, 5 November 2002.*
- *Case Cónka vs. Belgium, 5 May 2002.*
- *Case J.B. vs. Switzerland, 3 May 2001.*
- *Case Averill vs. United Kingdom, 6 June 2000.*

- *Case Saunders vs. United Kingdom, 17 December 1996.*
- *Case Murray vs. United Kingdom, 8 February 1996.*

#### **4.5 The Right to a free assistance of an interpreter.**

- *Case Hermi vs. Italy, 28 October 2006.*
- *Case Kamasinski vs. Austria, 19 December 1989.*
- *Case Luedicke, Belkacem y Koç vs. Germany, 28 September 1978.*

#### **4.6 The right to equality of arms.**

- *Case Steel and Morris vs. United Kingdom, 12 February 2005.*
- *Case Borgers vs. Belgium, 30 October 2001.*
- *Case Platakou vs. Greece, 11 January 2001.*
- *Case Berger vs. France, 3 December 2000.*
- *Case Niedbala vs. Poland, 4 July 2000.*
- *Case Koupila vs. Finland, 27 April 2000.*
- *Case Ankerl vs. Switzerland, 23 October 1996.*
- *Case Dombo Beher vs. Holland, 27 October 1993.*
- *Case Lamy vs. Belgium, 30 March 1989.*

#### **4.7 The right to legal assistance.**

- *Case Lanz vs. Austria, 31 January 2002.*
- *Case Meftah vs. France, 26 April 2001.*
- *Case Göç vs. Turkey, 9 November 2000.*
- *Case Biba vs. Greece, 26 September 2000.*
- *Case Dikme vs. Turkey, 11 July 2000.*
- *Case Schöpfer vs. Switzerland, 20 May 1998.*
- *Case Van Mechelen and others vs. Holland, 23 April 1997.*
- *Case Benham vs. United Kingdom, 10 June 1996.*
- *Case Tripodi vs. Italy, 24 February 1994.*
- *Case Edwards vs. United Kingdom, 16 December 1992.*
- *Case Croissant vs. Germany, 25 September 1992.*
- *Case S. vs. Switzerland, 28 November 1991.*
- *Case Quaranta vs. Switzerland, 28 March 1990.*
- *Case Kamasinski vs. Austria, 19 December 1989.*

- *Case Pakelli vs. Germany, 25 April 1983.*

#### **4.8 The right of the accused to appear at trial.**

- *Case Da Luz Domingues Ferreira vs. Belgium, 24 May 2007.*
- *Case Kaya vs. Austria, 8 June 2006.*
- *Case Sejdivic vs. Italy, 1 March 2006.*
- *Case Harizi vs. France, 20 March 2005.*
- *Case Sejdivic vs. Italy, 10 November 2004.*
- *Case Meftah and others vs. France, 26 July 2002.*
- *Case Medenica vs. Switzerland, 14 July 2001.*
- *Case Krombach vs. France, 13 February 2001.*
- *Case Van Geyseghen vs. Belgium, 21 January 1999.*
- *Case Zana vs. Turkey, 25 November 1996.*
- *Case Poitrimol vs. France, 23 November 1993.*
- *Case Llaloch vs. Holland, 23 November 1993.*
- *Case Kremzov vs. Austria, 21 September 1993.*
- *Case F.C.B. vs. Italy, 28 August 1991.*
- *Case Colozza vs. Italy, 12 February 1985.*

#### **4.9 The right to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence. In particular the right to examine or have examined witnesses.**

- *Case Bocos-Cuesta vs. Holland, 10 November 2005.*
- *Case Mild and Virtanu vs. Finland, 26 July 2005.*
- *Case Rachdad vs. France, 12 November 2003.*
- *Case S.N. vs. Sweden, 2 July 2002.*
- *Case P.S. vs. Germany, 20 December 2001.*
- *Case Lucà vs. Italy, 27 February 2001.*
- *Case A.M. vs. Italy, 14 December 1999.*
- *Case Asch vs. Austria, 26 April 1999.*
- *Case Van Mechelen Case Doorson vs. Holland, 26 March 1996.*
- *Case Lüdi vs. Switzerland, 15 June 1992.*
- *Case Vidal vs. Belgium, 22 April 1992.*
- *Case Isgró vs. Italy, 19 February 1991.*
- *Case Kostovski vs. Holland, 20 November 1989.*

#### 4.10 *The right to know the reasons of the decision of the Tribunal.*

- *Case Gouru vs. Greece, 20 March 2009.*
- *Case Benderskiy vs. Ukraine, 15 November 2007.*
- *Case Boldea vs. Romania, 15 February 2007.*
- *Case Alija vs. Greece, 7 April 2005.*
- *Case Hirvisaari vs. Finland, 27 September 2001.*
- *Case Jahnke and Lenoble vs. France, 29 August 2000.*
- *Case Ruiz vs. Spain, 21 January 1999.*
- *Case Higgins vs. France, 19 February 1998.*
- *Case Hiro Balani vs. Spain, 19 December 1994.*
- *Case Van den Hurk vs. Holland, 19 April 1994.*
- *Case Delcourt vs. Belgium, 17 January 1970.*

#### 4.11 *The right that the process is conducted in a reasonable time.*

- *Case Rizzotto vs. Italy, 24 April 2008.*
- *Case Intiva vs. Turkey, 24 May 2005.*
- *Case Gorolov and Rousiaiev vs. Russia, 17 March 2005.*
- *Case Lutz vs. France, 17 June 2003.*
- *Case Laine vs. France, 17 January 2002.*
- *Case Cultraro vs. Italy, 27 February 2001.*
- *Case Pirón vs. France, 14 November 2000.*
- *Case García vs. France, 26 September 2000.*
- *Case Bertín–Mourot vs. France, 2 August 2000.*
- *Case Péllisier and Sassi vs. France, 25 March 1999.*
- *Case Laino vs. Italy, 18 February 1999.*
- *Case Mavronichis vs. Cyprus, 24 April 1998.*
- *Case A. and others vs. Denmark, 8 February 1997.*
- *Case Venditelli vs. Italy, 18 July 1994.*
- *Case Muti vs. Italy, 23 March 1994.*
- *Case Scopelliti vs. Italy, 23 November 1993.*
- *Case Dobbertin vs. France, 25 February 1992.*
- *Case Vernillo vs. France, 20 February 1991.*
- *Case Hache vs. France, 24 October 1989.*
- *Case Pretto vs. Italy, 8 December 1983.*

*c. EU*

1. [Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the right to information in criminal proceedings \(Brussels, 9.03.2012; PE-CONS 78/11; 2010/0215 \(COD\)\)](#)
2. [Proposal for a Directive on the right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and on the right to communicate upon arrest \(8 June 2011; COM\(2011\) 326/3\)](#)
3. [Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings \(OJ L 280/1; 26.10.2010\)](#)
4. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the right to information in criminal proceedings \(Brussels, 20.7.2010; COM\(2010\) 392 final; 2010/0215 \(COD\)\)](#)
5. [Project of the Maastricht University: Effective Criminal Defence Rights in Europe](#)
6. [Taru Spronken and Marelle Attinger: Procedural Rights in Criminal Proceedings: Existing Level of Safeguards in the European Union](#)
7. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the rights to interpretation and to translation in criminal proceedings – Summary of the detailed statement in accordance with Article 5 of Protocol No 2 to the Lisbon Treaty \(Brussels, 16 December 2009,16801/09\)](#)
8. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the rights to interpretation and to translation in criminal proceedings – Explanatory memorandum \(\(Brussels, 15 December 2009,16801/09\)](#)
9. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the rights to interpretation and to translation in criminal proceedings \(\(Brussels, 11 December 2009,16801/09\)](#)
10. [Resolution of the Council of 30 November 2009 on a Roadmap for strengthening procedural rights of suspected or accused persons in criminal proceedings \(OJ C 295/1; 4.12.2009\)](#)
11. [Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings – IMPACT ASSESSMENT{COM\(2009\) 338 final; SEC\(2009\) 916}](#)
12. [Council Framework Decision 2009/299/JHA of 26 February 2009 amending Framework Decisions 2002/584/JHA, 2005/214/JHA, 2006/783/JHA, 2008/909/JHA and 2008/947/JHA, thereby](#)



[enhancing the procedural rights of persons and fostering the application of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions rendered in the absence of the person concerned at the trial \(OJ L 81, 27.03.2009\)](#)

13. [Commission Green Paper Procedural safeguards for suspects and defendants in criminal proceedings throughout the European Union \(COM\(2003\) 75 final\)](#)

#### *d. Case law ne bis in idem*

1. C-261/09 (judgment) ne bis in idem – Mantello, Judgment
2. C-288/05 (judgment) ne bis in idem – Jürgen Kretzinger
3. C-150/05 (judgment) ne bis in idem – van Straaten
4. C-467/04 (opinion) ne bis in idem – Gasparini and others
5. C-436/04 (judgment) ne bis in idem – van Esbroeck
6. C-469/03 (judgment) ne bis in idem – Miraglia
7. C-385/01 (judgment) ne bis in idem – Gözütok and Brügge

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### **4. Trainees**

Training on procedural rights provided under the Council of Europe legislation and the ECHR jurisdiction is primarily recommended for junior judges and prosecutors and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

Training in the form on the Framework Decision for in absentia judgements is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Training on procedural rights should take the shape of specialised seminars.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Recommended for training on the Council of Europe's legislation and the ECHR's jurisdiction.

### *C) Priority*

Training on the Council of Europe legislation and the ECHR's jurisdiction is recommended.

### *D) Format*

Training can take part at national and EU-wide level.

Discussion and debate about possible EU legislation should take place EU-wide.

## *II. Victims / Restorative justice*

### **1. Introduction**

Concerns for victims of crime have emerged in the context of the United Nations in the 1980s. Already in the VI. UN Congress for the prevention of crime and the offender, held in Caracas, experts were asked to address the problem of crime victims from the point of view of international law. The VII. Congress for the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, held in Milan in August and September 1985, recommended to the General Assembly the elaboration of a declaration on the rights of victims.

At the level of the Council of Europe, the rights of victims were dealt with for the first time in 1983 in under the Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes. Victims' rights are also mentioned in [the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings of 2005](#) as well as in the [Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism of 2005](#). Two recommendations deal with the right of victims, the most recent ones adopted in 2008 (R(85)11 and R(2006)08). The need to protect the victim's rights was also especially addressed in a Resolution on victims of crimes of October 2006. In 2008, guidelines on mediation in penal matters were set up.

At the level of the European Union, procedural penal rights of victims is so far addressed by [the Framework Decision on the standing of victims in criminal procedures of 2001](#). Compensation by civil law is addressed in a Directive of 2004. The Directive, however, only refers to the laws of the member states. Under the newly appointed Commission, the rights of victims are one of the top priorities. Hence, the Commission has begun to carry out a wide ranging impact assessment to consider what legislative and practical

measures to take in 2011 to further improve the position of victims. This is shown by several instruments currently discussed: first, the Proposal to update the Directive on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography that shall improve criminal action against perpetrators and update the protection of victims. In particular, the proposal aims at covering new forms of crime such as grooming. Second, the [Framework Decision on standing of victims in criminal proceedings of 15 March 2001 \(2001/220/JHA\)](#) and [the Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 29 April 2004 relating to compensating to crime victims are under review by the European Commission](#). Third, the initiative for a European Protection Order that would extend judicial protection across the EU for victims of violence or someone under the threat of violence.

On 13 December 2011, the [Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Protection Order](#) was adopted. Additionally, by letter of 20 May 2011 the Commission submitted to the Council and to the European Parliament a proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters. The objective of this proposal is to establish a legal framework to ensure that all protection measures taken in a member state benefit from an efficient mechanism of recognition to ensure their free circulation throughout the EU. It also aims at complementing the European Protection Order ("EPO Directive"), which covers protection orders in criminal matters.

On 18 May 2011, the European Commission released a legislative package aiming at strengthening the rights of victims in the EU. The package contains two legislative proposals, one Proposal in criminal matters for a Directive establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and one Proposal in civil matters for a Regulation on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters. Furthermore, the package includes a Communication making further reference to specific concerns and future action in the area of civil law, especially with regard to victims of road traffic offences.

## **Restorative justice**

The broader area of restorative justice, at EU level, so far, is only regulated by Article 10 of the Framework Decision on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings that refers to mediation. Nevertheless, training on restorative justice measures must be kept in mind for the future.

## *Training content*

Training should include the regulations made by the Council of Europe regulation and especially undertaken within the EU Framework Decision on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings. Attention should also be paid to the regulations in Article 10 of this provision.

## **2. Instruments and case law**

### *a. Council of Europe*

1. [Recommendation No. R \(2006\)16 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on quality improvement programmes for organ donation \(8.11.2006\)](#)
2. [Recommendation Rec \(2006\) 8 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on assistance to crime victims](#)
3. [Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
4. [Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
5. [Guidelines on the Protection of Victims of Terrorist Acts \(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 2 March 2005 at the 917th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies\)](#)
6. [Recommendation No. R \(99\) 19 of the Committee of Ministers to member States concerning mediation in penal matters](#)
7. [Recommendation No. R \(87\) 20 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on social reactions to juvenile delinquency](#)
8. [Recommendation No. R \(87\) 21 of the committee of ministers to member states on assistance to victims and the prevention of victimisation](#)
9. [Recommendation No. R \(85\) 11 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the position of the victim in the framework of criminal law and procedure \(28 June 1985\)](#)
10. [European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes \(Strasbourg, 24.XI.1983\)](#)

11. [Resolution \(77\) 27 on the compensation of victims of crime \(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 28 September 1977, at the 275th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies\)](#)

*b. EU*

1. [DIRECTIVE 2011/99/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order \(OJ L 338/2; 21/21/2011\)](#)
2. [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters \(2011/0130 \(COD\)\)](#)
3. [Putting Victims first – Better protection and support for victims of crime – Speech held by Vice-President of the European Commission, EU Justice Commissioner Viviane Reding at ERA on 09 June 2011](#)
4. [Proposal for a Directive establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime](#)
5. [Proposal for a Regulation on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters](#)
6. [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – Strengthening victims' rights in the EU \(COM\(2011\) 274/2\)](#)
7. [Amendment 231, Draft report on the initiative for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Protection Order \(23.11.2010, 2010/0802\(COD\)\)](#)
8. [Initiative for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Protection Order \(Brussels, 19 April 2010; 8703/10\)](#)
9. [Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings, and protecting victims, repealing Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA \(Com\(2009\) 136 final, 25.03.2009\)](#)
10. [Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, repealing Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA \(COM\(2009\)135 final; 25.3.2009\)](#)

11. [Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13, 20.1.2004\)](#)
12. [Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 29 April 2004 relating to compensation to crime victims \(OJ L 261/15, 6.8.2004\)](#)
13. [Green Paper – Compensation to crime victims \(Brussels, 28 September 2001\)](#)
14. [Council Framework Decision of 15 March 2001 on the standing of victims in criminal procedures \(OJ L 82/1, 22.03.2001\)](#)
15. [Report from the Commission on the basis of Article 18 of the Council Framework Decision of 15 March 2001 on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings, \(16.02.2004, COM\(2004\)54 final/2\)](#)

### *Case law*

1. C-404/07, Katz/Sós, Judgment of 22 November 2008
2. T-412/07, Ammayappan Ayyanarsamy, Order of 1 April 2008

### *c. United Nations*

1. [Resolution 2005/20 of the Economic and Social Council. Guidelines on Justice in Matters involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime, 22 July 2005.](#)
2. [Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, supplementing The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted by General Assembly resolution 55/25 of 15 November 2000.](#)
3. [Resolution 2002/12 of The Economic and Social Council on Basic principles on the use of restorative justice programmes in criminal matters, 24 July 2002.](#)
4. [Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution of 25 May 2000 entered into force on 18 January 2002.](#)
5. [Resolution General Assembly 52/86 on the Crime prevention and criminal justice measures to eliminate violence against women, 2 February 1998.](#)

6. [Declaration General Assembly 48/104 on the Elimination of Violence against Women, 20 December 1993.](#)
7. [Declaration General Assembly 40/34 of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power, 29 November 1985.](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be national practitioners, NGO and training institutions experts.

### 4. Trainees

Training can be recommended for junior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training on the rights of victims should be performed in the form of specialised seminars.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

#### *C) Priority*

Training should be a priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

Training should take part at local and regional level.

## ***III. Data protection***

### **1. Introduction**

With regard to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, existing international and European legislative instruments for data protection are either extremely broad, non-binding, or expressly exclude their application

for police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters such as the EU's main legislative First Pillar instrument Directive 95/46.

In fact, within the scope of the police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection rights have only been established within the respective frameworks of its agencies and instruments, e.g. regulations can be found within the Europol Convention, the Eurojust Decision, the Schengen Convention, etc. At the same time, enhancing the exchange of data to combat organised crime and terrorism, however, has become one of the priorities within the EU and several legislative instruments to facilitate this exchange have been launched. Hence, after nearly five years of discussion, in December 2008, a general Framework Decision on the protection of personal data processed in the framework of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters was adopted. Although the Framework Decision confirms the applicability of general data protection principles (legality, proportionality, accuracy, right to access, erasure and rectification, judicial remedies, etc.) to the sector of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, it is still limited to the processing of data in cross-border cases and thus, not applicable for data processed only nationally. The FD also does not affect the more specific regimes provided for Eurojust, Europol, the Schengen Information System or the Customs Information System.

The new Treaty on European Union has no immediate practical effect on the matter, but there are effects on the overall configuration of the sources of law, the powers of the EU institutions and in the field of data protection in their incardination. Indeed, the new Article 6.2 TEU enables the Union as such is a party to the ECHR, and therefore should apply to all its legislation in Article 8 ECHR, confers binding European Charter of Fundamental Rights. The new Article 16 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (before 286 TEC) makes it compulsory to protect data not only to the Union but to "the Member States when carrying out activities which fall within the scope of Union law".

The newly adopted Stockholm Programme, the five year roadmap for the area of freedom, security and justice for the period 2010–2014, as well as its implementing Action Plan will put first flesh on the bones of the Lisbon Treaty. The Stockholm Programme calls for a comprehensive strategy to protect citizens' data within the EU and in its relations with other countries and asks the Commission, amongst others, to:



- "evaluate the functioning of the various instruments which form the basis for the data protection regime in the EU (first pillar and third pillar) and present, where necessary, further legislative and non-legislative initiatives to maintain the effective application of the above principles,
- propose a Recommendation for the negotiation of a data protection and data sharing agreement with the United States of America, based on the work carried out by the EU-US High Level Contact Group on data protection and data sharing,
- consider a legal instrument laying down the data protection principles regarding the transfer of privately held data to third States for law enforcement purposes
- improve compliance with the principles of data protection through the development of appropriate new technologies, based on greater public/private sector cooperation, particularly in the field of research,
- examine the introduction of a European certification scheme for "privacy-aware" technologies, products and services,
- conduct information campaigns, in particular to raise awareness among the public."

In November 2010, the Commission has published a Communication on a comprehensive approach on personal data protection in the European Union. The strategy sets out proposals on how to modernise the EU framework for data protection rules through a series of key goals such as: strengthening individuals' rights so that the collection and use of personal data is limited to the minimum necessary; enhancing the Single Market dimension by reducing the administrative burden on companies and ensuring a true level-playing field; revising data protection rules in the area of police and criminal justice so that individuals' personal data is also protected in these areas; ensuring high levels of protection for data transferred outside the EU by improving and streamlining procedures for international data transfers; and more effective enforcement of the rules, by strengthening and further harmonising the role and powers of Data Protection Authorities.

The European Parliament approved by its [resolution of 6 July 2011](#) a report that supported the Commission's approach to reforming the data protection framework. The Council of the European Union adopted conclusions on 24 February 2011 in which it broadly supports the Commission's intention to reform the data protection framework. The European Economic and Social Committee likewise supported the Commission's general thrust to ensure a

more consistent application of EU data protection rules across all Member States and an appropriate revision of the [Directive 95/46/EC](#). On 25 January 2012, the European Commission issued a [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals](#) with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data.

### *Training content*

Training on data protection in the field of police and judicial cooperation should cover:

- Introduction to data protection: principles
- Existing international instruments: UN, ODCE
- European structure for data protection and existing instruments:
  - Directive 95/46
  - Article 8 Charter of fundamental rights
  - Framework Decision for PJCCM
  - Data protection requirements for Europol
  - Data protection requirements for Eurojust
  - Data protection requirements for Frontex
  - Data protection requirements for SIS
  - Control: European and national independent supervisory authorities
  - Judicial control
  - Lisbon Treaty
  - Plans under the new Communication

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

1. [Additional Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data regarding supervisory authorities and cross border data flows \(Strasbourg,8.XI.2001\)](#)

2. [Recommendation No. R \(87\) 15 of the Committee of Ministers to Member states regulating the use of personal data in the police sector \(17.09.1987\)](#)
3. [Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data \(Strasbourg, 28.I.1981\)](#)
4. [Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms as amended by Protocol No. 11 \(Rome, 4.XI.1950\)](#)

*b. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)*

5. [Recommendation of the Council concerning Guidelines governing the Protection of Privacy and Trans border Flows of Personal Data \(23.09.1980 – C\(80\)58/Final\) Declaration on Trans border Data Flows \(11.04.1985\)](#)
6. [Guidelines for Cryptography Policy \(27.03.1997\)](#)

*c. United Nations*

- [Guidelines for the Regulation of Computerized Personal Data Files \(adopted by General Assembly resolution 45/95 of 14.12.1990\)](#)

*d. EU*

1. [Proposal for a DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data \(COM/2012/010 final ; 25/01/2012\)](#)
2. [Council conclusions on the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – A comprehensive approach on personal data protection in the European Union \(3071st JUSTICE and HOME AFFAIRS Council meeting, Brussels, 24 and 25 February 2011\)](#)
3. [Commission Communication on a comprehensive approach on personal data protection in the European Union \(COM\(2010\) 609 final, 04.11.2010\)](#)

4. [Commission Recommendation No \(2009/387/EC\) of 12 May 2009 on the implementation of privacy and data protection principles in applications supported by radio-frequency identification.](#)
5. [Framework Decision 2008/977/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the protection of personal data processed in the framework of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters \(OJ L 350, 30 December 2008, p. 60\)](#)
6. [Directive 2006/24/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the retention of data generated or processed in connection with the provision of publicly available electronic communications services or of public communications networks and amending](#)
7. [Council Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the European Union of orders freezing property or evidence \(Article 5. Data Protection\)](#)
8. [Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector \(Directive on privacy and electronic communications\)](#)
9. [Directive 2002/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council relating on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services](#)
10. [Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union \(Arts. 7 y 8\)](#)
11. [Regulation \(EC\) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data](#)
12. [Directive 97/66/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 1997 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the telecommunications sector.](#)
13. [Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data \(OJ L 281 , 23/11/1995\)](#)

*e. Case Law*

1. Case C-275/06, *Productores de Música de España (Promusicae) v Telefónica de España*, Judgment of 29 January 2008
2. Cases C-317/04 and C-318/04, *Passenger Name Records*, Judgment of 30 May 2006
3. Case C-101/01, *Bodil Lindqvist*, Judgment of 6 November 2003
4. Cases C-465/00, C-138/01 and C-139/01, *Österreichischer Rundfunk and Others*, Judgment of 20 May 2003
5. Case C-101/01, *Bodil Lindqvist*, Judgement of 6 Nov 2003

#### *f. ECHR-Case Law*

1. Case *Bykov vs. Russia*, 10 March 2009
2. Case *Calmanovici vs. Romania*, 1 July 2008
3. Case *Illias Stefanov vs. Bulgaria*, 22 May 2008
4. Case *Wieser and Bicos Beiligungen GmbH vs. Austria*, 16 October 2008
5. Case *Copland vs. United Kingdom*, 3 April 2007
6. Case *Amann vs. Switzerland*, 16 February 2000
7. Case *Rotaru vs. Romania*, 4 May 2000
8. Case *Laender vs. Sweden*, 26 March 1987
9. Case *Malone vs. United Kingdom*, 2 August 1982.

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be EU experts, experts of NGOs and scholars.

### **4. Trainees**

Training is recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Training can take the shape of specialised seminars.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Additional e-learning can be recommended.

*C) Priority:*

Until the entry into force of the Framework Decision on the protection of personal data processed in the framework of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, training can be recommended.

Once it has come into force, training on the Framework Decision should have priority.

*D) Format:*

Training should take place at local, regional, and national level.

## Chapter D

### *European Criminal Law*

#### *I. Organised crime*

##### 1. Introduction

Since 1997, several action plans against organised crime have been adopted at European Union level. Within the Amsterdam Treaty on the European Union, which came into force in May 1999, a legal framework has been provided for accelerating efforts to strengthen law enforcement, judicial cooperation and to fight against trans-border organised crime. With regard to legislation against organised crime, much progress has been made at sectoral level, based on the Framework Decisions adopted in a variety of areas such as trafficking in human beings, cyber crime, confiscation of proceeds of organised crime etc. The objective of these Framework Decisions is to establish common definitions and to approximate national legislation, in particular through defining proportionate and dissuasive penal sanctions. Work along those lines is continuing with a view to covering all relevant sectors that allow organised crime to flourish. In the field of judicial cooperation, continued efforts have been undertaken to strengthen mutual recognition and mutual legal assistance provisions, with a view to ensuring equivalent criminal law protection to all citizens in the EU, to facilitate judicial cooperation in general and fill the legal loopholes between national jurisdictions which are being exploited by organised crime. Enhanced confiscation powers and witness protection provisions offer examples of additional policy initiatives that have been taken.

At its meeting on 24 October 2008, the Council formally adopted the Framework Decision on the fight against organised crime. The Framework Decision aims at harmonising the substantive criminal law of the Member States by defining offences relating to the participation of a criminal organisation. The FD also takes up the common scheme of laying down “minimum maximum penalties” for individuals, defining criminal liability and penalties for legal persons as well as the jurisdiction and coordination of proceedings.

### *Training content*

Training should focus on the forthcoming implementation of the Framework Decision on organized crime.

## **2. Instruments and case law**

### *a. UN*

- [United Nations Convention against Trans-national Organized Crime of 2000](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Council Framework Decision of 24 October 2008 on the fight against organised crime \(OJ L 300/42 ; 11.11.2008\)](#)
2. [Joint Action to make it a criminal offence to participate in a criminal organisation in the Member states of the European Union \(OJ L 351, 29.12.1998\)](#)

## **3. Trainers**

Trainers on the regulations under the new Framework Decision should be EU experts, national experts and scholars.

## **4. Trainees**

Training is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

## **5. Methodology**

### *A) Training method*

Training can take the shape of specialised seminars.

### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Additional e-learning can be recommended.

### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Furthermore, as outlined above, organised crime has been addressed by several legislative instruments at a sectoral level. Given the manifold



differences between these sectors, training on combating organised crime should also be set-up sector-wise. Thus, within this guideline, training options on each of these sectors have been **individually assessed below**.

## *II. Money laundering*

### **1. Introduction**

Money laundering has been given strategic priority at European Union level. In 2000, a decision was adopted by the EU Council of Ministers concerning arrangements for cooperation between financial intelligence units of the member states. The Europol Convention was extended to money laundering in general, not just drugs related. In 2001, a Framework Decision on money laundering, dealing with the identification, tracing, freezing and confiscation of criminal assets and the proceeds of crime was also adopted. The EU member states have signed the Protocol to the Convention on mutual assistance in criminal matters between the member states. A second anti-money laundering Directive was agreed, widening the definition of criminal activity giving rise to money laundering to include all serious crimes, including offences related to terrorism. In 2005, the third money-laundering Directive was adopted. The third Directive incorporates into EU law revisions made to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering's (FATF) recommendations in June 2003. It also extends the provisions to any financial transaction which might be linked to terrorist activities. Further provisions of the third Directive include identity checks on customers opening accounts, checks applying to any transaction over €15,000, stricter checks on 'politically exposed persons', and penalties for failure to report suspicious transactions to national financial intelligence units.

The Commission has proposed new legislation to make it easier for EU states to confiscate assets derived from serious and organised crime and protect our economies. The proposed Directive (12 March 2012) will simplify existing rules and fill important gaps which are being exploited by organised crime groups. It will enhance the ability of EU states to confiscate assets that have been transferred to third parties, it will make it easier to confiscate criminal assets even when the suspect has fled and will ensure that competent authorities can temporarily freeze assets that risk disappearing if no action is taken.

### *Training content*

Training should include:

- Background and development of the three money laundering Directives
- Scope, content of the third anti-money laundering Directive
- National implementation of the Directives
- Exchange of best practices and experiences
- Case studies

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

- [Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism Warsaw, 16.V.2005](#)
- [Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime \(Strasbourg, ETS 141, 8.XI.1990\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime in the European Union \(12.3.2012 COM \(2012\) 85 final; 2012/0036 \(COD\)\)](#)
2. [Directive 2005/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 26 October 2005 on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering and terrorist financing \(OJ L 309/15, 25.11.2005\) \(3rd money laundering Directive\)](#)
3. [Council Framework Decision of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the European Union of orders freezing property or evidence \(OJ L 196/45; 2.8.2003\)](#)
4. [Directive 2001/97/EC of 4 December 2001 amending Council Directive 91/308/EEC of 10 June 1991 on prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering \(OJ L 344/76, 28.12.2001\)](#)
5. [Council Framework Decision of 26 June 2001 on money laundering, the identification, tracing, freezing, seizing and confiscation of instrumentalities and the proceeds of crime \(OJ L 182/1, 05.07.2001\) \(2nd money laundering Directive\)](#)
6. [Council Decision of 17 October 2000 concerning arrangements for cooperation between financial intelligence units of the Member](#)

[states in respect of exchanging information \(OJ L 271/4, 24.10.2000\)](#)

7. [Council Decision concerning arrangements for cooperation between financial intelligence units of the Member states in respect of exchanging information \(OJ L 271/4, 24.10.2000\)](#)
8. [Council Directive 91/308/EEC of 10 June 1991 on prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering \(OJ L 166, 28.06.1991\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners, and scholars.

### 4. Trainees

Training in this matter should be addressed to practitioners who have a good understanding of their criminal system and who can exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it. Thus, training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

A combined training on OLAF, protecting the financial interest of the European Union, counterfeiting of the Euro, corruption and money laundering could also form a topic for training courses and distance learning courses.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update as the instruments are numerous and the change of regulation framework are frequent.

#### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:*

Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

*III. Counterfeiting of the Euro***1. Introduction**

The 1929 International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency is the basic instrument of protection by penal sanctions against counterfeiting at international level.

At the level of the European Union, Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA supplements the 1929 Convention by requiring member states to introduce effective, proportional and dissuasive penalties, including terms of imprisonment which can give rise to extradition, for any fraudulent making or altering of currency; the fraudulent circulation of counterfeit currency; the import, export, transport, receiving, or obtaining of counterfeit currency with a view to circulating the same; the fraudulent making, receiving, obtaining or possession of articles, computer programs, holograms or other instruments or means for the counterfeiting or altering of currency. [Framework Decision 2001/888/JHA](#) supplements [Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA](#) with regard to the recognition of previous convictions.

Furthermore, Europol and Eurojust have mandates for combating euro counterfeiting. In particular, OLAF has responsibilities in three areas: legislation (Regulation 1338/2001) and Framework Decision on the protection of euro banknotes and coins with criminal sanctions; training and technical assistance, co-ordination of member states actions for the technical protection of euro coins against counterfeiting, including the European Technical & Scientific Centre (ETSC).

*Training content*

Training should include:

- Development of legislation
- Scope, content of the Framework Decision
- Differences in implementation and national legislation
- Best practices
- Possibilities of support by Europol, Eurojust, OLAF

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. International instrument*

[International Convention of 20 April 1929 for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency and its Protocol \(No 2623, p. 372. League of Nations Treaty Series 1931. Signed in Geneva on 20 April 1929\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Council Regulation 1338/2001 of 28 June 2001 laying down measures necessary for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting \(OJ L 181/6, 04.07.2001\)](#)
2. [Council Framework Decision of 28 May 2001 on combating fraud and counterfeiting of non-cash means of payment \(OJ L 149/1, 02.06.2001\)](#)
3. [Council Decision of 6 December 2001 on the protection of the euro against counterfeiting \(OJ L 329/1, 14.12.2001\)](#)
4. [Council Framework Decision of 6 December 2001 amending Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA on increasing protection by criminal penalties and other sanctions against counterfeiting in connection with the introduction of the euro \(OJ L 329, 14.12.2001\)](#)
5. [Council Framework Decision of 29 May 2000 on increasing protection by criminal penalties and other sanctions against counterfeiting in connection with the introduction of the euro \(2000/383/JHA\) \(OJ L 140, 14.6.2000\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners, and scholars. Combined training on OLAF, protecting the financial interests of the European Union, counterfeiting of the Euro, corruption and money laundering could also form a topic for training courses and distance learning courses.

## 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors as training in this matter is addressed to practitioners that have a good understanding of the criminal system and thus are able to exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it. Furthermore, specialisation in criminal matters is more and more frequent.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update the trainees as instruments are numerous and changes in the legislation are frequent.

### *C) Priority:* Training should have priority

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *IV. Protection of the financial interests of the Communities*

### 1. Introduction

European Union policies are financed by the Community budget. Fraud affecting the Community's financial interests is a major risk. Those interests need, therefore, to be effectively protected. In order to combat fraud and other illegal activities affecting those interests, the member states signed the Convention of 26 July 1995 on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests and its three additional protocols which provide for measures aimed in particular at aligning national criminal laws. As these so-called PFI instruments ('Protection of Financial Interests') have not been ratified by all the member states, in 2002 the Commission presented a proposal for a Directive on the criminal-law protection of the Communities' financial interests. No agreement has yet been reached, however, the Commission is planning to further examine possible approaches opened up by the reform of the EU/EC Treaty.

To further combat fraud, corruption and any other illegal activity adversely affecting the Community's financial interests, the Community Institutions established the European Anti-Fraud Office (*see separate Chapter B 'OLAF'*).

To protect taxpayers' money in a context of budgetary austerity, the fight against misuse of EU public money is a priority for the Union. This priority is reflected in the Lisbon Treaty which sets out an obligation, and corresponding legal bases, to act for the protection of EU financial interests, including by means of criminal law. In this regard, it has to be mentioned:

- Communication on the protection of the financial interests of the European Union by criminal law and by administrative investigations (26.5.2011COM(2011) 293 final)
- Commission staff working paper accompanying the Communication (26.5.2011 SEC(2011) 621 final)

### *Training content*

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [Communication on the protection of the financial interests of the European Union by criminal law and by administrative investigations \(26.5.2011COM\(2011\) 293 final\)](#)
- b. [Commission staff working paper accompanying the Communication \(26.5.2011 SEC\(2011\) 621 final\)](#)
- c. [Second Report from the Commission – Implementation of the Convention on the Protection of the European Communities' financial interests and its protocols \(Brussels, 14.2.2008; COM\(2008\) 77 final\)](#)
- d. [Report from the Commission – Implementation of the Convention on the Protection of the European Communities' \(Brussels, 25.10.2004; SEC\(2004\) 1299\)](#)
- e. [Proposal for a Directive on the criminal-law protection of the Communities' financial interests \(COM \(2001\) 272 final, 23.05.2001\)](#)
- f. [Second Protocol of the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 221, 19.7.1997, p. 11-1\)](#)
- g. [Protocol to the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 313, 23.10.1996, p. 1-1\)](#)
- h. [Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 316 , 27/11/1995 P. 0048 – 0048\)](#)

- i. *Money laundering*: [Second Protocol to the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 221, 19.07.1997\)](#)
- j. *Corruption*: [Convention on the fight against corruption involving officials of the European communities or officials of Member states of the European Union \(OJ C 195, 25.06.1997\)](#)
- k. *Corruption*: [Protocol to the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 313, 23.10.1996\)](#)
- l. *Fraud*: [Council regulation 2988/95 on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ L 312, 23.12.1995\)](#)
- m. *Fraud*: [Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 316, 27.11.1995\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors as training in this matter is addressed to practitioners that have a good understanding of the criminal system and thus are able to exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it. Furthermore, specialisation in criminal matters is more and more frequent.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method:*

The training method recommended is specialised seminars and workshops.

Combined training on OLAF, protecting the financial interest of the European Union, counterfeiting of the Euro, corruption and money laundering could also form a topic for training courses and distance learning courses.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update the trainees as instruments are numerous and changes in the legislation are frequent.

#### *C) Priority:*



Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *V. Corruption*

### **1. Introduction**

The OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of 1997 was the first global legal instrument to fight foreign bribery. Two other important international conventions with a wider scope are the Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention of 1999 on Corruption and the United Nations Convention against Corruption of 2003. While the OECD Convention addresses only the bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions (not passive bribery), the Council of Europe Convention covers a broad range of offences, including the active and passive bribery of domestic and foreign public officials, bribery in the private sector and trading in influence. The United Nations Convention against Corruption is the most comprehensive international anti-corruption convention to date as it covers the broadest range of corruption offences, including the active and passive bribery of domestic and foreign public officials, obstruction of justice, illicit enrichment, and embezzlement.

At EU level, the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests and several additional Protocols as well as OLAF have been set up. In 2008, a Council Decision on a contact-point network against corruption has been adopted.

Official Journal L 301 , 12/11/2008 P. 0038 – 0039

The fight against corruption in the private sector has been tackled by Council Framework Decision on combating corruption in the private sector. Finally, the mandates of Europol and Eurojust cover fraud and corruption.

On 6 June 2011, the European Commission re-launched its anti-corruption policy by adopting a new package, consisting of:

- [A Communication on fighting corruption in the EU;](#)
- [A Commission Decision establishing an EU anti-corruption reporting mechanism;](#)
- A report on the implementation of Council [Framework Decision 2003/568/JHA](#) on combating corruption in the private sector;
- [A report on the modalities of EU participation in the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption \(GRECO\).](#)

These initiatives are part of a wider agenda to protect Europe's economy, as identified in the EU Internal Security Strategy in Action presented by the Commission in November 2010 (IP/10/1535). In autumn 2011, the Commission will also propose a revised EU legal framework on confiscation and asset recovery.

### *Training content*

- Substantive legislation covering active and passive bribery in the public and the private sector
- Compliance and enforcement possibilities.
- Overview of existing anti-corruption legislation at European and international level
- Experiences and best practice when detecting and reporting corruption,
- Obstacles to the bringing of prosecutions in respect of transnational corruption
- Prevention measures
- Cooperation: initiative for an EU network

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. UN*

- [United Nations Convention against Corruption \(adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 31 October 2003 \(Resolution 58/4\)\).](#)

### *b. OECD*

- [OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions \(November 1997\)](#)

*c. Council of Europe*

1. [Report on the modalities of EU participation in the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption \(GRECO\). Brussels, 6.6.2011; \(COM\(2011\) 307 final\)](#)
2. [Additional Protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption 2003 \(Strasbourg, 15.V.2003\)](#)
3. [Criminal Law Convention on Corruption Strasbourg, \(ETS 173, Strasbourg, 27.I.1999\)](#)

*d. EU*

1. [Communication – Fighting Corruption in the EU \(6.6.2011; COM\(2011\) 308 final\)](#)
2. [Report from the Commission based on Article 9 of Council Framework Decision 2003/568/JHA of 22 July 2003 on combating corruption in the private sector \(Brussels, 6.6.2011;COM\(2011\) 309 final\)](#)
3. [Council Decision 2008/852/JHA of 24 October 2008 on a contact-point network against corruption \( OJ L 301, 12.11.2008, p. 38–39\)](#)
4. [Council Framework Decision 2003/568/JHA of 22 July 2003 on combating corruption in the private sector \(OJ L 192/54, 31.7.2003\)](#)
5. *Corruption:* [Convention on the fight against corruption involving officials of the European communities or officials of Member states of the European Union \(OJ C 195, 25.06.1997\)](#)
6. *Corruption:* [Protocol to the Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 313, 23.10.1996\)](#)
7. *Fraud:* [Council regulation 2988/95 on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ L 312, 23.12.1995\)](#)
8. *Fraud:* [Convention on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests \(OJ C 316, 27.11.1995\)](#)

*e. Case law*

- [German \*Bundesgerichtshof\*, judgement of 29.08.2008, 2 StR 587/07](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

## 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors as training in this matter is addressed to practitioners that have a good understanding of the criminal system and thus are able to exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred. Furthermore, specialisation in criminal matters is more and more frequent.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

The training method recommended should be specialised seminars and workshops. Combined training on OLAF, protecting the financial interests of the European Union, counterfeiting of the Euro, corruption and money laundering could also form a topic for training courses and distance learning courses.

### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update trainees as instruments are numerous and changes in the legislation are frequent.

### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *VI. Illicit drug trafficking*

### 1. Introduction

In its 1988 Convention, the UN aimed at promoting co-operation among the Parties so that they may address more effectively the various aspects of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances having an international

dimension. Contracting parties are asked to established criminal offences with regard to certain activities concerning drugs when committed internationally. In carrying out their obligations under the Convention, the Parties shall take necessary measures, including legislative and administrative measures, in conformity with the fundamental provisions of their respective domestic legislative systems.

The EU's approach to address drug trafficking comprises an EU Drug Strategy 2005–2012, an EU Drugs Action Plan 2009–2012, special Europol drug trafficking reports etc. Special actors to address drug trafficking within the EU include, for instance, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and more specific in the field of criminal law the Maritime Analysis and Operations Centre – Narcotics (MAOC–N). Furthermore, several agreements with third states and partners are into force or envisaged.

Several legislative instruments of the EU address drug trafficking and the manufacturing of drugs. [Framework Decision 2004/757/JHA](#) lays down minimum provisions on criminal acts and the penalties applicable to drug trafficking.

In its meeting in November 2009, the JHA Council adopted Conclusions on establishing a European system for forensic drug profiling that had been proposed by the Swedish Presidency in September 2009. Such a law enforcement driven system is seen as an additional tool to combat organised crime and drug production and/or trafficking. The objective of the system should be to carry out and compare forensic profiling analysis according to reliable and well-defined standards. In its Conclusions, the Council invites Member States to inter alia to encourage their law enforcement personnel and judicial authorities dealing with drug related offences to use the results of law enforcement intelligence/information and related forensic drug profiling in their work; to designate National Contact Points in law enforcement organisations as part of a network for information exchange, to ensure enhanced collaboration and exchange of information between law enforcement agencies (including Europol) and forensic institutes

### *Training content*

Training should include:

- Scope and content of the Framework Decision

- Differences in implementation and national legislation
- Best practices
- Possibilities of support by Europol and Eurojust

## 2. Instruments and case law

### a. UN

- [UNGASS Drugs Assessments](#)
- [United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 20 December 1988](#)

### b. EU

1. [Council Conclusions on a European system for forensic drug profiling \(2979th Justice and Home Affairs Council meeting, Brussels, 30 November 2009\)](#)
2. [Council Conclusions on the strengthening of the fight against drug trafficking in West Africa: \(2979th Justice and Home Affairs Council meeting; Brussels, 30 November 2009\)](#)
3. [EU Drugs Strategy 2005–2012 \(15074/04; 22.11.2004\)](#)
4. [EU Drugs Action Plan for 2009–2012 \(2008/C 326/09\)](#)
5. European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA: <http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/>)

### *Addressing drug trafficking*

1. [Report from the Commission on the implementation of Framework Decision 2004/757/JHA laying down minimum provisions on the constituent elements of criminal acts and penalties in the field of illicit drug trafficking \(10.12.2009, COM\(2009\)669 final\)](#)
2. [Council Framework Decision 2004/757/JAI of 25 October 2004 laying down minimum provisions on the constituent elements of criminal acts and penalties in the field of illicit drug trafficking. \(OJ L 335 of 11.11.04\)](#)
3. [Council Recommendation of 25 April 2002 on improving investigation methods in the fight against organised crime linked to organised drug trafficking: simultaneous investigations into drug trafficking by criminal organisations and their finances/assets \(OJ C 114 of 15.05.2002\)](#)

4. [Council Resolution of 29 November 1996 on the drawing up of police/customs agreements in the fight against drugs \(OJ C 375 of 12.12.1996\)](#)

*Fight against the manufacture of drugs:*

1. [Council Decision 2008/206/JHA of 3 March 2008 on defining 1-benzylpiperazine \(BZP\) as a new psychoactive substance which is to be made subject to control measures and criminal provisions \(OJ L 63/45; 7.3.2008\)](#)
2. [Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances \(OJ L 127/32; 20.05.2005\)](#)
3. [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 111/2005 of 22 December 2004 laying down rules for the monitoring of trade between the Community and third countries in drug precursors \(OJ L 22 of 26.01.05\)](#)
4. [Regulation \(EC\) No 273/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 on drug precursors](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners, and experts of NGOs.

### 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

*A) Training method:* Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

*B) Complementary e-learning:* recommended

*C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## ***VII. Environmental crime***

### **1. Introduction**

In 1998, the Council of Europe opened for signature the European Convention on the protection of the environment through criminal law. This was significant because it represented the first international convention to criminalise acts causing or likely to cause environmental damage.

At European Union level, in 2000 Denmark took the main elements of this Convention and made a proposal for a Framework Decision on combating serious environmental crime based on Articles 29, 31(e) and 34(2)(b) TEU ('Third Pillar'). In 2001, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law based on Art. 175 EC ('First Pillar') In 2003, the Council adopted [Framework Decision 2003/80/JHA](#) on the protection of the environment through criminal law. On 13 September 2005, the European Court of Justice annulled this, stating that it encroached on Community competences as it should have been adopted under Article 175 of the EC Treaty. In 2007, the Commission adopted a new proposal for a Directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law which aims to replace the annulled [Framework Decision 2003/80/JHA](#). [Directive 2008/99/EC](#) has been adopted in December 2008. It obliges Member States to provide for effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties in their national legislation in case of serious infringements of EC law on the protection of the environment.

#### *Training content*

Training should include:

- Scope and content of the Framework Decision
- Differences in implementation and national legislation

### **2. Instruments and case law**

#### *a. Council of Europe*



- [Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law \(Strasbourg, 4.XI.1998\)](#)

#### *b. EU*

1. [Directive 2008/99/EC of 19 November 2008 on the protection of the environment through criminal law \(OJ L 328/28, 6 December 2008\)](#)
2. [Directive 2005/35/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on ship-source pollution and on the introduction of penalties for infringements \(OJ L 255/11; 30.9.2005\)](#)
3. [Annulled: Council Framework Decision of 27 January 2003 on the protection of the environment through criminal law \(OJ L 29, 05.02.2003\)](#)
4. [Annulled: Council Framework Decision 2005/667/JHA of 12 July 2005 to strengthen the criminal-law framework for the enforcement of the law against ship-source pollution \(OJ L 255/164; 30.9.2005\)](#)

#### *c. Case law*

1. [Case C-440/05, \*ship-source pollution\*, annulment Framework Decision 2005/667/JHA, Judgment of 23 October 2007](#)
2. [C-176/03, \*protection of the environment\*, annulment Framework Decision 2003/80/JHA, Judgment of 13 September 2005](#)

### **3. Trainers**

Training should focus on the scope and content of the Directive. Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioner.

### **4. Trainees**

Training on the Framework Decision at this point in time is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

As the Directive is not yet into force, complementary e-learning is not necessary.

*C) Priority:*

Until the Directive enters into force, training is recommended. Once it has come into force, training should have top priority.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *VIII. Trafficking in human beings and sexual exploitation*

### **1. Introduction**

Trafficking in human beings is a major problem in Europe today (trafficking in human beings is to be distinguished from smuggling of migrants. While the aim of smuggling of migrants is unlawful cross-border transport in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit, the purpose of trafficking in human beings is exploitation. Furthermore, trafficking in human beings does not necessarily involve a trans-national element, it can exist at national level). Annually, thousands of people fall victim to trafficking for sexual exploitation or other purposes, whether in their own countries or abroad. Most identified victims of trafficking are women but men also are sometimes victims of trafficking in human beings. Furthermore, many of the victims are young, sometimes children.

A strategy for combating trafficking in human beings must adopt a multidisciplinary approach incorporating prevention, protection of human rights of victims and prosecution of traffickers, while at the same time seeking to harmonise relevant national laws.

At the legislative level, the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Trans-national Organised Crime ('Palermo Protocol') laid the foundations for international action on trafficking.

In the European context, legislative measures have first been taken at EU level, starting with the 2002 Framework Decision on combating trafficking in human beings and Directive 2004/81/EC residence permits issued to third-

country nationals who are victims of trafficking in human beings or who have been the subject of an action to facilitate illegal immigration, who cooperate with the competent authorities. Council Framework Decision of 15 March 2001 on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings would also be relevant in the field of trafficking in human beings. In 2005, the Council of Europe Convention on trafficking in human beings was adopted, taking the Palermo Protocol as a starting point and taking into account other international legal instruments relevant to combating trafficking in human beings.

At EU level, the Framework Decision on combating trafficking in human beings aims to approximate the laws and regulations of member states in the field of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters relating to the fight against trafficking in human beings. It also aims to introduce at European level common framework provisions to address certain issues such as criminalisation, penalties and other sanctions, aggravating circumstances, jurisdiction and extradition. In February 2010, the Council adopted an Action-Oriented Paper on strengthening the EU external dimension on action against trafficking in human beings; Towards Global EU Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. The paper includes an analysis of the issue and the EU's objectives, drawing on relevant information from the EU's institutions; a summary of current action being carried out both by the Commission and by Member States; and identification of what needs to be done at the political, technical and operational levels in order to meet EU objectives.

In April 2011, a new Directive on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings, and protecting victims replacing the 2002 Framework Decision entered into force. The Directive builds upon the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings and adopts the same holistic approach including prevention, prosecution, protection of victims, and monitoring. The Directive establishes minimum rules concerning the definition of criminal offences and sanctions in the area of trafficking in human beings. It also introduces common provisions, taking into account the gender perspective, to strengthen the prevention of this crime and the protection of the victims thereof.

The Framework Decision on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography is to harmonise the legislative and regulatory provisions of the member states concerning police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters with a view to combating trafficking in human beings, the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography. It introduces common European provisions to address certain issues such as the creation of offences, penalties, aggravating circumstances, jurisdiction and extradition. A proposal to update the Framework Decision by a Directive that shall improve criminal action against perpetrators and update the protection of victims is currently discussed. In particular, the proposal aims at covering new forms of crime such as grooming

Furthermore, the fight against trafficking in human beings and the sexual exploitation of children has an impact on a number of European institutions. Europol has the competence to prevent and combat trade in human beings including forms of sexual exploitation and assault of minors or trade in abandoned children. Eurojust has the competence for combating trafficking in human beings in the context of investigations and prosecutions concerning two or more member states.

### *Training content*

- National and international THB context and concepts
- Scope and content of legislation, especially the Framework Decisions and Directive 2011/36/UE of the Council and the European Parliament on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting victims, as well as repealing Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA
- National implementation of the Framework Decisions
- Bilateral, regional and international cooperation including Europol and Eurojust's measures against THB
- Links between THB and other criminal networks
- Victims Protection: Characteristics of this type of victims, protection mechanisms, compensation mechanisms.
- The financial aspect of prosecution in trafficking in human beings. seizure and confiscation

## **2. Instruments and case law**

*a. UN*

[UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Trans-national Organized Crime](#)

*b. Council of Europe*

[Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)

[Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime \(Strasbourg, 8.XI.1990\)](#)

*c. EU*

1. [Directive 2011/36/EU of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA](#)
2. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, repealing Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA \(Brussels, 30 March 2010; 8155/10\)](#)
3. [Action Oriented Paper \(AOP\) on strengthening the EU external dimension on action against trafficking in human beings \(Brussels, 25 February 2010; 6865/10\)](#)
4. [Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13, 20.1.2004\)](#)
5. [Directive 2004/81/EC of 29 April 2004 on the residence permit issued to third-country nationals who are victims of trafficking in human beings or who have been the subject of an action to facilitate illegal immigration, who cooperate with the competent authorities \(OJ L 261; 06.08.2004\)](#)
6. [Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13 of 20.01.2004, p. 13\)](#)
7. [Council Framework Decision of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13, 20.01.2004\)](#)

8. [Council Framework Decision of 19 July 2002 on combating trafficking in human beings \(OJ L 203/1, 01.08.2002\): REPLACED BY DIRECTIVE 2011/36/EU](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers recommended are EU experts, experts of NGOs and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior and junior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

*B) Complementary e-learning:* Complementary e-learning is recommended.

#### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## ***IX. Racism and xenophobia***

### 1. Introduction

Within the framework of the Council of Europe, racism and xenophobia have not been particularly tackled within any legal instrument. However, over the last few years, discussions have started within the Council of Europe to specifically address the fight against racism and xenophobia on the world-wide web. In 2001, the Council of Europe adopted its Convention on Cybercrime which aims, amongst other things, at banning the distribution of

child pornography via the internet. The Convention, however, does not address the issue of racism, xenophobia, hate speech and racial discrimination on the internet. Therefore, in 2003, the issue was addressed in an additional Protocol to the Convention, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems.

In December 2008, the Framework Decision on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law was adopted. The Framework Decision aims at ensuring that racist and xenophobic offences are sanctioned in all Member States by at least a minimum level of effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties. Within the scope of the Framework Decision, racism and xenophobia shall mean belief in race, colour, descent, religion or belief, national or ethnic origin as a factor determining aversion to individuals. The Framework Decision applies to all offences committed within the territory of the European Union, by a national of a member state or for the benefit of a legal person established in a member state. Certain forms of conduct committed for a racist or xenophobic purpose will be punishable as criminal offences such as public incitement to violence or hatred, public insults or threats, public condoning of genocide or crimes against humanity as defined in the Statute of the International Criminal Court, public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material containing expressions of racism and xenophobia, directing of a racist or xenophobic group. Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit the above offences will also be punishable. With regard to the above racist offences, member states must ensure that they are punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties. In all cases, racist or xenophobic motivation will be considered as an aggravating circumstance in determining the penalty to be applied to the offence.

Furthermore, on 1 March 2007, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) came into being, following the extension of the mandate of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) (*see separate Chapter F 'Human Rights'*).

*Training content*

Training should focus on the content of the new Framework Decision, offer discussions and debates on its added value, expected obstacles and problems arising within the individual national legal systems, improvements to be expected, impact on fundamental rights and the rights of the defence.

Training should also cover the role of the European Agency for Fundamental Rights and the support it can offer to the practitioners (*see separate Chapter F 'Human Rights'*)

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a. [Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law \(OJ L 328; 06.12.2008\)](#)
- b. [European Parliament resolution of 26 April 2007 on homophobia in European \(P6\\_TA\(2007\)0167\)](#)
- c. [Joint Action of 15 July 1996 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, concerning action to combat racism and xenophobia \(96/443/JHA\) \(OJ L 185, 24.7.1996\) will be repealed by the FD.](#)

## 3. Trainers

Recommended experts are: EU experts, national practitioners, scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Trainees should be well familiar with practical implications in this field. Thus, training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors and law enforcement

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

Case law from different European countries should be included.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.



### *C) Priority*

In its Communication ['Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunities For All – a Framework Strategy'](#) (COM(2005) 224 final) of June 2005, the Commission recommended to raise awareness on this issue by, amongst other things, providing training for legal practitioners. Hence, training should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

Training should take place at EU-wide level.

## ***X. Terrorism***

### **1. Introduction**

It is often said that the attacks of 11 September 2001 as well as the following terrorist attacks of Madrid and London in 2004 and 2005 have served as a catalyst for counter-terrorism legislation. Since then, the fight against terrorism has become a declared EU objective and consequently numerous legislative instruments have been adopted in the last year, of which two are of particular importance for the area of criminal justice: the Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism and the Council Decision of 20 September 2005 on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences. The Framework Decision on combating terrorism introduced, for the first time, common EU-wide minimum rules to define terrorist offences and lays down the penalties that member states must incorporate in their national legislation. On 18 April 2008, the Council reached a common approach on the amendment of the Framework Decision by the Commission on 6 November 2008. The amendment up-dates the Framework Decision making public provocation to commit a terrorist offence, recruitment and training for terrorism punishable behaviour, also when committed via the Internet.

The Council Decision on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences aims at improving the exchange of information between the member states as well as Europol and Eurojust.

The latest development in the fight against terrorism is the insertion of the offences of 'public provocation to commit a terrorist offence', 'training for

terrorism' and 'recruitment for terrorism' to the Council Framework Decision on combating terrorism.

Furthermore, since the establishing of the so-called 'EU terrorist blacklists, the European Court of Justice has delivered several judgments in which it annuls a Council Decision ordering the freezing of funds.

### *Training content*

Training should include:

- International counter-terrorism legislation
- EU criminal justice counter-terrorism instruments, especially amendments to the FD on combating terrorism
- Interplay EU – domestic legislation
- Case law ECJ
- Role of Europol and Eurojust
- Role of the private sector
- European Arrest Warrant and the terrorism crime.
- Framework Decision on double incrimination
- Definition of the crime of being part of a terrorist organization
- International cooperation instruments ( EAW, Joint Investigation Teams)
- Crime of financing terrorist organizations.

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

1. [Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
2. [Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
3. [Protocol amending the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism \(Strasbourg, 15.V.2003\)](#)
4. [European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism \(Strasbourg, 27.I.1977\)](#)

### *b. EU*

1. [Report on EU Action Plan on combating terrorism \(17 January 2011; 15893/1/10\)](#)

2. [EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report \(TE-SAT\) 2011](#)
3. [Judicial dimension of the fight against terrorism – Recommendations for action \(13318/10, 7 September 2010\)](#)
4. [Report on the joint review of the implementation of the Agreement between the European Union and the United States of America on the processing and transfer of Passenger Name Record \(PNR\) data by air carriers to the United States Department of Homeland Security \(DHS\), 7 April 2010](#)
5. [EU-US Agreement on the Transfer of Financial Messaging Data for purposes of the Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme \(6265/10, 9 February 2010\)](#)
6. [EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report \(TE-SAT\) 2010](#)
7. [Report on the implementation of the revised Strategy on Terrorist Financing \(8864/1/09 REV 1, 5 May 2009\)](#)
8. [Council Framework Decision 2008/919/JHA of 28 November 2008 amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism \(OJ L 330, 9 December 2008, p. 21\)](#)
9. [Council Decision 2008/651/CFSP/JHA of 30 June 2008 on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, of an Agreement between the European Union and Australia on the processing and transfer of European Union-sourced passenger name record \(PNR\) data by air carriers to the Australian Customs Service \(OJ L 213/47, 8 August 2008\)](#)
10. [Council Decision 2005/671/JHA of 20 September 2005 on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences \(OJ L 253/22; 29.9.2005\)](#)
11. [Council Decision 2005/211/JHA of 24 February 2005 concerning the introduction of some new functions for the Schengen Information System, including in the fight against terrorism Official Journal L 068 , 15/03/2005 P. 0044 - 0048](#)
12. [Council Decision of 28 November 2002 establishing a mechanism for evaluating the legal systems and their implementation at national level in the fight against terrorism 24.12.2002 EN Official Journal of the European Communities L 349/1](#)
13. [Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism, OJ L 164/3, 22.6.2002](#)

*c. ECJ case law*

1. Case T-348/07 Al Aqsa v Council, Judgment of 9 September 2010
2. Case C-550/09 E & F, Judgment of the Court of 29 June 2010
3. Case C-340/08, M and others v. United Kingdom, Judgment of the Court of 29 April 2010
4. Joined Cases C-399/06, Hassan v. Council and Commission, Judgment of the Court of 3 December 2009
5. Case T-318/01, Othman v. Council and Commission, Judgment of the Court of 11 June 2009
6. Case T-287/08, People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI), Judgment of 4 December 2008
7. C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P, Kadi and Al Barakaat, Judgment of
8. C-354/04 P and C-355/04 P, Gestoras Pro Amnistía, Juan Mari Olano, Julen Zelarain Errasti v Council of the European Union, Kingdom of Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Judgment of 27 February 2007
9. Case C-266/05 P, Jose Maria Sison v Council of the European Union, Judgment of 1 February 2007
10. Case C-229/05, PKK and KNK, Judgment of 18 January 2007
11. Case C-415/05 P, Appeal brought on 23 November 2005 by Ahmed Yusuf and Al Barakaat International Foundation against the judgment of the Court of First Instance (Second Chamber (Extended Composition)) of 21 September 2005 in Case T-306/01 Ahmed Yusuf and Al Barakaat International Foundation v the Council of the European Union and Commission of the European Communities

#### *d. ECHR case law*

1. Article 5 ECHR: Right to liberty and security
2. Ilascu and others v. Moldova and Russia (8 July 2004)
3. Article 2 ECHR: Right to life
4. McCann and Others v. the United Kingdom (5 September 1995)
5. Article 8 ECHR: Right to respect for private and family life
6. Klass v. Germany (6 September 1978)
7. Article 3 ECHR: Prohibition of torture
8. Ireland v. The United Kingdom (18 January 1978)

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners and scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors as training in this matter is addressed to practitioners who have a good understanding of the criminal system and thus are able to exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update the trainees as instruments are numerous and changes in the legislation are frequent.

### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *XI. Cybercrime*

### 1. Introduction

Prosecuting crimes in cyberspace can be viewed as a key challenge for the coming years. Through the use of ICTs, potentially, almost all forms of “traditional” crimes can be committed via internet in the future. This is the case of recruitment and training of terrorists, the organisation of drug smuggling via a simple exchange of emails, illegal online gambling, fraud committed using cloned credit cards, the trade of child sexual image material. All these crimes can be committed anonymously via the internet by perpetrators located anywhere in the world. Therefore it is essential for them to have at least a basic understanding of the cybercrime phenomenon. In this

context, there is also an increasing need to talk with the private sector (public/private partnership). If potentially all crimes can be committed with the use of internet, the bilateral cooperation between judges and between prosecutors (also from different countries) is insufficient. High-tech crimes cannot be adequately investigated, prosecuted and adjudicated without cooperation with industry. Dialogue with internet service providers such as Google, AOL, Yahoo!, Skype, Facebook, eBay and many others will be key for judges and prosecutors to prevent, detect and respond to crimes committed using the ICT facilities.

In 2001, the Council of Europe adopted its Convention on Cybercrime which aims, amongst other things, at banning the distribution of child pornography via the world wide web.

The European Union has already taken action to fight cybercrime but more needs to be done through collective action, in partnership with the private sector. The aim is to set the scene for further progress of both e-commerce in Europe and for the Information Society on a global scale. The European Commission has presented a legislative package to approximate specific areas of substantive criminal law in the area of high-tech crime. In 2005, [the Council Framework Decision of 24 February 2005](#) on attacks against information systems entered into force. The Framework Decision aims at improving judicial and other law enforcement cooperation through the approximation of laws in the EU Member States in the area of attacks against information systems. In essence, the Framework Decision obliges Member States to punish certain computer-related offences with “effective, proportional and dissuasive criminal penalties”. Punishable offences are illegal access to information systems, illegal system interference, and illegal data interference. In 2008, the Commission published its first evaluation report.

### *Training content*

Training should focus on the means and methods of cybercrime, new phenomena (e.g. phishing), basic ICT knowledge, and the new legislation such as Framework Decision on attacks against information systems.

## **2. Instruments and case law**

*a. Council of Europe*

1. [Council of Europe – Global Project on Cybercrime – Summary February 2009](#)
2. [Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems \(Strasbourg, 28.I.2003\)](#)
3. [Convention on Cybercrime \(Budapest, 23.XI.2001\)](#)

*b. EU*

1. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on attacks against information systems and repealing Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA \(30.9.2010, COM\(2010\) 517 final 2010/0273 \(COD\)](#)
2. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, repealing Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA \(20.9.2010; 13799/10\)](#)
3. [3010th General Affair Council meeting: Conclusions concerning an Action Plan to implement the concerted strategy of combat cybercrime, Luxembourg 26 April 2010](#)
4. [Council of the European Union, Multidisciplinary Group on Organised Crime \(MDG\): “Proposal by the Spanish presidency for an action plan on the concerted strategy to combat cybercrime” \(Council of the European Union, doc 5071/10, 08.01.2010\)](#)
5. [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection – Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience \(30.3.2009, COM\(2009\) 149 final\)](#)
6. [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of Regions – Towards a general policy on the fight against cyber crime \(COM \(2007\) 267 final\)](#)
7. [Report from the Commission to the Council based on Article 12 of the Council Framework Decision of 24 February 2005 on attacks against information systems \(14.7.2008; COM\(2008\) 448 final\)](#)

8. [Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA of 24 February 2005 on attacks against information systems \(OJ L 69/67;16.3.2005\)](#)
9. [Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13/44; 20.1.2004\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Given the rapid growth of crimes committed by ICT, training on cybercrime should address all judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

#### *C) Priority*

Training should have top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, training at national level is sufficient.

## *XII. Intellectual property rights, counterfeiting and piracy*

### 1. Introduction



The protection of intellectual property is governed by various international conventions to which the EU has signed up, such as the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which states that intellectual property shall be protected, the Berne, Brussels and Paris Conventions, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) Copyright Treaty, the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) with the agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS).

In order to bring itself into line with these international commitments, the EU adopted the Directive on the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights (also labelled the 'IPR Enforcement Directive'), in March 2004. This Directive sought to consolidate the fragmented body of EU legislation on intellectual property – i.e. disparate measures on copyrights, trade marks, authors' rights, designs, counterfeiting and piracy, computer programmes, etc. – to create more clarity and predictability for European businesses. It also gave national authorities increased powers to pursue infringers and obtain compensation for rights-holders.

However, as the counterfeiting and piracy phenomenon grows, the Commission saw the need for additional measures. In July 2005, the Commission presented a double proposal for a Directive and a Council Framework Decision aimed at introducing criminal sanctions for IPR infringements. The proposal was redrafted in April 2006, to take into account a judgment by the ECJ of 13 September 2005 (C-176/03), which holds that the EU has powers to harmonise member state criminal law, if required for the effective implementation of Community law. If adopted, the Directive would be the first ever to harmonise member state criminal law. In April 2007, the Directive was adopted in the Parliament plenary session. In April 2008, examination by member states in the Council took place. The Directive is still awaiting its adoption by the Council. Once adopted, it will enter into force immediately following its publication in the Official Journal. Member states would then have 18 months to transpose the Directive.

To ensure the protection of intellectual property rights against the massive violations they are subjected to via the internet as well as the repression of these violations, it should be noted that: [Directive 2009/140 of the Parliament and the Council \(25/11/2009\)](#), modifies, amongst others,

Directive 2002/21 relative to a common regulating framework for networks and services of electronic communications.

Its Article 1)b – § 3 bis states that: “Any of these measures regarding end-users’ access to, or use of, services and applications through electronic communications networks liable to restrict those fundamental rights or freedoms may only be imposed if they are appropriate, proportionate and necessary within a democratic society, and their implementation shall be subject to adequate procedural safeguards in conformity with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and with general principles of Community law, including effective judicial protection and due process. Accordingly, these measures may only be taken with due respect for the principle of the presumption of innocence and the right to privacy. A prior, fair and impartial procedure shall be guaranteed, including the right to be heard of the person or persons concerned, subject to the need for appropriate conditions and procedural arrangements in duly substantiated cases of urgency in conformity with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The right to effective and timely judicial review shall be guaranteed.” This provision has allowed some Member States to internalize administrative procedures aiming at eliminating and sanctioning behaviours which harm intellectual property rights via the Internet. (Sinde Law)

With regard to case law, it is necessary to consider the doctrine which the European Court of Justice is establishing in matters relating to intellectual property as an interpreter of EU law. In this sense the following cases are relevant:

**C-275/06 *Promusicae*, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 29 January 2008:** prejudicial decision issued by the Mercantile Court number 5 in relation to the interpretation of articles 15 §2 and 18 of [Directive 2000/31/EC \(08/06/2000\)](#) relative to specific areas of information society services, and in particular, to electronic trade in the internal market (DO L 178, p. 1); of article 8 §1 and §2 of [Directive 2001/29/EC \(22/05/2001\)](#) relative to the harmonization of specific aspects of copyright in the information society (DO L 167, p. 10); and of article 8 of Directive 2004/48/EC (19/04/2004) regarding the respect of intellectual property rights (DO L 157, p. 45) – Treatment of general data produced via established communications during the provision of a service for the information society

- Obligation to keep and make available the above mentioned data, which is the responsibility of network operators and electronic communication services, network telecommunication access providers and data hosting service providers - Exclusion from civil procedures.

**C-467-08 *Padawan*, Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 21 October 2010** (“digital canon”): prejudicial question raised by the Provincial Court of Barcelona. This case brings before the European Court of Justice the interpretation of Directive 2001/29/EC about copyright as well as other related rights, the uniform interpretation of private copy and the concept of fair compensation.

### *Training content*

As long as the EU Directive is not yet in force, training would focus on the international instruments and their implementation and give an outlook on the forthcoming EU instruments.

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic instruments*

1. [Directive 2009/140/EC of 25 November 2009 amending Directives 2002/21/EC on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services, 2002/19/EC on access to, and interconnection of, electronic communications networks and associated facilities, and 2002/20/EC on the authorisation of electronic communications networks and services \(OJ L 337/37;18.12.2009\)](#)
2. [Amended proposal for a Directive on criminal measures aimed at ensuring the enforcement of intellectual property right \(Brussels, 26.4.2006; COM\(2006\) 168 final\)](#)
3. [Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Directive on criminal measures aimed at ensuring the enforcement of intellectual property rights \(12.7.2005, COM\(2005\)276 final\)](#)
4. [Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights \(OJ L 157; 30.04 2004 \)](#)

*b. Case law*

1. [C-467-08 \*Padawan\*, Judgment of the Court \(Third Chamber\) of 21 October 2010](#)
2. [C-275/06 \*Promusicae\*, Judgment of the Court \(Grand Chamber\) of 29 January 2008](#)
3. [C-176/03, \*Commission of the European Communities v Council of the European Union\*](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

*A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

*B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

*C) Priority*

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

*D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, policy debates should take place on a national and EU-wide level.

## ***XIII. Employment of Illegal Migrants***

### **I. Introduction**

In May 2007, a proposal for a Directive providing sanctions against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals has been published.

The Directive would prohibit the employment of illegally staying third-country nationals in order to fight illegal immigration. To this end, it lays down minimum common standards on sanctions and measures to be applied in the Member States against employers who infringe this prohibition. The European Parliament approved the proposal in February 2009. The Directive was adopted in June 2009. Member States now have 2 years for the transposition of this directive into their national laws before it will be fully applicable in practice.

## 2. Instruments and case law

[Directive 2009/52/EC of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers should be EU experts.

## 4. Trainees

Training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

### *C) Priority*

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### *D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, policy debates should take place on a national and EU-wide level.

ard to the above racist offences, member states must ensure that they are punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties. In all cases, racist or xenophobic motivation will be considered as an aggravating circumstance in determining the penalty to be applied to the offence.

Furthermore, on 1 March 2007, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) came into being, following the extension of the mandate of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) (*see separate Chapter F 'Human Rights'*).

### *Training content*

Training should focus on the content of the new Framework Decision, offer discussions and debates on its added value, expected obstacles and problems arising within the individual national legal systems, improvements to be expected, impact on fundamental rights and the rights of the defence.

Training should also cover the role of the European Agency for Fundamental Rights and the support it can offer to the practitioners (*see separate Chapter F 'Human Rights'*)

## 2. Instruments and case law

- d. [Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law \(OJ L 328; 06.12.2008\)](#)
- e. [European Parliament resolution of 26 April 2007 on homophobia in European \(P6\\_TA\(2007\)0167\)](#)
- f. [Joint Action of 15 July 1996 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, concerning action to combat racism and xenophobia \(96/443/JHA\) \(OJ L 185, 24.7.1996\) will be repealed by the FD.](#)

## 3. Trainers

Recommended experts are: EU experts, national practitioners, scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Trainees should be well familiar with practical implications in this field. Thus, training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors and law enforcement

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

Case law from different European countries should be included.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

### *C) Priority*

In its Communication 'Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunities For All – a Framework Strategy' (COM(2005) 224 final) of June 2005, the Commission recommended to raise awareness on this issue by, amongst other things, providing training for legal practitioners. Hence, training should be a priority.

### *D) Format*

Training should take place at EU-wide level.

## *X. Terrorism*

### **1. Introduction**

It is often said that the attacks of 11 September 2001 as well as the following terrorist attacks of Madrid and London in 2004 and 2005 have served as a catalyst for counter-terrorism legislation. Since then, the fight against terrorism has become a declared EU objective and consequently numerous legislative instruments have been adopted in the last year, of which two are of particular importance for the area of criminal justice: the Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism and the Council Decision of 20 September 2005 on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences. The Framework Decision on combating terrorism introduced, for the first time, common EU-wide minimum rules to define terrorist offences and lays down the penalties that member states must incorporate in their national legislation. On 18 April 2008, the Council

reached a common approach on the amendment of the Framework Decision by the Commission on 6 November 2008. The amendment up-dates the Framework Decision making public provocation to commit a terrorist offence, recruitment and training for terrorism punishable behaviour, also when committed via the Internet.

The Council Decision on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences aims at improving the exchange of information between the member states as well as Europol and Eurojust.

The latest development in the fight against terrorism is the insertion of the offences of 'public provocation to commit a terrorist offence', 'training for terrorism' and 'recruitment for terrorism' to the Council Framework Decision on combating terrorism.

Furthermore, since the establishing of the so-called 'EU terrorist blacklists', the European Court of Justice has delivered several judgments in which it annuls a Council Decision ordering the freezing of funds.

### *Training content*

Training should include:

- International counter-terrorism legislation
- EU criminal justice counter-terrorism instruments, especially amendments to the FD on combating terrorism
- Interplay EU – domestic legislation
- Case law ECJ
- Role of Europol and Eurojust
- Role of the private sector
- European Arrest Warrant and the terrorism crime.
- Framework Decision on double incrimination
- Definition of the crime of being part of a terrorist organization
- International cooperation instruments ( EAW, Joint Investigation Teams)
- Crime of financing terrorist organizations.

## **2. Instruments and case law**

### *a. Council of Europe*



5. [Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
6. [Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism \(Warsaw, 16.V.2005\)](#)
7. [Protocol amending the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism \(Strasbourg, 15.V.2003\)](#)
8. [European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism \(Strasbourg, 27.I.1977\)](#)

*b. EU*

14. [Report on EU Action Plan on combating terrorism \(17 January 2011; 15893/1/10\)](#)
15. [EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report \(TE-SAT\) 2011](#)
16. [Judicial dimension of the fight against terrorism – Recommendations for action \(13318/10, 7 September 2010\)](#)
17. [Report on the joint review of the implementation of the Agreement between the European Union and the United States of America on the processing and transfer of Passenger Name Record \(PNR\) data by air carriers to the United States Department of Homeland Security \(DHS\), 7 April 2010](#)
18. [EU-US Agreement on the Transfer of Financial Messaging Data for purposes of the Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme \(6265/10, 9 February 2010\)](#)
19. [EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report \(TE-SAT\) 2010](#)
20. [Report on the implementation of the revised Strategy on Terrorist Financing \(8864/1/09 REV 1, 5 May 2009\)](#)
21. [Council Framework Decision 2008/919/JHA of 28 November 2008 amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism \(OJ L 330, 9 December 2008, p. 21\)](#)
22. [Council Decision 2008/651/CFSP/JHA of 30 June 2008 on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, of an Agreement between the European Union and Australia on the processing and transfer of European Union-sourced passenger name record \(PNR\) data by air carriers to the Australian Customs Service \(OJ L 213/47, 8 August 2008\)](#)

23. [Council Decision 2005/671/JHA of 20 September 2005 on the exchange of information and cooperation concerning terrorist offences \(OJ L 253/22; 29.9.2005\)](#)
24. [Council Decision 2005/211/JHA of 24 February 2005 concerning the introduction of some new functions for the Schengen Information System, including in the fight against terrorism Official Journal L 068 , 15/03/2005 P. 0044 - 0048](#)
25. [Council Decision of 28 November 2002 establishing a mechanism for evaluating the legal systems and their implementation at national level in the fight against terrorism 24.12.2002 EN Official Journal of the European Communities L 349/1](#)
26. [Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism, OJ L 164/3, 22.6.2002](#)

*c. ECJ case law*

12. Case T-348/07 Al Aqsa v Council, Judgment of 9 September 2010
13. Case C-550/09 E & F, Judgment of the Court of 29 June 2010
14. Case C-340/08, M and others v. United Kingdom, Judgment of the Court of 29 April 2010
15. Joined Cases C-399/06, Hassan v. Council and Commission, Judgment of the Court of 3 December 2009
16. Case T-318/01, Othman v. Council and Commission, Judgment of the Court of 11 June 2009
17. Case T-287/08, People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI), Judgment of 4 December 2008
18. C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P,, Kadi and Al Barakaat, Judgment of
19. C-354/04 P and C-355/04 P, Gestoras Pro Amnistía, Juan Mari Olano, Julen Zelarain Errasti v Council of the European Union, Kingdom of Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Judgment of 27 February 2007
20. Case C-266/05 P, Jose Maria Sison v Council of the European Union, Judgment of 1 February 2007
21. Case C-229/05, PKK and KNK, Judgment of 18 January 2007
22. Case C-415/05 P, Appeal brought on 23 November 2005 by Ahmed Yusuf and Al Barakaat International Foundation against the judgment of the Court of First Instance (Second Chamber (Extended Composition)) of 21 September 2005 in Case T-306/01 Ahmed Yusuf and Al Barakaat

International Foundation v the Council of the European Union and Commission of the European Communities

#### *d. ECHR case law*

9. Article 5 ECHR: Right to liberty and security
10. Ilascu and others v. Moldova and Russia (8 July 2004)
11. Article 2 ECHR: Right to life
12. McCann and Others v. the United Kingdom (5 September 1995)
13. Article 8 ECHR: Right to respect for private and family life
14. Klass v. Germany (6 September 1978)
15. Article 3 ECHR: Prohibition of torture
16. Ireland v. The United Kingdom (18 January 1978)

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers recommended are EU experts, national practitioners and scholars.

### **4. Trainees**

Training is especially recommended for senior judges and prosecutors as training in this matter is addressed to practitioners who have a good understanding of the criminal system and thus are able to exercise their jurisdiction in cases referred to it.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method:*

Training should take the form of specialised seminars and workshops.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning should be designated as a permanent method to update the trainees as instruments are numerous and changes in the legislation are frequent.

#### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

*D) Format:* Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## *XI. Cybercrime*

### **1. Introduction**

Prosecuting crimes in cyberspace can be viewed as a key challenge for the coming years. Through the use of ICTs, potentially, almost all forms of “traditional” crimes can be committed via internet in the future. This is the case of recruitment and training of terrorists, the organisation of drug smuggling via a simple exchange of emails, illegal online gambling, fraud committed using cloned credit cards, the trade of child sexual image material. All these crimes can be committed anonymously via the internet by perpetrators located anywhere in the world. Therefore it is essential for them to have at least a basic understanding of the cybercrime phenomenon. In this context, there is also an increasing need to talk with the private sector (public/private partnership). If potentially all crimes can be committed with the use of internet, the bilateral cooperation between judges and between prosecutors (also from different countries) is insufficient. High-tech crimes cannot be adequately investigated, prosecuted and adjudicated without cooperation with industry. Dialogue with internet service providers such as Google, AOL, Yahoo!, Skype, Facebook, eBay and many others will be key for judges and prosecutors to prevent, detect and respond to crimes committed using the ICT facilities.

In 2001, the Council of Europe adopted its Convention on Cybercrime which aims, amongst other things, at banning the distribution of child pornography via the world wide web.

The European Union has already taken action to fight cybercrime but more needs to be done through collective action, in partnership with the private sector. The aim is to set the scene for further progress of both e-commerce in Europe and for the Information Society on a global scale. The European Commission has presented a legislative package to approximate specific areas of substantive criminal law in the area of high-tech crime. In 2005, the Council Framework Decision of 24 February 2005 on attacks against information systems entered into force. The Framework Decision aims at

improving judicial and other law enforcement cooperation through the approximation of laws in the EU Member States in the area of attacks against information systems. In essence, the Framework Decision obliges Member States to punish certain computer-related offences with “effective, proportional and dissuasive criminal penalties”. Punishable offences are illegal access to information systems, illegal system interference, and illegal data interference. In 2008, the Commission published its first evaluation report.

### *Training content*

Training should focus on the means and methods of cybercrime, new phenomena (e.g. phishing), basic ICT knowledge, and the new legislation such as Framework Decision on attacks against information systems.

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Council of Europe*

4. [Council of Europe – Global Project on Cybercrime – Summary February 2009](#)
5. [Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems \(Strasbourg, 28.I.2003\)](#)
6. [Convention on Cybercrime \(Budapest, 23.XI.2001\)](#)

### *b. EU*

10. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on attacks against information systems and repealing Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA \(30.9.2010, COM\(2010\) 517 final 2010/0273 \(COD\)\)](#)
11. [Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, repealing Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA \(20.9.2010; 13799/10\)](#)
12. [3010th General Affair Council meeting: Conclusions concerning an Action Plan to implement the concerted strategy of combat cybercrime, Luxembourg 26 April 2010](#)

13. [Council of the European Union, Multidisciplinary Group on Organised Crime \(MDG\): "Proposal by the Spanish presidency for an action plan on the concerted strategy to combat cybercrime" \(Council of the European Union, doc 5071/10, 08.01.2010\)](#)
14. [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection – Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience \(30.3.2009, COM\(2009\) 149 final\)](#)
15. [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of Regions – Towards a general policy on the fight against cyber crime \(COM \(2007\) 267 final\)](#)
16. [Report from the Commission to the Council based on Article 12 of the Council Framework Decision of 24 February 2005 on attacks against information systems \(14.7.2008; COM\(2008\) 448 final\)](#)
17. [Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA of 24 February 2005 on attacks against information systems \(OJ L 69/67;16.3.2005\)](#)
18. [Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography \(OJ L 13/44; 20.1.2004\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Given the rapid growth of crimes committed by ICT, training on cybercrime should address all judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

### *C) Priority*

Training should have top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

### *D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, training at national level is sufficient.

## *XII. Intellectual property rights, counterfeiting and piracy*

### **1. Introduction**

The protection of intellectual property is governed by various international conventions to which the EU has signed up, such as the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which states that intellectual property shall be protected, the Berne, Brussels and Paris Conventions, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) Copyright Treaty, the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) with the agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS).

In order to bring itself into line with these international commitments, the EU adopted the Directive on the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights (also labelled the 'IPR Enforcement Directive'), in March 2004. This Directive sought to consolidate the fragmented body of EU legislation on intellectual property – i.e. disparate measures on copyrights, trade marks, authors' rights, designs, counterfeiting and piracy, computer programmes, etc. – to create more clarity and predictability for European businesses. It also gave national authorities increased powers to pursue infringers and obtain compensation for rights-holders.

However, as the counterfeiting and piracy phenomenon grows, the Commission saw the need for additional measures. In July 2005, the Commission presented a double proposal for a Directive and a Council Framework Decision aimed at introducing criminal sanctions for IPR

infringements. The proposal was redrafted in April 2006, to take into account a judgment by the ECJ of 13 September 2005 (C-176/03), which holds that the EU has powers to harmonise member state criminal law, if required for the effective implementation of Community law. If adopted, the Directive would be the first ever to harmonise member state criminal law. In April 2007, the Directive was adopted in the Parliament plenary session. In April 2008, examination by member states in the Council took place. The Directive is still awaiting its adoption by the Council. Once adopted, it will enter into force immediately following its publication in the Official Journal. Member states would then have 18 months to transpose the Directive.

To ensure the protection of intellectual property rights against the massive violations they are subjected to via the internet as well as the repression of these violations, it should be noted that: [Directive 2009/140 of the Parliament and the Council \(25/11/2009\)](#), modifies, amongst others, [Directive 2002/21 relative to a common regulating framework for networks and services of electronic communications](#).

Its Article 1)b – § 3 bis states that: “Any of these measures regarding end-users’ access to, or use of, services and applications through electronic communications networks liable to restrict those fundamental rights or freedoms may only be imposed if they are appropriate, proportionate and necessary within a democratic society, and their implementation shall be subject to adequate procedural safeguards in conformity with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and with general principles of Community law, including effective judicial protection and due process. Accordingly, these measures may only be taken with due respect for the principle of the presumption of innocence and the right to privacy. A prior, fair and impartial procedure shall be guaranteed, including the right to be heard of the person or persons concerned, subject to the need for appropriate conditions and procedural arrangements in duly substantiated cases of urgency in conformity with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The right to effective and timely judicial review shall be guaranteed.” This provision has allowed some Member States to internalize administrative procedures aiming at eliminating and sanctioning behaviours which harm intellectual property rights via the Internet. (Sinde Law)



With regard to case law, it is necessary to consider the doctrine which the European Court of Justice is establishing in matters relating to intellectual property as an interpreter of EU law. In this sense the following cases are relevant:

**C-275/06 *Promusicae*, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 29 January 2008:** prejudicial decision issued by the Mercantile Court number 5 in relation to the interpretation of articles 15 §2 and 18 of Directive [2000/31/EC \(08/06/2000\)](#) relative to specific areas of information society services, and in particular, to electronic trade in the internal market (DO L 178, p. 1); of article 8 §1 and §2 of [Directive 2001/29/EC \(22/05/2001\)](#) relative to the harmonization of specific aspects of copyright in the information society (DO L 167, p. 10); and of article 8 of Directive 2004/48/EC (19/04/2004) regarding the respect of intellectual property rights (DO L 157, p. 45) – Treatment of general data produced via established communications during the provision of a service for the information society – Obligation to keep and make available the above mentioned data, which is the responsibility of network operators and electronic communication services, network telecommunication access providers and data hosting service providers – Exclusion from civil procedures.

**C-467-08 *Padawan*, Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 21 October 2010 (“digital canon”):** prejudicial question raised by the Provincial Court of Barcelona. This case brings before the European Court of Justice the interpretation of [Directive 2001/29/EC](#) about copyright as well as other related rights, the uniform interpretation of private copy and the concept of fair compensation.

### *Training content*

As long as the EU Directive is not yet in force, training would focus on the international instruments and their implementation and give an outlook on the forthcoming EU instruments.

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *a. Basic instruments*

5. [Directive 2009/140/EC of 25 November 2009 amending Directives 2002/21/EC on a common regulatory framework for electronic](#)

[communications networks and services, 2002/19/EC on access to, and interconnection of, electronic communications networks and associated facilities, and 2002/20/EC on the authorisation of electronic communications networks and services \(OJ L 337/37;18.12.2009\)](#)

6. [Amended proposal for a Directive on criminal measures aimed at ensuring the enforcement of intellectual property right \(Brussels, 26.4.2006; COM\(2006\) 168 final\)](#)
7. [Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Directive on criminal measures aimed at ensuring the enforcement of intellectual property rights \(12.7.2005, COM\(2005\)276 final\)](#)
8. [Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights \(OJ L 157; 30.04 2004 \)](#)

#### *b. Case law*

4. C-467-08 *Padawan*, Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 21 October 2010
5. C-275/06 *Promusicae*, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 29 January 2008
6. C-176/03, *Commission of the European Communities v Council of the European Union*

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be international experts, EU experts and national practitioners.

### **4. Trainees**

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

### *C) Priority*

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### *D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, policy debates should take place on a national and EU-wide level.

## ***XIII. Employment of Illegal Migrants***

### **I. Introduction**

In May 2007, a proposal for a Directive providing sanctions against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals has been published. The Directive would prohibit the employment of illegally staying third-country nationals in order to fight illegal immigration. To this end, it lays down minimum common standards on sanctions and measures to be applied in the Member States against employers who infringe this prohibition. The European Parliament approved the proposal in February 2009. The Directive was adopted in June 2009. Member States now have 2 years for the transposition of this directive into their national laws before it will be fully applicable in practice.

### **2. Instruments and case law**

[Directive 2009/52/EC of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals](#)

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be EU experts.

### **4. Trainees**

Training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

*B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

*C) Priority*

As long as the EU Directive is not in force, training in the form of policy debates is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

*D) Format*

As long as the EU Framework Decision is not in force, policy debates should take place on a national and EU-wide level.

## Chapter E

### Police cooperation

#### 1. Interpol

##### 1. Introduction

Interpol is the world's largest international police organisation, with 186 member countries. Created in 1923, it facilitates cross-border police cooperation, and supports and assists all organisations, authorities and services whose mission is to prevent or combat international crime. Interpol aims to facilitate international police cooperation even where diplomatic relations do not exist between particular countries. Action is taken within the limits of existing laws in different countries and in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

##### *Training content*

Training on Interpol would include information on the role and tasks of the organisation and aim to raise awareness of the support it can offer to the national practitioner.

##### 2. Instruments and case law

- [Interpol website](#)
- [ICPO-INTERPOL Constitution and General Regulations](#)

##### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be international experts (Interpol staff) and experts from the training institutions.

##### 4. Trainees

Information on the support that Interpol can offer is of interest for junior judges and prosecutors and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training could be included in training courses and basic seminars and, in particular, study visits could be offered.

### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning on Interpol can be included in basic seminars.

### *C) Priority*

Informing on the role and tasks of the organisation is recommended.

### *D) Format*

Training can take place at local and regional level.

## *II. Europol (see Chapter B)*

## *III. CEPOL*

### **1. Introduction**

CEPOL is an EU Agency, established in 2005 and located in Bramshill, UK. CEPOL's mission is to bring together senior police officers from police forces in Europe – essentially to support the development of a network – and encourage cross-border cooperation in the fight against crime, public security and law and order by organising training activities and research findings. CEPOL has set up cooperation agreements with Europol, Frontex and Eurojust.

According to its Work Programme 2012, CEPOL's priorities include the establishment of a comprehensive training need assessment; further development and establishment of the European Police Exchange Programme; further development and enhancement of E-learning options and web-based

seminars; strengthening of CEPOL involvement in capacity building activities, especially for civilian crisis management; further strengthen the aspect of

Fundamental and Human rights in police training; strengthening CEPOLs role in training on cybercrime to gain a central function in this area; further development of an accredited post graduated Master Course on Police Cooperation in Europe based on the pilot courses in 2011; further development of the inter-agency cooperation; and enhancing external cooperation with third countries.

### *Training content*

Training on CEPOL would basically involve information about the role and tasks of the college and aim to raise awareness of the support it can offer to the national practitioner.

## 2. Instruments and case law

- [CEPOL Website](#)
- [European Police College – Work Programme 2012](#)
- [Council of the European Union, CEPOL strategy \(DG H 3 A ENFOPOL 293 15068/10; 18.10.2010\)](#)
- [European Parliament, Committee on Budgetary Control, Draft Second Report on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Police College for the financial year 2008 \(C7-0198/2009 – 2009/2127\(DEC\)\) \(2009/2127\(DEC\); 21.6.2010\)](#)
- [Draft Council conclusions on the exchange programme for police officers inspired by Erasmus \(Brussels, 13 April 2010; 8309/1/10\)](#)
- [Council Decision of 22 December 2000 establishing a European Police College \(CEPOL\) \(OJ L 336 , 30/12/2000\)](#)
- [Handbook for Participants 2012, CEPOL European Police Exchange Programm 2012 \(Inspired by ERASMUS\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers could be EU experts and experts from the training institutions.

## 4. Trainees

Information on the institution is of interest for junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training could be included in training courses and basic seminars.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Given CEPOL's role as a training institution, complementary e-learning is not recommended.

#### *C) Priority*

Information on the college is recommended.

#### *D) Format*

Training should preferably take place at local and regional level.

### ***IV. Information exchange***

#### **1. Introduction**

In the fight against organised crime and terrorism, it is commonly understood that exchanging information is one of the most important tools. Since the terrorist attacks in New York in 2001 as well as in Madrid and London, several legislative initiatives and instruments have been launched at EU level to facilitate the exchange of information between EU law enforcement authorities.

By setting up the so-called principle of availability, direct online access to available information and to index data for information that is not accessible online should have become possible between all law enforcement authorities in the EU in relation to certain types of data (profiles, fingerprints, ballistics, vehicle registration information, telephone numbers and other communications data, with the exclusion of content data and traffic data unless the latter data are controlled by a designated authority, minimum data for the identification of persons contained in civil registers).

At this point in time, finding a unanimous agreement on this very ambitious idea is not in sight. Nevertheless, several smaller steps have been taken to enhance the exchange of information in the EU. In 2005, the exchange of information on terrorist offences with Europol and Eurojust was enforced by a Council Decision. The so-called Swedish Initiative that came into force in



2006 simplifies the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities by introducing time limits for responses and limiting grounds for refusal. The biggest step was taken by the so-called 'Treaty of Prüm', an initiative between several member states of the EU that introduces mutual access to each other's DNA, fingerprint and vehicle registration information systems. The Council Decision which transfers the 'Third Pillar' regulations of the Treaty of Prüm into the framework of the EU has been adopted in August 2008. Member States had to implement general aspects such as the automated sharing of DNA files by August 2009, and provisions on on-line access by 26 August 2011. An agreement has been set up allowing EU Member States and Iceland and Norway to grant one another access rights to their 'Prüm data'. In March 2010, the Spanish Presidency launched a proposal on a Model Agreement for setting up Joint Cooperation Teams under the Prüm Decision (joint patrols and other joint operations in cases of disasters, serious accidents, mass gatherings and other major events). The draft model agreement which is very similar but not to be confused with the Model Agreement on Joint Investigation Teams (see below: V.) foresees standard provisions for setting up such joint teams (e.g. place and period of the operation; responsible officers; specialists, advisers; executive powers of the seconded officers; logistic modalities; costs; etc.).

The current system of information systems and instruments in the EU has become more and more non-transparent which caused JHA Ministers to call for the setting-up of an Information Management Strategy for EU Internal Security. One future major factor in this strategy is the new Agency for the operational management of large-scale information technology IT systems that is to be responsible for the operational management of the Schengen Information System (SIS II), Visa Information System (VIS), Eurodac and possible other large-scale IT systems. The Agency has been inaugurated in Tallinn on 22 March 2012. While Europol's and law enforcement authorities' access to the Visa Information System has been agreed, their access to Eurodac is still debated.

### *Training content*

Training on the exchange of information should include:

- An introduction to the principle of availability
- The regulations set up under the Swedish Initiative
- The regulations set up under the Treaty of Prüm

## 2. Instruments and case law

### *General*

- a. [Council Conclusions on an Information Management Strategy for EU internal security Communication from the Commission: Legislative package establishing an Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice \(11709/09; 3.7.2009\)](#)
- b. [Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on the exchange of information under the principle of availability \(12.10.2005 COM\(2005\) 490 final\)](#)

### *Joint cooperation Teams*

- a. [Proposal for a Council Resolution on a Model Agreement for setting up joint cooperation teams under Chapter 5 of Decision 2008/615/JHA \(Brussels, 26 March 2010; 7991/10\)](#)

### *Swedish Initiative*

- a. [Council Framework Decision 2006/960/JHA of 18 December 2006 on simplifying the exchange of information and intelligence between law enforcement authorities of the Member states of the European Union – Assessment of Compliance pursuant to Article 11\(2\) – Draft Report \(Brussels 13 September 2011; 13970/11\)](#)
- b. [Council Framework Decision 2006/960/JHA of 18 December 2006 on simplifying the exchange of information and intelligence between law enforcement authorities of the Member states of the European Union \(OJ L 386/89; 29.12.2006\)](#)

### *Prüm Decisions*

- a. [Implementation of the Prüm Decisions – lessons learned \(Brussels, 20 December 2011; 18676/11\)](#)

- b. [Draft discussion paper on the state of play on the implementation of Council Decisions 2008/615/JHA and 2008/616/JHA \("Prüm Decisions"\) \(28 October 2010;15567/10\)](#)
- c. [Implementation of the provisions on information exchange of the "Prüm Decisions" – overview of documents and procedures; overview of declarations; state of play of implementation of automated data exchange \(April 2010; 5904/1/10\)](#)
- d. [Prüm/VRD evaluation of Finland: – Report of the evaluation visit \(17–19 March 2010\) \(27 April 2010, 9032/10\)](#)
- e. [Implementation of the "Prüm Decisions" regarding fingerprints– Search capacities \(27 April 2010;5860/3/19\)](#)
- f. [Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, and on the provisional application of certain provisions of the Agreement between the European Union and Iceland and Norway on the application of certain provisions of Council Decision 2008/615/JHA on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime and Council Decision 2008/616/JHA on the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JHA on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime, and the Annex thereto \(26 January 2009;5060/09\)](#)
- g. [Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime \(OJ L 210; 06.08.2008\)](#)
- h. [Council Decision 2008/616/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JHA on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime \(OJ L 210; 06.08.2008\)](#)
- i. [Convention on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism, cross-border crime and illegal migration \('Treaty of Prüm'\) \(7 July 2005 \(28.07\), 10900/05\)](#)
- j. [Prüm Convention \(10900/05; 7 July 2005\)](#)

### *Large-scale IT Agency*

- a. [Regulation \(EU\) No 1077/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Agency for the operational](#)

- [management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice \(OJ L 286/1; 1.11.2011\)](#)
- b. [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing an Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice- Preparation for the high-level dialogue \(11 March 2011;7638/11\)](#)
  - c. [Opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice, and on the proposal for a Council Decision conferring upon the Agency established by Regulation XX tasks regarding the operational management of SIS II and VIS in application of Title VI of the EU Treaty \(OJ C 70/13, 19.3.2010\)](#)
  - d. [Proposal for a Council Decision conferring upon the Agency established by Regulation XX tasks regarding the operational management of SIS II and VIS in application of Title VI of the EU Treaty \(COM\(2009\) 294 final, 24.6.2009\)](#)
  - e. [Proposal for a Regulation establishing an Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice \(Brussels, 24.6.2009; COM\(2009\) 293 final\)](#)

#### *Law enforcement access to VIS*

1. [Regulation \(EU\) No 154/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of February 2012 establishing a Community Code on Visas \(Visa Code\) \(OJ L 58/3; 29.2.2012\)](#)
2. [Commission implementing decision of 4.8.2011 amending Commission Decision No C \(2010\) 1620 final of 19 March 2010 establishing the Handbook for the processing of visa applications and the modification of issued visas \(C\(2011\) 5501 final; 4.8.2011\)](#)
3. [Commission Decision of 11.06.2010 establishing the Handbook for the organisation of visa sections and local Schengen cooperation \(C\(2010\)3667 final; 11.6.2010\)](#)
4. [Comission Decision of 19.3.2010 establishing the Handbook for the processing of visa applications and the modification of issued visas \(C\(2010\) 1620 final; 19.3.2010\)](#)

5. [Commission Decision of 4 May 2010 on the Security Plan for the operation for the Visa Information System \(2010/260/EU\)](#)
6. [Council Decision 2008/633/JHA of 23 June 2008 concerning access for consultation of the Visa Information System \(VIS\) by designated authorities of Member States and by Europol for the purposes of the prevention, detection and investigation of terrorist offences and of other serious criminal offences \(OJ L 218/129; 13.8.2008\)](#)
7. [Regulation \(EC\) No 767/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 concerning the Visa Information System \(VIS\) and the exchange of data between Member States on short-stay visas \(VIS Regulation\) \(OJ L 218, 13.8.2008, p. 60-81\)](#)
8. [Opinion of 20 January 2006 on the Proposal for a Council Decision concerning access for consultation of the Visa Information System \(VIS\) by the authorities of Member States responsible for internal security and by Europol for the purposes of the prevention, detection and investigation of terrorist offences and of other serious criminal offences \(COM \(2005\)600 final\), \(OJ C 97, 25.04.2006, p. 6\)](#)
9. [Council Decision of 8 June 2004 establishing the Visa Information System \(VIS\) \(OJ L 213/5; 15.6.2004\)](#)

#### *Law enforcement access to Eurodac*

- a. [EDPS Opinion on the Amended proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of 'EURODAC' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation \(EC\) No \[.../...\] \[establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person\] \(Recast version\) \(15.12.2010\)](#)
- b. [Amended proposal of the European Commission for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of 'EURODAC' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation \(EC\) No \[.../...\] \[establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of](#)

- [the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person\] \(DG H 1 B 14919/10 GK/es EURODAC 44 CODEC 1034 Interinstitutional File 2008/0242 \(COD\) of 13 October 2010\)](#)
- c. [Amended proposal of the European Commission for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the establishment of 'EURODAC' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation \(EC\) No \[.../...\] \[establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person\] \(COM\(2009\) 342 final; 10.09.2009\)](#)
  - d. [Proposal of the European Commission for a Council decision on requesting comparisons with EURODAC data by Member States' law enforcement authorities and Europol for law enforcement purposes \(COM\(2009\) 344 final; 10.09.2009\)](#)
  - e. [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council concerning the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation \(EC\) No \[.../...\] \[establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person\] \(3.12.2008; COM\(2008\) 825 final\)](#)
  - f. [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 2725/2000 of 11 December 2000 concerning the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of the Dublin Convention \(OJ L 316/1; 15.12.2000\)](#)

### *Passenger Name Records*

- [Recommendation on the draft Council decision on the conclusion of the Agreement between the United States of America and the European Union on the use and transfer of Passenger Name Records to the United States Department of Homeland Security \(17433/2011 - C7-0511/2011 - 2011/0382\(NLE\)\), 3.4.2012, LIBE Committee](#)
- [Opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the use of Passenger Name Record data for the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences and serious crime \(25 March 2011\)](#)

- [Proposal for a Directive on the use of Passenger Name Record data for the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences and serious crime \(Brussels, 2.2.2011; COM\(2011\) 32 final\)](#)
- [Proposal for a Council Framework Decision of 6 November 2007 on the use of Passenger Name Record \(PNR\) for law enforcement purposes \(COM\(2007\) 654 final\)](#)

### *Case law*

[C-482/08 UK v Council \(Access for consultation of the Visa Information System\)](#)

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be EU experts and national practitioners.

### **4. Trainees**

Training should be especially provided for senior judges and prosecutors.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of specialised seminars and workshops.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is recommended.

#### *C) Priority*

Given the fact that that the provisions of the Treaty of Prüm are now applicable throughout the EU in due course, training on the issue should be given top priority.

#### *D) Format*

Training should take place at national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## ***V. Joint Investigation Teams (JITs)***

### **1. Introduction**

A new and important tool for police cooperation within the EU is the possibility to set-up joint investigation teams under Article 13 of the 2000 MLA Convention (respectively the Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on JITs). Training on the legal basis laid down to set up these teams under the Convention/ Framework Decision is therefore highly relevant, not only to law enforcement authorities, but also to the judiciary, and especially prosecutors.

The existing solutions for joint police cooperation under the Council of Europe second additional protocol to the Convention of mutual assistance and the CISA were seen as too cumbersome and did not offer solutions for complex, cross-border investigations involving several states. JITs under Article 13 of the EU Convention on mutual assistance of 2000 can be established for a limited period and a specific purpose between two or more member states. Special regulations are foreseen with regard to the organisation and composition of the team (e.g. team leader, involvement of Europol and Eurojust), operating rules, seconded members, needs of the team, and information exchange.

On 23 September 2009, Eurojust and Europol published the first JIT Manual. The Manual intends to inform practitioners about the legal basis and requirements for setting up a JIT and to provide advice on when a JIT can be usefully employed. Furthermore, the Manual offers advice on how to draft the written JIT Agreement. Finally, the Manual gives an overview on the EU Member States national laws implementing JITs.

Since July 2009, JITs are eligible for direct and targeted financial support from Eurojust. In order to receive funding from Eurojust, interested parties need to submit an application for financial assistance to the JIT Project Manager at Eurojust. If the application is successful, a specified amount will be reserved pending the submission of a request for reimbursement.

In March 2010, an updated Model Agreement for setting up JITs was published in the Official Journal of the EU. The updated Model Agreement is now based on best practices where establishing JITs.

Besides the cooperation in JITs, one of the latest initiatives for police cooperation concerns the use of police dogs in the European Union. In March 2011, the Council adopted a resolution inviting EU Member States to create a network of police dog professionals in Europe. The network shall be called



KYNOPOL and aim at enhancing cooperation and coordination of the activities of the Member States' law enforcement authorities regarding the use of police dogs.

### *Training content*

1. Differences between JITs under Article 13 of the 2000 MLA Convention and JITs under other legal instruments
  - 1.1 Schengen Convention: hot pursuit and cross-border observation
  - 1.2. 1997 Naples II Convention (Art. 20)
  - 1.3. 2000 UN Convention on trans-national organised crime (Art. 19)
  - 1.4. 2001 CoE 2nd additional protocol
2. Legal issues for JITs under 2000 MLA Convention
  - 2.1. Information exchange
3. Usage of information obtained while part of a JIT
4. Liability of members and seconded members
5. Differences in national legislation implementing JITs (see Europol-Eurojust guide)
6. Setting-up a JIT agreement
7. Role of Eurojust and Europol
8. Role of JIT national experts
9. Experience and best practice

## 2. Instruments and case law

- a) [Joint Investigation Teams Manual \(Brussels, 4 November 2011; 15790/1/11\)](#)
- b) [Draft Council Resolution on the use of police dogs in the European Union \(25 March 2011; 8178/11\)](#)
- c) [Council Resolution of 26 February 2010 on a Model Agreement for setting up a Joint Investigation Team \(JIT\) \(Official C 70/1; 19.3.2010\)](#)
- d) [Joint Investigation Teams Manual \(13598/09; 23.09.2009\)](#)
- e) [Eurojust JIT funding](#)
- f) [Eurojust JIT funding application form](#)
- g) [Council Resolution of 26 February 2010 on a Model Agreement for setting up a Joint Investigation Team \(JIT\) \(OJ C 70/1; 19.3.2010\)](#)

- h) [Council Recommendation of 8 May 2003 on a model agreement for setting up a joint investigation team \(JIT\) \(OJ C 121/1; 23.5.2003\)](#)
- i) [Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on joint investigation teams \(OJ L 162/1; 20.6.2002\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers should be EU experts and national practitioners.

### 4. Trainees

Training on JITs is recommended for senior judges and prosecutors.

### 5. Methodology

#### *A) Training method*

Training on JITs should take the shape of specialised seminars and workshops.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning, especially by means of case studies, is recommended.

#### *C) Priority*

Article 13 of the 2000 MLA Convention for the first time offers an in-depth legal basis for joint police investigations within the EU. Training on these issues should have top priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

#### *D) Format*

Training should take place at national, trans-national, and EU-wide level.

## ***VI. The Schengen Acquis and the Schengen Information System(s)***

### **1. Introduction**

To counterbalance the abolition of the internal borders introduced within the Schengen area, so-called "compensatory" measures were established. This

involved improving cooperation and coordination between the police and the judicial authorities in order to safeguard internal security and in particular to tackle organised crime effectively. With regard to judicial cooperation in criminal matters, the main measure included the strengthening of judicial cooperation through a faster extradition system and faster distribution of information on the enforcement of criminal judgments.

In the area of police cooperation, cross-border rights of surveillance and hot pursuit for police forces in the Schengen states was introduced.

At the heart of the Schengen mechanism, an information system was set up: the Schengen Information System (SIS). SIS is a sophisticated database used by the authorities of the Schengen member countries to exchange data on certain categories of people and goods.

Since the coming-into-force of the EU Convention on mutual legal assistance of 29 May 2000, and its Protocol, mutual legal assistance between the member states of the EU is mainly based on these legal instruments as well as on the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement (CISA).

Regarding border control at the moment, various new measures are proposed under the so-called 'European Integrated Border Management'. New initiatives include the introduction of an entry/exit system, the facilitation of border crossing for bona fide travellers, the development of a European Border Patrols Network, the creation of a European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR), the use of passenger name records for law enforcement purposes.

Furthermore, access of the law enforcement to the Visa Information system is envisaged.

In 2011, the influx of migrants following the democratic uprisings in North Africa has given rise to a new border debate. While Italy and France called on the European Commission to facilitate the reinstatement of border checks, Denmark announced the reintroduction of customs checks citing rising crime concerns. On 12 May 2011, EU interior ministers met to discuss the criteria under which border controls could be temporarily reintroduced. In September 2011, the European Commission tabled a proposal for a Regulation order to

provide for common rules on the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in exceptional circumstances.

### *Training content*

Training on the Schengen Convention and its protocols should include the following fields:

1. Schengen Acquis: General background, associated countries, opt-ins and opt-outs
2. Schengen Convention (CISA):
3. Judicial cooperation:
  - Mutual assistance in criminal matters under the CISA
  - Application of the 'ne bis in idem' principle and respective case law of the ECJ
  - Extradition
  - Transfer of the execution of criminal judgments
4. Police cooperation under Schengen
5. Schengen Information Systems: SIS I, SISone4all, SIS II
6. Certain specific forms of mutual assistance:
  - 6.1. Cross border surveillance
  - 6.2. Cross border pursuit
  - 6.3. Data exchange

## 2. Instruments and case law

- [Proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation \(EC\) No 562/2006 in order to provide for common rules on the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in exceptional circumstances \(Brussels, 16.9.2011; COM\(2011\) 560 final\)](#)
- [Updated Catalogue of Recommendations for the correct application of the Schengen Acquis and Best practices: Police cooperation \(25.01.2011; 15785/2/10\)](#)
- [Council Decision of 26 April 2010 supplementing the Schengen Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the sea external borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union \(2010/252/EU\) \(OJ L 111/20; 4.5.2010\)](#)

- [Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Preparing the next steps in border management in the European Union of 13.2.2008 \(COM\(2008\) 69 final\)](#)
- [Commission Recommendation of 6 November 2006 establishing a common “Practical Handbook of Border Guards \(Schengen Handbook\)” to be used by Member States’ competent authorities when carrying out the border control of persons \(C\(2006\) 5186 final\) as amended by Commission Recommendation of 25 June 2008 \(C\(2008\) 2976 final\)](#)
- [Regulation \(EC\) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code of the rules governing the movement of persons across borders \(Schengen Borders Code\) \(OJ L 105, 13.4.2006, p.1\) as amended by regulation \(EC\) No 296/2008 of the European Parliament as regards the implementing powers conferred on the Commission \(OJ L 97, 9.4.2008, p.60\)](#)
- [The Schengen Acquis as referred to in Article 1\(2\) of Council Decision 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999 \(OJ L 239/1, 22.9.2000\)](#)
- [Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders \(OJ L 239, 22.9.2000, p. 19-62\)](#)

#### *Schengen Information System (SIS)*

- [Council Decision of 29 June 2010 on the application of the provisions of the Schengen acquis relating to the Schengen Information System in the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania \(OJ L 166, 1.7.2010, p. 17\)](#)
- [Reintroduction of border controls under Articles 23 et seq. of Regulation \(EC\) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders \(Schengen Borders Code\), \(27.05.2010, 8584/10\)](#)
- [2010/252/: Council Decision of 26 April 2010 supplementing the Schengen Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the sea external borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union \(OJ L 111, 4.5.2010, p. 20-26\)](#)

- [Proposal for a Council Regulation on the establishment of an evaluation mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis \(COM\(2009\)102 final; 4.3.2009\)](#)
- [Proposal for a Council Decision on the establishment of an evaluation mechanism to monitor the application of the Schengen acquis \(COM\(2009\)105 final; 4.3.2009\)](#)
- [Regulation \(EC\) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code of the rules governing the movement of persons across borders \(Schengen Borders Code\) \(OJ L 105, 13.4.2006, p.1\) as amended by regulation \(EC\) No 296/2008 of the European Parliament as regards the implementing powers conferred on the Commission \(OJ L 97, 9.4.2008, p.60\)](#)
- [Analysis of the impact of SISone4ALL on the SIS1+ and SIS II projects from the Council Secretariat in Brussels, \(20.11.2006; 14773/06\)](#)
- [Regulation \(EC\) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders \(Schengen Borders Code\)\(OJ L 105/1; 13.4.2006\)](#)
- [Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders \(OJ 2000 L 239, p. 19 - 62\)](#)
- [Regulation \(EC\) No 1160/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 2005 amending the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 on the gradual abolition of checks at common borders, as regards access to the Schengen Information System by the services in the Member States responsible for issuing registration certificates for vehicles \(Text with EEA relevance\) \(OJ L 191, 22.7.2005, p.18\)](#)
- [Council Decision 2005/211/JHA of 24 February 2005 concerning the introduction of some new functions for the Schengen Information System, including in the fight against terrorism \(OJ L 68, 15.3.2005\)](#)

*Schengen Information System II (SIS II):*

1. [CEPS Paper: \*The Difficult Road to the Schengen Information System II: The legacy of 'laboratories' and the cost for fundamental rights and the rule of law\*, Joanna Parkin \(April 2011\)](#)

2. [Commission staff working document, Report on the global schedule and budget for the entry into operation of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\), SEC\(2010\) 1138 final, Brussels, 21.09.2010.](#)
3. [Council note from the Austrian and German delegations on the further direction of SIS II, no. 10833/10 of 7 June 2010.](#)
4. [Council Regulation \(EU\) No 541/2010 of 3 June 2010 amending Regulation \(EC\) No 1104/2008 on migration from the Schengen Information System \(SIS 1+\) to the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 155 22.06.2010, p.19\)](#)
5. [Council Regulation 542/2010 amending Decision 2008/839/JHA on migration from the Schengen Information System \(SIS 1+\) to the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) OJ L 155/23, 22.6.2010](#)
6. [Press release, 3018th Council meeting Justice and Home Affairs, 3-4 June 2010](#)
7. [Council Conclusions on SIS II \(6.05.2010; 8932/1/10\)](#)
8. [Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the development of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) – Progress Report July 2009 – December 2009 \(COM\(2010\)0221 final; 6.5.2010\)](#)
9. [2010/261/: Commission Decision of 4 May 2010 on the Security Plan for Central SIS II and the Communication Infrastructure \(OJ L 112, 5.5.2010, p.31 \)](#)
10. [Report on the proposal for a Council regulation amending Decision 2008/839/JHA on migration from the Schengen Information System \(SIS 1+\) to the second generation Schengen Information System A7-0127/2010, 29.04.2010.](#)
11. [Council Regulation amending Decision 2008/839/JHA on migration from the Schengen Information System \(SIS 1+\) to the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(31.03.2010; 9925/10\)](#)
12. [Council Regulation amending Regulation \(EC\) No 1104/2008 on migration from the Schengen Information System \(SIS 1+\) to the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(31.03.2010; 9920/10\)](#)
13. [Council Conclusions on SIS II, 2927th Justice and Home Affairs Council meeting, 26 and 27 February 2009](#)

14. [Second generation of Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) - Implementation of measures \(03.02.2009; 6067/09\)](#)
15. [Council Decision on the tests of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(13.02.2008; 6071/08\)](#)
16. [Council Regulation on the tests of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(09.01.2008; 5135/08\)](#)
17. [Council Decision 2007/533/JHA of 12 June 2007 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 205, 7.8.2007\)](#)
18. [Commission Decision of 16 March 2007 laying down the network requirements for the Schengen Information System II \(3rd pillar\) \(OJ L 79, 20.3.2007\)](#)
19. [Council Decision 2006/1007/JHA of 21 December 2006 amending Decision 2001/886/JHA on the development of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 27, 2.2.2007, p. 43\)](#)
20. [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 1988/2006 of 21 December 2006 amending Regulation \(EC\) No 2424/2001 on the development of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 27/3; 2.2.2007\)](#)
21. [Regulation \(EC\) No 1987/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 381, 28.12.2006, p. 4-23\)](#)
22. [Regulation \(EC\) No 1986/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 regarding access to the Second Generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) by the services in the Member States responsible for issuing vehicle registration certificates \(OJ L 381, 28.12.2006, p. 1-3\)](#)
23. [Council Decision 2005/211/JHA of 24 February 2005 concerning the introduction of some new functions for the Schengen Information System, including in the fight against terrorism \(OJ L 068; 15/03/2005\)](#)
24. [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 2424/2001 of 6 December 2001 on the development of the second generation Schengen Information System \(SIS II\) \(OJ L 328, 13.12.2001, p.4\)](#)

### 3. Trainers

Trainers for this topic should be EU experts and national practitioners.



#### 4. Trainees

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors

#### 5. Methodology

##### *A) Training method*

The Schengen Convention and its protocols serves as important background information for a better understanding of the EU Convention on mutual legal assistance and further EU measures in the field of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters as well as it still constitutes an important in the framework of cross-border judicial cooperation with other Council of Europe member states. Thus general knowledge of the instrument should be provided. Hence, the method recommended for this area are basic seminars and distance learning courses.

##### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training on this legal instrument can be completed by e-learning.

##### *C) Priority*

Training should have priority.

Training on this topic has been selected to form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice by the participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'.

##### *D) Format*

The recommended training format includes local, regional and national training.

### ***VII. Joint cooperation centres***

#### **1. Introduction**

In 1997 France and Germany founded the first common centre as a pioneer in order to facilitate and enhance cooperation between police and customs officials along the common border between the two countries. Since then this example of practical cross-border cooperation was duplicated along many

borders between Member States. The tasks of the common centres vary. The legal basis was negotiated individually for every centre.

Within the Council of the EU, discussions were initiated by a number of Member States with the aim to consolidate the numerous legal frameworks into one common legislative framework, in particularly with a view to setting up new centres in the future.

## 2. Instruments and case law

- [Conclusions of the PCCCs seminar: "PCCCs, national bodies and Europol: 3 levels, 1 goal?!" \(27 October 2010\)](#)
- [Evaluation of the Police and Customs Cooperation Centre \(PCCC\): model questionnaire \(29 May 2009; 10454/09\)](#)
- [European Best Practice Guidelines for Police and Customs Cooperation Centres Brussels, \(13815/08; 03.10.2008\)](#)

## 3. Trainers

Trainers should be EU experts.

## 4. Trainees

Training is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method*

Training should take the shape of a specialised seminar focusing on discussions and debate.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended at this point.

### *C) Priority*

Training should take form of policy debates and is recommended to senior judges and prosecutors.

### *D) Format*

Policy debates should take place on a national and EU-wide level.

## *Chapter F*

### *Human Rights*

#### *1. European Convention on Human Rights*

##### **1. Introduction**

The European Convention on Human Rights is an outstanding document in a number of respects. World-wide it is the most successful document of international human rights protection. It is an innovative instrument as it provided for the first time in the history of international law the possibility for a citizen to sue its own country before a court that had unconditional jurisdiction. Today it is an instrument that has a large influence through the

jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights on the respect of fundamental rights by the member states of the Council of Europe.

The Convention was elaborated in the framework of the Council of Europe and entered into force in 1953. 14 additional protocols have been elaborated amending the Convention, six of which (Protocols nos. 1, 4, 6, 7, 12 and 13) contain substantive provisions. Today countries can only accede to the Council of Europe if they recognise the Convention, the obligatory jurisdiction of the Strasbourg Court and the right to individual petition. The Convention and its additional protocols as construed by the European Court of Human Rights – as any other fundamental rights document – has an impact on all fields of law. Legal practitioners of all kinds cannot practice law without at least basic knowledge of the provisions of the ECHR and the case law of the Court.

The right of individual petition is now recognized in all member states of the Council of Europe. Petitioning the Court of Human Rights is subject to a number of admissibility criteria, most prominently the duty to exhaust all internal judicial remedies. Since 1998 the European Court of Human Rights works as a permanent court based in Strasbourg.

The relation between the European Convention and national law is a question of national law itself and the rules of general public international law and varies between the different member states. The obligation of States stemming from article 1 of the Convention means in effect that the European Court of Human Rights assumes a subsidiary role to that of national authorities, including national courts. As has been succinctly stated, “The overall approach of the Convention is based on the principles of solidarity and subsidiarity. Solidarity refers to the commitment of the Contracting Parties to secure effective protection of the rights enumerated in the Convention within their national legal orders, while subsidiarity refers to the role of the Strasbourg Court as secondary to the institutions of national legal systems in adjudicating on claims that Convention rights have been violated. It is partly for this reason that a complaint cannot be made to the Strasbourg Court until all efforts to resolve the dispute have been undertaken within the national legal order. This principle also explains why the Strasbourg Court does not regard itself as a court of appeal from decisions of institutions

within national legal orders.”<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of the “margin of appreciation” accorded to States parties to the Convention and, to a certain extent, the doctrine of *quatrième instance* flow from this subsidiary approach.

## 2. Instruments and case-law

In the following paragraphs most of the articles of the European Convention on Human Rights most relevant in the area of criminal law will be given and are followed by a number of leading cases for every article, article. bearing It should be borne in mind that the jurisprudence of the ECtHR is abundant and every week there are new judgments delivered. While every effort has been made to refer mainly to cases with a criminal law flavour, other cases have also been included since often the principles (e.g. the principles of proportionality, of effectiveness, of due diligence) enunciated are applicable *mutatis mutandis* to a criminal, prosecutorial or investigative context. Note that most cases referred to deal with more than one provision of the Convention or its Protocols.

### A. [European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950 \(ETS No. 5\)](#)

#### 1. *Right to life (article 2)*

Case Mastrometteo v. Italy, 24 October 2002

Case McCann and other v. UK, 27 September 1995

Case Akman v. Turkey, 26 June 2001

Case Bader and Kanbor v. Sweden, 8 November 2005

Case Šilih v. Slovenia, 9 April 2009

Case Varnava and others v. Turkey, 18 September 2009

Case Mižigárová v. Slovakia, 14 December 2010

Case Giuliani and Gaggio v. Italy, 24 March 2011

Case Todorova v. Bulgaria, 25 May 2011

Case Chiechońska v. Poland, 14 June 2011

Case Al-Skeini and others v. UK, 7 July 2011

Case Grovenky and Bugara v. Ukraine, 12 January 2012

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jacobs, F.G., White, R.C.A. and Ovey, C. The European Convention on Human Rights, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 84*

2. *Prohibition of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment (article 3)*

- Case Tomasi v. France, 27 August 1992
- Case Aksoy v. Turkey, 18 December 1996
- Case Selmouni v. France, 28 July 1999
- Case Ireland v. UK, 18 January 1978
- Case Kalashnikov v. Russia, 15 July 2002
- Case Soering v. UK, 7 July 1989
- Case Mouisel v. France, 14 November 2002
- Case Ramirez Sanchez v. France, 4 July 2006
- Case Herczegfalvy v. Austria, 24 September 1992
- Case Labita v. Italy, 6 April 2000
- Case Mamatkulov and Askarov v. Turkey, 4 February 2005
- Case Salah Sheek v. the Netherlands, 11 January 2007
- Case Saadi v. Italy, 28 February 2008
- Case N. v. UK, 27 May 2008
- Case Alibekov v. Russia, 14 May 2009
- Case Gäfgen v. Germany, 1 June 2010
- Case M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece, 21 January 2011
- Case Vinter and others v. UK, 17 January 2012
- Case Stanev v. Bulgaria, 17 January 2012
- Case Othman (Abu Qatada) v. UK, 17 January 2012
- Case Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy, 23 February 2012

3. *Prohibition of slavery and forced labour (article 4)*

- Case De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp v. Belgium, 18 June 1971
- Case Siliadin v. France, 26 July 2005
- Case Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia, 7 January 2010
- Case Zarb Adami v. Malta, 20 June 2006
- Case Stummer v. Austria, 7 July 2011

4. *Right to liberty and security (article 5)*

- Case Guzzardi v. Italy, 6 November 1980
- Case Bouamar v. Belgium, 29 February 1988
- Case Kurt v. Turkey, 25 May 1998
- Case Schiesser v. Switzerland, 4 December 1979
- Case Huber v. Switzerland, 23 October 1990
- Case Skoogström v. Sweden, 2 October 1984

Case Brogan and others v. UK, 29 November 1988  
Case Lawless v. Ireland, 1 July 1961  
Case Brannigan and McBride v. UK, 28 May 1993  
Case Neumeister v. Austria, 27 June 1968  
Case Letellier v. France, 26 June 1991  
Case Toth v. Austria, 12 December 1991  
Case De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp v. Belgium, 18 June 1971  
Case Lamy v. Belgium, 30 March 1989  
Case Weeks v. UK, 2 March 1987  
Case Öcalan v. Turkey, 12 May 2005  
Case M v. Germany, 17 December 2009  
Case Mirosław Garlicki v. Poland, 14 June 2011  
Case Al-Jedda v. UK, 7 July 2011  
Case M. and others v. Bulgaria, 26 July 2011  
Case O.H. v. Germany, 24 November 2011  
Case Creangă v. Romania, 23 February 2012  
Case Austin and others v. UK, 15 March 2012  
Case Woolley v. UK, 10 April 2012

5. *Right to a fair, speedy and impartial trial (article 6)*

Case Colozza and Rubinat v. Italy, 12 February 1985  
Case Piersack v. Belgium, 1 October 1982  
Case Hausschildt v. Denmark, 24 May 1989  
Case Incal v. Turkey, 9 June 1998  
Case Campbell and Fell v. UK, 28 June 1984  
Case Pisano v. Italy, 24 October 2002  
Case Engel and others v. the Netherlands, 8 June 1976  
Case Ekbatani v. Sweden, 26 May 1988  
Cases Scordino, Riccardi Pizzati, Music, Giuseppe Mostacciuolo, Coccharella, Apicell, Ernesto Zullo and Giuseppa and Orestina Procaccini v. Italy, 29 March 2006  
Case Ringeisen v. Austria, 16 July 1971  
Case Eckle v. Germany, 15 July 1982  
Cases Lutz, Englert, Nölkenbockhoff v. Germany, 25 August 1987  
Case Sekina v. Austria, 25 August 1993  
Case Brozicek v. Italy, 19 December 1989

Case Goddi v. Italy, 9 April 1984  
Case Salabiaku, 7 October 1988  
Case Salduz v. Turkey, 27 November 2008  
Case Scoppola v. Italy (no. 2), 17 September 2009  
Case Micallef v. Malta, 15 October 2009  
Case Taxquet v. Belgium, 16 November 2010  
Case Urban and Urban v. Poland, 30 November 2010  
Case Sabeh El Leil v. France, 29 June 2011  
Case Al-Khawaja and Tahery v. UK, 15 December 2011  
Case Ashendon and Jones v. UK, 15 December 2011  
Case Nikolov and others v. Bulgaria, 21 February 2012  
Case Cani v. Albania, 6 March 2012  
Case Boulois v. Luxembourg, 3 April 2012

6. *Prevention of punishment without legal provisions (article 7)*

Case Streletz, Kessler & Krenz v. Germany, 22 March 2001  
Case Welch v. UK, 9 February 1995  
Case S.W., 22 November 1995  
Case Cantoni, 15 November 1996  
Case Kafkaris v. Cyprus, 12 February 2008  
Case Sud Fondi SRL v. Italy, 20 January 2009  
Case Alimuçaj v. Albania, 7 February 2012

7. *Respect for private and family life (article 8)*

Case Funke v. France, 25 February 1993  
Case Niemietz v. Germany, 16 December 1992  
Case Société Colas Est and others v. France, 16 April 2002  
Case Silver and others v. UK, 25 March 1983  
Case Campbell v. UK, 25 March 1992  
Case Klass and others v. Germany, 6 September 1978  
Case Malone v. UK, 2 August 1984  
Cases Kruslin and Huvig v. France, 24 April 1990  
Case Cyprus v. Turkey, 10 May 2001  
Case K. and T. v. Finland, 12 July 2001  
Case Christine Goodwin v. UK, 11 July 2002  
Case Odièvre v. France, 13 February 2003  
Case Leyla Şahin v. Turkey, 10 November 2005



Case Üner v. the Netherlands, 18 October 2006  
Case E.B. v. France, 22 January 2008  
Case Maslov v. Austria, 23 June 2008  
Case R.R. v. Poland, 26 May 2011  
Case Nunez v. Norway, 28 June 2011  
Case A.A. v. UK, 20 September 2011  
Case S.H. and others v. Austria, 3 November 2011  
Case V.C. v. Slovakia, 8 November 2011  
Case Giszczak v. Poland, 29 November 2011  
Case von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2), 7 February 2012  
Case Y.C. v. UK, 13 March 2012  
Case Antiwi and others v. Norway, 14 February 2012  
Case Balogun v. UK, 10 April 2012

8. *Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (article 9)*

Case Kalaç v. Turkey, 1 July 1997  
Case Buscarini and others v. San Marino, 18 February 1999  
Case Thlimmenos v. Greece, 6 April 2000  
Case Cha'are Shalom Ve Tsedek v. France, 27 June 2000  
Case Hasan and Chaush v. Bulgaria, 26 October 2000  
Case Agga v. Greece, 17 October 2002  
Case Kuznetsov and others v. Russia, 11 January 2007  
Case Holy Synod and others v. Bulgaria, 22 January 2009  
Case Jakóbski v. Poland, 7 December 2010  
Case Bayatyan v. Armenia, 7 July 2011

9. *Freedom of expression (article 10)*

Case Handyside v. UK, 7 December 1976  
Case Lingens v. Austria, 8 July 1986  
Case Lehideux and Isorni v. France, 23 September 1998  
Case Goodwin v. UK, 27 March 1996  
Case Jersild v. Denmark, 23 September 1994  
Case Müller and others v. Switzerland, 24 May 1988  
Case Wille v. Liechtenstein, 28 October 1999  
Case of von Hannover v. Germany, 24 June 2004  
Case Verein gegen Tierfabriken v. Switzerland (no. 2), 30 June 2009

Case MGN Limited v. UK, 18 January 2011  
Case Pinto Coelho v. Portugal, 28 June 2011  
Case Wizerkaniuk v. Poland, 5 July 2011  
Case Palomo Sánchez and others v. Spain, 29 September 2011  
Case John Anthony Mizzi v. Malta, 22 November 2011  
Case Lahtonen v. Finland, 17 January 2012  
Case Axel Springer AG v. Germany, 7 February 2012

10. *Freedom of assembly and association (article 11)*

Case Ezelin v. France, 26 April 1991  
Case Vogt v. Germany, 26 September 1994  
Case Maestri v. Italy, 17 January 2004  
Case Sørensen and Rasmussen v. Denmark, 11 January 2006  
Case Vörður Ólafsson v. Iceland, 27 April 2010  
Case United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden–Pirin and others (no. 2) v. Bulgaria, 18 October 2011

11. *Right to marry (article 12)*

Case F. v. Switzerland, 18 December 1987  
Case Sheffield and Horsham v. UK, 30 July 1998  
Case Christine Goodwin v. UK, 11 July 2002  
Case B. and L. v. UK, 13 September 2005  
Case Muñoz Díaz v. Spain, 8 December 2009  
Case O'Donoghue and others v. UK, 14 December 2010

12. *Right to an effective remedy (article 13)*

Case Powell and Rayner v. UK, 21 February 1990  
Case Kudla v. Poland, 26 October 2000  
Case Al-Nashif v. Bulgaria, 20 June 2002  
Case Mc Farlane v. Ireland, 10 September 2010

13. *Prohibition of discrimination (article 14)*

Case “Relating to certain aspects of the laws on the use of languages in education in Belgium” v. Belgium (*sub. nom.* Belgian Linguistic Case), 23 July 1968  
Case Rasmussen v. Denmark, 28 November 1984  
Case Pine Valley Developments Ltd and others v. Ireland, 29 November 1991

Case Chassagnou v France, 29 April 1999  
Case Aziz v. Cyprus, 22 June 2004  
Case Nachova and others v. Bulgaria, 6 July 2005  
Case 97 members of the Gldani Congregation of Jehovah's  
Witnesses and 4 others v. Georgia, 3 May 2007

**B. (First) Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 20 March 1952 (ETS No. 9)**

*1. Protection of property (article 1)*

Case Sporrang and Lönnroth v. Sweden, 18 December 1984  
Case Pincová and Pinc v. the Czech Republic, 5 November 2002  
Case Broniowski v. Poland, 22 June 2004  
Case Hutten-Czapska v. Poland, 19 June 2006

*2. Right to free elections (article 3)*

Case Hirst v. UK, 6 October 2005  
Case Greens and M.T. v. UK, 23 November 2010  
Case Sitaropoulos and Giakoumopoulos v. Greece, 23 March  
2012

**C. Protocol No. 4 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, securing certain rights and freedoms other than those already included in the Convention and in the first Protocol thereto, 16 September 1963 (ETS No. 046)**

*1. Prohibition of imprisonment for debts (article 1)*

*2. Freedom of movement within the territory of a contracting party (article 2)*

Case Raimondo v. Italy, 22 February 1994  
Case Oliveira v. the Netherlands, 4 June 2002  
Case Assanidze v. Georgia, 8 April 2004  
Case Villa v. Italy, 20 April 2010  
Case Miażdżyk v. Poland, 24 January 2012

*3. Prohibition of expulsion of a country's own nationals (article 3 para. 1)*

*4. Freedom of entry for a country's nationals (article 3 para. 2)*

*5. Prohibition of collective expulsion of foreigners (article 4)*

Case Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy, 23 February 2012

D. [Protocol No. 6 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms concerning the Abolition of the Death Penalty, 28 April 1983 \(ETS No.: 114\)](#)

*Abolition of the death penalty other than in times of war (articles 1 and 2)*

E. [Protocol No. 7 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 22 November 1984 \(ETS No.: 117\)](#)

*1. Procedural guarantees in cases of expulsion of a foreigner (article 1)*

Case Lupsa v. Romania, 8 June 2006

Case Ahmed v. Romania, 13 July 2010

Case Nowak v. Ukraine, 31 March 2011

*2. Right to a judicial review for first instance judicial decisions in criminal cases (article 2)*

Case Hubner v. Austria, 31 August 1999

Case Krombach v. France, 13 February 2001

Case Hakobyan and others v. Armenia, 10 April 2012

*3. Right to damages in case of erroneous judicial decisions in criminal cases (article 3)*

Case Matveyev v. Russia, 3 July 2008

*4. Ne bis in idem (article 4)*

Case Gradinger v. Austria, 23 October 1995

Case Sailer v. Austria, 6 June 2002

Case W.F. v. Austria, 30 May 2002

Case Sergey Zolotukhin v. Russia, 10 February 2009

Case Ruotsalainen v. Finland, 16 June 2009

Case Tomasović v. Croatia, 18 October 2011

*5. Equality between man and women concerning marriage, during marriage and in the moment of its dissolution (article 5)*

F. [Protocol No. 12 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 2000 \(ETS No.: 177\)](#)

*Prohibition of discrimination of any kind (article 1)*

G. [Protocol No. 13 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, concerning the abolition of the death penalty in all circumstances \(ETS No.: 187\)](#)

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers could be international experts, national experts, and scholars.

### **4. Trainees**

Awareness and basic knowledge of the importance of the ECHR and the jurisprudence of the ECtHR are essential for every lawyer. Senior judges and prosecutors should have specialised knowledge of the case law of the ECtHR relevant for their area.

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method*

Basic seminars are recommended for all trainees; as an alternative distance learning courses, such as those developed under the Council of Europe's HELP programme (<http://moodle.stoas.nl/help>)

Specialised seminars focussing on more specific questions of individual rights and studying in more detail the jurisprudence and study visits to the ECtHR for senior judges and senior prosecutors are appropriate.

Use can also be made of the “fact sheets” available at: <http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/Press/Information+sheets/Factsheets/>

*B) E-learning:*

Basic seminars: B1

Deepening: B2–3

An e-learning platform already exists under: <http://moodle.stoas.nl/help>

*C) Priority:*

Basic seminars should have top priority. Specialised seminars and workshops should have priority. Study visits are recommended.

Participating trainers of the joint Workshop 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU' agreed that human rights and their implementation by ECJ and ECHR form such a necessary content of every judicial training programme that they should not as such be considered included in the number of hours especially dedicated to training in European Criminal Law.

*D) Format:*

Basic seminars could take place at local, regional and national level, specialised seminars at trans-national and EU-wide level.

## ***II. The relationship between the ECHR and EU law***

### **1. Introduction**

Formally the EU is not a contracting party to the ECHR and could not become one as the treaties did not provide competence to becoming party to it. The European Court of Justice, however, has recognized the ECHR as a source of inspiration when identifying the fundamental rights that European citizens enjoy under the general principles of Community law.

On the other hand, the ECtHR had to give a judicial response to the question as to what kind of fundamental rights standards apply when EU member states transfer part of their competences to the EU and if this could lead to a situation in which the transfer of competences results in a loss of fundamental rights protection just because the EU is not party to the ECHR.

This situation will change in a not so distant future. The Lisbon Treaty gives the EU the conferred power to accede the ECHR. On the side of the ECHR, the Protocol No. 14 makes the necessary amendments. It enters into force on 1 June 2010. In view of these changes, the EU is preparing for negotiations with the Council of Europe. A number of details need to be clarified, such as the question whether there should be an 'EU' judge and how this person would be selected, the question how Member States can be sued alongside the EU and how the enforcement of judgements against the EU will be ensured.

## 2. Case law

The recognition of the ECHR in the EU treaties and the jurisprudence of the ECJ and the possible accession of the EU to the ECHR and the future relationship between the court in Strasbourg and in Luxembourg

Case law of the ECtHR on the obligations of EU member states under the ECHR:

- Case of Matthews v. United Kingdom, application no. 24833/94, judgment of 18 February 1999
- Case of Bosphorus AS v. Ireland, application no. 45036/98, judgment of 30 June 2005
- Case of Cooperative Producentenorganisatie van de Nederlandse Kokkelvisserij v. the Netherlands, application no. 13645/05, decision as to the admissibility of 20 January 2009.

## 3. Trainers

Recommended trainers are international experts and scholars.

## 4. Trainees

Training is recommended for senior judges.

## 5. Methodology

### *A) Training method:*

Training should be offered in specialised seminars.

*B) Complementary e-learning.*

Complementary e-learning is not recommended.

*C) Priority:*

Training is recommended.

*D) Format:*

Training should take place at local, regional and national level.

### ***III. European Union documents***

#### **1. Introduction**

The recognition of fundamental rights as part of Community law was first developed in the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the European Communities (ECJ). While the ECJ found that fundamental rights were part of the general principles of EC law, no codifying instrument was created until 2000. The treaties included a reference to the European Convention on Human Rights and the national constitutional provisions instead.

In the late 1990s a Convention composed of members of the European Parliament and of national parliaments and representatives from Member States' governments and the European Commission elaborated the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. It was solemnly proclaimed at an Intergovernmental Conference in Nice in 2000. It did not become part of the EU law at that time. The EU institutions, however, did declare that they felt to be bound by it.

Today, the Charter of Fundamental Rights read together with the European Convention and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights can be considered as the EU fundamental rights acquis.

With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty on 1 December 2009, the Charter of Fundamental Rights became a document that is enforceable in Court. The new article 6 § 1 of the Treaty on European Union affirms that this will not lead to an extension of the competences of the EU. The protocol on the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights to Poland and the UK reaffirms this, stressing that the Charter cannot be used to declare national legislation invalid under European law by the ECJ and specifically ensures that



the ‘social rights’ included in Title IV of the Charter cannot be enforced in courts of the two countries unless provided so for by national law. The explanations relating to the text of the Charter, as adopted by the Convention drafting this, are represent one of the guidelines for interpreting the Charter itself, as provided for by article 6 of the Treaty on European Union.

## 2. Instruments and case-law

### *a. Basic instruments*

1. [Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union \(OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 389\)](#)
2. [Protocol \(No. 30\) on the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights to Poland and the United Kingdom \(OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 313\);](#)
3. [Declaration \(No. 53\) by the Czech Republic on the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union \(OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 355\);](#)
4. [Declaration \(No. 61\) by the Republic of Poland on the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union \(OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 358\);](#)
5. [Declaration \(No. 62\) by the Republic of Poland concerning the Protocol on the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights to Poland and the United Kingdom \(OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 358\);](#)
6. [European Union – Consolidated Versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union \( OJ C 83 of 30.03.2010, p. 13 and 47\)](#)

### *b. Case law*

- *Case 29/69 Erich Stauder v. Stadt Ulm – Sozialamt*
- *Case 11/70 Internationale Handelsgesellschaft*
- *Case 4/73 Nold*
- *Case 44/79 Hauer*
- *Case 98/79 Pecastaing*
- *Case C-265/95 Commission v. France*
- *Case C-36/02 Omega*
- *Case C-112/00 Schmidberger*

### **3. Trainers**

Trainers should be EU experts and scholars.

### **4. Trainees**

Training should in particular be provided for junior and senior judges .

### **5. Methodology**

#### *A) Training method:*

Training should preferably take the shape of basic seminars, specialised seminars, and distance e-learning.

#### *B) Complementary e-learning:*

Complementary e-learning can be recommended.

#### *C) Priority:*

Training should have priority

#### *D) Format:*

Training should preferably take place at regional, national, trans-national and EU-wide level.

## ***IV. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)***

### **1. Introduction**

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights is a Vienna-based agency of the European Union inaugurated on March 1, 2007. It was established by Council Regulation (EC) No 168/2007 of 15 February 2007 as the successor to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). The objective of the Agency is to provide the relevant institutions and authorities of the Community and its member states when implementing Community law with assistance and expertise relating to fundamental rights to support them when they take measures or formulate courses of action within their respective spheres of competence to fully respect fundamental rights. The tasks of the Agency include information and data collection, research and analysis, advice to EU institutions and member states, co-operation with civil society and awareness-raising.

### *Training content*

1. Role and tasks of FRA
2. Co-operation between FRA and national authorities: how to work together?
3. Using FRA
4. Relationships between FRA and other EU Institutions

## **2. Instruments and case law**

[Council Regulation \(EC\) No 168/2007 of 15 February 2007 establishing a European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights \(OJ L 53/1; 22.2.2007\)](#)

## **3. Trainers**

Trainers recommended for this topic should be EU experts, and national practitioners.

## **4. Trainees**

This topic can be especially recommended for junior judges and prosecutors, and future/trainee judges and prosecutors.

## **5. Methodology**

### *A) Training method*

Training methods are basic seminars as well as study visits.

The seminar should give a comprehensive overview of the role and tasks of the Agency.

### *B) Complementary e-learning*

Training can be completed by e-learning.

### *C) Priority*

Training is recommended.

### *D) Format*

The training format recommended includes local, regional, and national training.

## Conclusions



Réseau Européen de Formation Judiciaire  
European Judicial Training Network

*Workshop on 'A joint frame for European criminal justice training in the EU'  
The Hague, 8–9 December 2009*

## Conclusions

### 1.

From an expert's point of view, participating trainers agreed that the following topics proposed by the Penal Sub-group should form part of a common national training curriculum in European criminal justice:

#### *A. General EU Law*

1. Eu judicial system
2. EU Law effects on national legal systems
3. EU competence in relation to police and judicial cooperation

#### *B. Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters*

1. Surrender of persons–Extradition and EAW
2. MLA–Evidence
3. MLA–Seizure of Criminal assets
4. European Judicial Network

5. Protection of the EU financial Interests
6. EUROJUST

### *C. Procedural Rights*

1. Victims and restorative justice

### *D. European Criminal Law*

1. Money Laundering
2. Corruption
3. Illicit Drug Trafficking
4. Trafficking of Human Beings
5. Terrorism
6. Cybercrime

### *E. Police Cooperation*

1. Schengen
2. Joint Investigation Teams

## 2.

Human Rights and their implementation by ECJ and ECHR, a necessary content of every judicial training programme, should not as such be considered included in the number of hours especially dedicated to training in European Criminal Law.

## 3.

The diversity of training institutions, legal and organisational systems and training needs in participating countries must be borne in mind at all times. In this sense, the implementation of the common curriculum will necessarily be subject to national adjustments.

## 4.

Therefore, the choice of common subjects in which training should be provided does not prejudge the training audience (i.e. judges/prosecutors, initial/on-going training), the methodologies to be used, the importance that should be given to different topics or the way they should be developed by training institutions.

## 5.

Participants considered EJTN's "European Criminal Justice Training Guidelines", which spell out the content of the abovementioned and other subjects, as a very useful instrument. Institutions that want to can use the Guidelines to design their training programmes on the selected topics.

## 6.

A draft proposal for a common European training curriculum in criminal matters, accompanied by an explanatory document, will be drafted in accordance with the works of the Sub-group Penal and the results of the Workshop. It will be presented to the WG Programmes for consideration, prior to its submission to EJTN's Plenary in Madrid with a view to its approval.



*With the support of the European Union*

## *Chapter G*

### *Bibliography*

*Reproduced from (except for Portugal): European Criminal Law, Andre Klip, Antwerp, Intersentia, 2009, ISBN 978-90-5095-772-4 as well as from the replies of following members of the sub-group 'penal': Centro de Estudos Judiciários, Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura, National Training Centre, NIM, SSR and amended for the 2011 update by ERA.*

## *I. Selected Bibliography on European Criminal Law*

- Akehurst, M.*, The Application of General Principles of Law by the Court of Justice of the European Communities, 52 *British Journal of International Law* 1981, p. 29–51
- Allen, C.G.*, Criminal offences against the law of the European Community, *Common Market Law Review* 1974, p. 183–190
- Ambos, K.*, *Internationales Strafrecht Strafanwendungsrecht Volkerstrafrecht Europaisches Strafrecht*, Verlag C.H. Beck, 2nd Edition 2008
- Armone, G.M. (ed.)*, *Diritto Penale Europeo e Ordinamento Italiano*, Giuffrè Editore 2006
- Baker, E.*, Taking European Criminal Law Seriously, *Criminal Law Review* 1998, p. 361–380
- Bassiouni, M. Ch., V. Militello and H. Satzger*, *European Cooperation in Penal Matters: Issues and Perspectives*, Wolters Kluwer Italia 2008
- Beken, T. Vander*, *Forumkeuze in het internationaal strafrecht*, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 1999
- Belgian Standing Intelligence Agencies Review Committee*; Fusion centres throughout Europe : all-source threat assessments in the fight against terrorism – Antwerpen (u.a.) : Intersentia, 2010. – XXIII, 220 p. – (Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? ; 4)
- Bennion, F.A.R.*, *Understanding common law legislation*, Oxford University Press 2001
- Bose, M.*, *Der Grundsatz der Verfügbarkeit von Informationen in der strafrechtlichen Zusammenarbeit der Europäischen Union*, Bonn University Press 2007
- Braum, S.; Weyembergh, A. (eds)*; Institut d' Etudes Européennes, *Le contrôle juridictionnel dans l' espace pénal européen*, Bruxelles : Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 2009. – 350 p.
- Cadoppi, A.*, Towards a European Criminal Code, *European Journal of Crime, Criminal law and Criminal Justice* 1996, p. 2–17
- Caeiro, P.*, *Fundamento, conteúdo e limites da jurisdicação penal do estado: o caso português*, Dissertation University of Coimbra 2008

- Calderoni, F.*; Organized crime legislation in the European Union / Francesco Calderoni. – Berlin (u.a.): Springer, 2010. – XIV, 189 p.
- Cape, E. and J. Hodgson, T. Prakken and T. Spronken* (eds.), Suspects in Europe, Intersentia 2007X
- Cape, E.*; Effective criminal defence in Europe / Antwerpen (u.a.): Intersentia, 2010. – XXXI, 657 p. – (IUS Commune Europaeum; 87)
- Corstens, G. and J. Pradel*, Het Europese strafrecht, Deventer, Kluwer 2003
- Danilet, C.*; Corruption and anti-corruption in the justice system / – München: Beck [u.a.], 2010. – 208 p.
- Dannecker, G. and O. Jansen*, Competition Law Sanctioning in the European Union, Kluwer Law International 2004
- Delmas-Marty, M.*, Procédures pénales d'Europe, Presses universitaires de France 1995
- Delmas-Marty, M.*, Quelle politique pénale pour l'Europe? Paris, Economica 1993
- Delmas-Marty, M.*, The European Union and Penal Law, European Law Journal, 1998, p. 87-115
- Delmas-Marty, M. and J.A.E. Vervaele*, The Implementation of the Corpus Juris in the Member States, Intersentia 2000
- Dijk, P. van, F. van Hoof, A. van Rijn and L. Zwaak* (eds.), Theory and Practice of the European Convention on Human Rights, Intersentia Antwerpen-Oxford 2004, 4<sup>th</sup> edition
- Droit penal europeen, Europees strafrecht, European Criminal Law*, Presses universitaires de Bruxelles 1970
- Droit penal, droit europeen*, Melanges offerts a G. Levasseur, Paris, 1992
- Enschede, Ch.J.*, Model Penal Code for Europe, Een uniform Europees strafrecht?, Gouda Quint Arnhem 1970, 1990
- European Criminal Law*, Special Issue of the Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law 2005, Vol. 12, number 2, p. 113-213
- European Integration and Harmonisation and Criminal Law*, Four Contributions on the Interplay between European Integration and European and National Law to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of Maastricht University's Faculty of Law 2006, p. 109-153
- European Parliament*; Harmonization of criminal law in the EU: a special focus on the US judicial system; study/ Nadja Long – Luxembourg: European Parliament, 2010. – 34 p.



- Europeanisering van het Nederlands recht*, opstellen aangeboden aan Mr. W.E. Haak, (editors G.J.M. Corstens, W.J.M. Davids, M.I. Veldt-Foglia) Kluwer Deventer 2004
- Fichera, M.*; The implementation of the European Arrest Warrant in the European Union: law, policy and practice / Antwerpen (u.a.): Intersentia, 2011. – XIII, 253 S. – (Supranational criminal law: capita selecta; Vol. 10)
- Fijnaut, C.*, De Europese Unie: een lusthof voor (strafrechtelijke) rechtsvergelijking, Gouda Quint Deventer 2001, inaugural lecture Tilburg University
- Fijnaut, C.*, Rechtsvergelijking en strafrecht(swetenschap): enkele methodologische beschouwingen, Nederlandse Vereniging voor Rechtsvergelijking, Handelingen No. 61, Kluwer Deventer 2001
- Fijnaut, C.; Ouwerkerk J. (eds)*; The future of police and judicial cooperation in the European Union / ed. by – The Hague (u.a.): Martinus Nijhoff Publ., 2010. – XXII, 412 p.
- Fletcher, M. and R. Loof*, EU Criminal Law and Justice, Edward Elgar Publishing 2008
- Flore, D.*; Droit pénal européen : les enjeux d' une justice pénale européenne / Bruxelles : Larcier, 2009. – 633 p.
- Gerhard, H.*; Das Recht der internationalen Terrorismusbekämpfung : Asset Freezing, UN- und FATF-Vorgaben, US-Recht, EuGH-Judikatur, Grundrechte / Wien : Sramek, 2010. – XXI, 256 p. – (Europarecht)
- Grasso, G. and R. Sicurella*, Lezioni di Diritto Penale Europeo, Giuffrè Editore 2007
- Guerini, U.*, Il Diritto Penale dell'Unione Europea, G. Giappichelli Editore, Torino 2008
- Harding, Chr. and B. Swart*, Enforcing European Community Rules, Dartmouth 1996
- Hecker, B.*, Europäisches Strafrecht, Springer Verlag 2005
- Hendry, I.D.*, The third pillar of Maastricht, cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs, 36 German Yearbook of International Law 1993, p. 295-327
- Henzelin, M.*, Le principe de l'universalité en droit pénal international, Collection Genevoise 2000
- Hoecke, M. Van* (ed.), Epistemology and Methodology of Comparative Law, Hart Publishing, Oxford and Portland Oregon 2004

- Johannes, H.*, Le droit penal et son harmonisation dans les Communautés Europeennes, *Revue trimestrielle de droit europeen*, 1971, p. 315-352
- Jung, H.*, Criminal Justice - a European Perspective, *Criminal Law Review* 1993, p. 237-245
- Kaiafa-Gbandi, M.*, The development towards Harmonization within Criminal Law in the European Union. A Citizen's Perspective, *9 European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice* 2001, p. 239-263
- Kerchove, G. De and A. Weyembergh*, La reconnaissance mutuelle des decisions judiciaires penales dans l'Union europeenne, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Universite de Bruxelles 2001
- Kerchove, G. De and A. Weyembergh*, L'espace penal europeen: enjeux et perspectives Bruxelles, Editions de l'Universite de Bruxelles 2002
- Kerchove, G. De and A. Weyembergh*, Quelles reformes pour l'espace penal europeen?, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Universite de Bruxelles 2003
- Kerchove, G. De and A. Weyembergh*, Vers un espace judiciaire penal europeen, Towards a European Judicial Criminal Area, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Universite de Bruxelles 2000
- Klip, A.H.*, Conditions for a European Corpus Juris Criminalis, in: Michael Faure, Jan Smits en Hildegard Schneider (eds.), Towards a European Jus Commune in Legal Education and Research, Maastricht 2002, p. 109-123
- Klip, A.H.*, Harmonisierung des Strafrechts - eine Idee fixe?, *Neue Zeitschrift fur Strafrecht* 2000, p. 626-630
- Klip, A.H.*, The Decrease of Protection under Human Rights Treaties in International Criminal Law, *68 Revue Internationale de Droit Penal/ International Review of Penal Law* 1997, p. 291-310
- Klip, A.H.*, Uniestrafrecht/ Criminal Law of the European Union/ Le Droit Penal de l'Union Europeenne/ Strafrecht in der Europaischen Union, oratie/ inaugural lecture/ Antrittsrede/ discours inaugural, Maastricht University Kluwer 2005
- Klip, A. and H. van der Wilt*, Harmonisation and Harmonising Measures in Criminal Law, Royal Academy of Science/ Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Verhandelingen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel 186, Amsterdam 2002
- Krause, J.; Witt, D. (eds)*; Institut für Sicherheitspolitik an der Universität Kiel: Jahrbuch Terrorismus 2009 - Opladen (u.a.): Verl. Barbara Budrich, 2010. - 350 p.

- Lawson, R.A.*, Het EVRM en de Europese Gemeenschappen, Kluwer Deventer 1999
- McBride, J.*, Human rights and criminal procedure: the case law of the European Court of Human Rights / Jeremy McBride. – Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publ., 2009. – 398 p.
- Nelles, U.*, Europaisierung des Strafverfahrensstraßprozessrecht für Europa, Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft 1997, p. 727–755
- Nijboer, J.F. and W.J.J.M. Sprangers* (eds.), Harmonisation in Forensic Expertise, An Inquiry into the Desirability of International Standards for Scientific Evidence, Thela Thesis, Amsterdam 2000
- OLAF*; OLAF 10th anniversary conference: compilation of speeches – Brüssel : OLAF, 2010. – 157 p.
- Peers, S.*, EU Justice and Home Affairs Law, Oxford University Press, 2nd Edition 2007
- Pieth, M.; Thelesklaf, D.; Ivory, R. (eds.)*; Countering terrorist financing: the practitioner's point of view / – Frankfurt a. M. (u.a.) : Lang, 2009. – XXII, 283 S.
- Pradel, J. and G. Corstens*, Droit Penal Europeen, 2e edition, Paris Dalloz 2002
- Rodrigues, A.M.*, O Direito Penal Europeu Emergente, Coimbra Editora 2008
- Roger France, E.*, The influence of European Community Law on the criminal law of the member states, European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice 1994, p. 324–358
- Satzger, H.*, Internationales und Europaisches Strafrecht, Nomos 2005
- Schunemann, B.*, Alternative–Project for a European Criminal Law and Procedure, Criminal Law Forum 2007, p. 227–251
- Schunemann, B. and J. de Figueiredo Dias*, Bausteine des europaischen Strafrechts, Coimbra–Symposium für Claus Roxin, Carl Heymanns Verlag KG 1995
- Sevenster, H.G.*, Criminal law & EC Law, 29 Common Market Law Review 1992, p. 29–70
- Sgubbi, F. and G. Insolera*, L'interpretazione conforme al diritto comunitario in materia penale, Bononia University Press 2007
- Sieber, U.*, European Unification and European Criminal Law, European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice 1994, p. 86–104

*Sieber, U.;* Die Zukunft des europäischen Strafrechts: ein neuer Ansatz zu den Zielen und Modellen des europäischen Strafrechtssystems / – Sonderdr. – Freiburg i. Br. : MPI f. ausl. u. int. Strafrecht, 2009. – 67 p. Sonderdruck aus Bd. 121 (2009), der "Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft"

NE: Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft; ZStW

*Sieber, U.;* Blurring the categories of criminal law and the law of war: efforts and effects in the pursuit of internal and external security / – Sonderdr. – Freiburg i. Br.: MPI f. ausl. u. int. Strafrecht, 2009. – p. 35 – p. 69 Sonderdruck aus: "Criminal law between war and peace"

NE: Criminal law between war and peace

*Sotis, C.,* Il Diritto Senza Codice, Uno studio sul sistema penale europeo vigente, Milano, Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore 2007

*Spencer, J.,* The European Arrest Warrant, The Cambridge Yearbook on European Legal Studies 2004, p. 201–234

*Spronken, T.,* A Place of Greater Safety, inaugural lecture Maastricht 2003

*Spronken, T. and M. Attinger,* Procedural Rights in Criminal Proceedings: Existing Level of Safeguards, Maastricht/ Brussel 2005

*Spronken, T., Vermeulen, G., De Vocht, D.,* EU procedural rights in criminal proceedings / Brussels: European Commission, 2009. – 744 p. (Ordner)

*Spronken, T.;* An EU-wide letter of rights: towards best practice / Antwerpen (u.a.) : Intersentia, 2010. – X, 525 p. – (IUS Commune Europaeum; 92)

*Strijards, G.A.M.,* Internationaal strafrecht, strafmachtsrecht, Gouda Quint Arnhem 1984

*Swart, A.H.J.,* Een ware Europese rechtsruimte, Gouda Quint Deventer 2001, inaugural lecture University of Amsterdam

*Swart, B. and A. Klip,* International Criminal Law in the Netherlands, Beitrage und Materialien aus dem Max-Planck-Institut für internationales und ausländisches Strafrecht, Band 566, Freiburg im Breisgau 1997

*Szarek-Mason, P.;* The European Union's fight against corruption: the evolving policy towards Member States and candidate countries / Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010. – X, 305 p. – (Cambridge studies in European law and policy)

*Vermeulen, G.,* Aspecten van Europees formeel strafrecht, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 2002

*Vermeulen, G.,* Aspecten van Europees materieel strafrecht, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 2002

- Vermeulen, G.*, Wederzijdse rechtshulp in strafzaken in de Europese Unie, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 1999
- Vermeulen, G., T. Vander Beken, L. Van Puyenbroeck and S. Van Malderen*, Availability of law enforcement information in the European Union, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 2005
- Vernimmen–Van, T.; Surano, L.; Weyembergh, A.*; Institut d' Etudes Européennes, The future of mutual recognition in criminal matters in the European Union, – Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université libre de Bruxelles, 2009. – 603 p.
- Vervaele, J.A.E.*, El Derecho Penal Europeo, Del Derecho Penal Economico y Financiero a un Derecho Penal Federal, UBIJUS, Lima Peru 2006
- Vervaele, J.A.E.* (ed.), European Evidence Warrant, Intersentia 2005
- Vervaele, J.A.E.*, Handen en tanden van het (gemeenschapsrecht), Inaugural lecture Utrecht University 1994, Kluwer Deventer 1994
- Vervaele, J.A.E.* (ed.), Transnational Enforcement of the Financial Interests of the European Union. Developments in the Treaty of Amsterdam and the Corpus Juris, Intersentia, Antwerpen 1999
- Vervaele, J. and A. Klip*, European Cooperation between Tax, Customs and Judicial Authorities, European Monographs 32, Kluwer Law International, The Hague, London, New York 2002
- Verwey, D.*, The European Community, the European Union and the International Law of Treaties, TMC Asser Press, The Hague 2004
- Vogel, J.*, Europäische Kriminalpolitik – europäische Strafrechtsdogmatik, Goldammer's Archiv für Strafrecht 2002, p. 517–534
- Walden, I.*, Computer crimes and digital investigations / Oxford Univ. Press, 2007. – XLII, 491 p.
- Weyembergh, A.*, L'harmonisation des législations: condition de l'espace pénal européen et révélateur de ses tensions, Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles 2004
- Weyembergh, A. and S. de Biolley*, Comment évaluer le droit pénal européen? Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles 2006
- Weyembergh, A.; Santamaria, V. (eds)*; Institut d' Etudes Européennes., The evaluation of European criminal law: the example of the Framework Decision on combating trafficking in human beings – Bruxelles : Editions de l'Université libre de Bruxelles, 2009. – 409 p. – (Études européennes)
- Wyngaert, Chr. Van den*, Strafrecht, strafprocesrecht en internationaal strafrecht, Maklu Antwerpen/ Apeldoorn 2003

*Zöller, M. A.*; Terrorismusstrafrecht: ein Handbuch / Mark A. Zöller. – Heidelberg : C. F. Müller, 2009. – XXX, 758 p. – (Wissenschaft)

## II. AUSTRIA

*Fuchs, H.*, Europäischer Haftbefehl und Staaten-Souveränität, Juristische Blätter 2003, p. 405 *et seq.*

*Kert, R.*, Lebensmittelstrafrecht im Spannungsfeld des Gemeinschaftsrechts, Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Wien 2004

*Killmann, B.-R.*, Die rahmenbeschlusskonforme Auslegung im Strafrecht vor dem EuGH, Juristische Blätter 2005, p. 566 *et seq.*

*Medigovic, U.*, Der Europäische Haftbefehl in Österreich, Juristische Blätter 2006, p. 627 *et seq.*

*Medigovic, U.*, Die gegenseitige Anerkennung von vermögensrechtlichen Sanktionen innerhalb der EU und ihre Umsetzung im österreichischen Justizstrafrecht, Juristische Blätter 2008, p. 69 *et seq.*

*Murschetz, V.*, Auslieferung und Europäischer Haftbefehl, Springer-Verlag, Wien – New York 2007

*Reiter, S.*, Europäische Union und österreichisches Strafrecht: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Delikte gegen Menschenhandel und Schlepperei, Wien 2008

*Schroeder, W.*, Der Rahmenbeschluss als Rechtssatzform in den Verträgen, in: Lagodny, Otto/ Wiederin, Ewald/ Winkler, Roland (Hrsg.), Probleme des Rahmenbeschlusses am Beispiel des Europäischen Haftbefehls – Ein neues Instrument der europäischen Integration aus Sicht von Europarecht, Strafrecht, Verfassungsrecht und Völkerrecht, Berlin/Graz 2007, p. 37–58

*Schroeder, W.*, Die Durchführung von Gemeinschaftsrecht – einheitliche Wirkung versus nationale Verfahrenautonomie, in: Hummer, Waldemar (Hrsg.), Paradigmenwechsel im Europarecht zur Jahrtausendwende, Wien/New York 2004, p. 231–267

*Schwaighofer, K.*, Die Neuordnung des Auslieferungsrechts durch den Europäischen Haftbefehl, in: Grafl /Medigovic (eds.), Festschrift für Manfred Burgstaller, Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Wien – Graz 2004

*Zeder, F.*, Der Europäische Haftbefehl in Österreich. Eine Analyse der materiellen Voraussetzungen für eine Übergabe nachdem EU-JZG, Juristische Blätter 2006, p. 627 *et seq.*

*Zeder, F.*, Europastrafrecht – Aktueller Stand, in: Bundesministerium für Justiz (ed.), Vorarlberger Tage 2007, p. 51 *et seq.*

### III. BELGIUM

*Beken, T. Vander*, From Brussels with love. Bespiegelingen over de invloed van de Europese Unie op het Belgisch strafrecht, T. Strafr. 2002, p. 2–26

*Hert, P. de*, Het einde van de Europese rechtshulp en de geboorte van een Europese horizontale strafprocesruimte, Justitiële Verkenningen, 2004, vol. 30, nr. 6, 96–118

*Hert, P. de*, Trends in de Europese politiele en justitiële informatiesamenwerking, Panopticon, Tijdschrift voor strafrecht, criminologie en forensisch welzijnswerk, 2004, vol. 25, nr. 1, 26–56

*Kerckhove, G. De and A. Weyembergh* (ed.), La confiance mutuelle dans l'espace pénal européen, Collection Etudes européennes, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Centre européennes, Bruxelles, 2005, 261 p.

*Stessens, G.*, De nationale en internationale bestrijding van het witwassen, Intersentia uitgevers 1997

*Wyngaert, Chr. Van den*, De internationale strafrechtelijke samenwerking bij de bestrijding van de EEG-Fraude, RW 1991–92, p. 417–424

*Wyngaert, Chr. Van den*, Droit pénal et communautés européennes, Revue de Droit Pénal et de Criminologie 1982, p. 837–862

*Wyngaert, Chr. Van den*, Kennismaking met het internationaal en Europees strafrecht, Maklu, Antwerpen, 2003

### IV. CYPRUS

*Tsadiras, A.*, National courts: Cyprus Supreme Court, Judgment of 7 November 2005 (Civil Appeal No. 294/2005) on the Cypriot European Arrest Warrant Law, 44

Common Market Law Review 2007, p. 1515 *et seq.*

### V. DANMARK

*Cornils, K. and V. Greve*, Danmark. Organisierte Kriminalität und kriminelle Organisationen. Walter Gropp and Arndt Sinn (Hrsg.). Baden–Baden 2006, p. 31–71

- Elholm, T.*, EU-konform fortolkning af national straff eret. In: Jurist uden omsvob, Festskrift til Gorm Toft egaard Nielsen. Annette Moller-Sorensen et al. (eds.). Christian Ejlers Forlag. Kobenhavn, 2007, p. 97-116
- Elholm, T.*, Strafrechtliche Masnahmen der EU – verstärkte Repression in den nordischen Landern? Muller-Dietz et al. (eds.): Festschrift fur Heike Jung, 2007, p. 135-152
- Gade, I.* et al., Det politimassige og straff eretlige samarbejde i Den Europaiske Union. Jurist- og Okonomforbundets Forlag, 2005
- Holst Christensen, N.*, Mens vi venter pa Godot. In: Ikke kun straf... Festskrift til Vagn Greve. Thomas Elholm et al. (eds.). Jurist- og Okonomforbundets Forlag, 2008, p. 243-253
- Vestergaard, J.*, Dansk lovgivning om bekampelse af terrorisme. In: Enhver stats pligt.. International straff eret og dansk ret. Lars Plum & Andreas Laursen (eds.). DJOFs Forlag, 2007, p. 391-424
- Vestergaard, J.*, Det straff eretlige varn mod terrorisme – nye konventionsforpligtelser mv. Tidsskrift for Kriminalret 4/2006, pp. 246-260
- Vestergaard, J.*, Udlevering til straff orfolgning m.v. – den europaiske arrestordre som udtryk for gensidig anerkendelse. In: Festskrift til Hans Gammeltoft –Hansen. Arne Flifl et et al. (eds.). Jurist- og Okonomforbundets Forlag 2004, p. 627-653

## VI. FINLAND

- Frande, D.*, Om att frysa i EU– nagra iakttagelser. Rikosoikeudellisia kirjoituksia VIII Raimo Lahdelle omistettu. Suomalainen Lakimiesyhdistys, Helsinki 2006, p. 19-29
- Frande, D.*, Om bevisupptagning inom EU. Juha Lappalaisen juhlakirja. COMI, Helsinki s. 69-83
- Jahkola, K.*, Rikosasioita koskeva keskinainen oikeusapu Euroopan Unionissa. Lakimies 2000/4 p. 506-536
- Lahti, R.*, Harmonisering av den straff rattsliga lagstift ningen och konsekvenser for den nationella lagstift ningen. Materiella och rattskipningsrelaterade stotestenaar. Juridiska Foreningens Tidsskrift 3-4/2004 p. 377-385
- Lahti, R.*, Straff rattsligt samarbete i EU:s tredje pelare – nagot att strava eft er? Forhandlingarna vid Det 36 nordiska juristmotet i Helsingfors 15-17



- augusti 2002. Del I. Utgivna av lokalstyrelsen for Finland. Jyvaskyla 2002, p. 431-444
- Melander, S.*, Rangaistusten yhdenmukaistamisesta Euroopan unionissa. Defensor legis 2002/6 p. 966-973
- Nuotio, K.*, Eurooppalaistuva rikosoikeus. EU-oikeuden perusteita II - aineellisen EU-oikeuden aloja ja ulottuvuuksia - teoksessa (toim. Ojanen and Haapea) Edita 2007 p. 375-411
- Sihto, J.*, Den europeiska arresteringsordern. Juridiska Foreningens Tidsskrift 4-5/2003, p. 502-531
- Suominen, A.*, Om giltigheten av ett rambeslut i europeisk straff ratt samt Lissabonfordragets inverkan pa omradet for den europeiska straff rattan. NordiskTidsskrift for Kriminalvidenskap 2/2008, p. 130-150
- Suominen, A.*, The past, present and the future of Eurojust. Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law, Volume 15, 2/2008 p. 217-234

## VII. FRANCE

- Badinter, R.*, L'Europe judiciaire, Recueil Dalloz 2007 p. 208 *et seq.*
- Bernardi, A.*, Le role du troisieme pilier dans l'europeanisation du droit penal. Un bilan synthetique a la veille de la reforme des traites Revue de science criminelle 2007 p. 713 *et seq.*
- Labayle, H.*, Architecte ou spectatrice? La Cour de justice dans l'Espace de liberte, securite et justice, RTDE 2006 n°1 p. 3 *et seq.*
- Labayle, H.*, Instruments et procedures de l'espace de liberte, de securite et de justice: quelques reflexions critiques, Europe 2003 n° p. 3 *et seq.*
- Labayle, H.*, La cooperation dans le domaine de la justice et des affaires interieures, Repertoire Dalloz de droit communautaire, 1998
- Labayle, H.*, La politique exterieure de l'Union europeenne en matiere de Justice et d'affaires interieures: chimere ou realite?, Melanges en l'honneur de JC Gautron, Pedone, 2004, p. 681 *et seq.*
- Manacorda, S.*, La consolidation de l'Espace de liberte, de securite et de justice: vers une "mise a l'ecart" du rapprochement penal? Revue de science criminelle 2007 p. 899 *et seq.*

*Meeusen, J.*, L'Europe entre unite et diversite: du marche interieur a l'ELSJ, in Trajectoires de l'Europe, unie dans la diversite depuis 50 ans, sous la direction de S. Poillot-Peruzzetto, Dalloz 2008

*Montain-Domenah, J.*, Le droit de l'espace judiciaire penal europeen: un nouveau modele juridique?, Cultures & Confl its, n°62 (2/2006) p. 149-168

## VIII. GERMANY

Commentaries on Cooperation in Criminal Law (including a part on European Union Law and its implementation, e.g. the European Arrest Warrant and its implementation in §§78 et seq. IRG): Heinrich Grutzner/ Paul-Gunter Potz/ Claus Kres (ed.), Internationaler Rechtshilfeverkehr in Strafsachen, third edition, Heidelberg 2007 et seq. Schomburg, Wolfgang/ Lagodny, Otto/ Gles, Sabine/ Hackner, Thomas, Internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen, fourth edition, Munchen 2006

Commentary on the Law of the European Union (with regard to Art. 29 to Art. 42 TEU): Jurgen Schwarze (ed.), EU-Kommentar, second edition, August 2008

Proposals on the reform of European Criminal Law: Bernd Schunemann (ed.), Ein Gesamtkonzept fur die europaische Strafrechtspflege, Koln 2007; Jurgen Wolter/ Wolf-Rudiger Schenke/Hans Hilger/Josef Ruthig/Mark

A. Zoller (ed.), Alternativ-Entwurf Europol und europaischer Datenschutz, Heidelberg 2008

## IX. GREECE

*Αναγνωστόπουλου Η.*, 'Απάτη και κοινοτική απάτη', Ποινικά Χρονικά 2001, σ. 759 επ. (*Anagnostopoulou I.*, 'Apati kai koinotiki apati, Penal Chronicles', 2001, p. 759 et seq.)

[*Anagnostopoulou I.*, 'Fraud and Community fraud', Penal Chronicles, 2001, p. 759 et seq.]

*Ζημιανίτη Δ.*, 'Δικαστική Συνεργασία σε ποινικές υποθέσεις στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση Θεσμικό πλαίσιο, κεκτημένο, προοπτικές', Αθήνα 2007 (*Zimianitis D.*, 'Dikastiki sinergasia se poinikes ipotheseis stin Evropaiki Enosi - Th esmiko plaisio, kektimeno, prooptikes', Athens 2007)

[*Zimianitis D.*, 'Judicial cooperation in criminal matters in the European Union-Institutional framework, *acquis*, prospective', Athens, 2007]

*Καϊάφα-Γκμπάντι Μ., 'Κοινές δικονομικές αρχές ως βάση μιας διακρατικής ποινικής καταστολής', Ποινικά Χρονικά 2007, σ. 673 επ. (Kaiafa-Gbandi M., 'Koines dikonomikes arches os vasi mias diakraticis poinikis katastolis', Penal Chronicles 2007, p. 673 et seq.)*

[*Kaiafa-Gbandi M., 'Common procedural principles as the basis for an inter-state criminal repression', Penal Chronicles 2007, p. 673 et seq.*]

*Καϊάφα-Γκμπάντι Μ., Γιαννακούλα Α., 'Ποινική νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ελληνική νομοθεσία ενσωμάτωσης', Θεσσαλονίκη 2008 (Kaiafa-Gbandi M.,*

*Giannakoula A., 'Poiniki nomothesia tis Evropaikis Enosis kai elliniki nomothsia ensomatosis', Th essaloniki 2008)*

[*Kaiafa-Gbandi M.; Giannakoula A., 'Penal legislation in the European Union and Greek Legislation of Implementation', Th essaloniki 2008]*

*Καλφέλη Γ., 'Το Ευρωπαϊκό ένταλμα σύλληψης - Μονοδιάστατη ενοποίηση των ευρωπαϊκών κατασταλτικών μηχανισμών,' σε I. Μανωλεδάκη Τιμητικό τόμο II: Μελέτες Ποινικού δικαίου - Εγκληματολογίας - Ιστορίας του εγκλήματος, Θεσσαλονίκη 2007, σ. 799 επ. (Kalfelis G., 'Το Ευρωπαϊκό entalma sillipsis*

*Monodiasitati enopoisi ton evropaikon katastaltikon michanison?' in I. Manoledakis Timitikos Tomos II: Meletes Poinikou Dikaiou - Eglimatologias - storia tou eglimatou, Th essaloniki 2007, p. 799 et seq.*

[*Kalfelis G., 'The European Arrest Warrant: One-dimensional unification of European repressive mechanisms?' in I. Manoledakis Honorary Volume II: Studies of Criminal Law- Criminology - History of crime, Th essaloniki 2007, p. 799 et seq.*]

*Μανωλεδάκη Ι., 'Μπορεί να επιβιώσει το Ποινικό Δίκαιο - όπως διαμορφώθηκε μέχρι σήμερα στον ευρωπαϊκό χώρο - και στο νέο αιώνα;', Υπεράσπιση 2000, σ. 15 επ.*

*(Manoledakis I., 'Borei na epiviosei to Poiniko Dikaio - opos diamorfothike mehri simera ston evropaiko choro - kai to neo aiona?', Yperaspisi 2000, p. 15 et seq.)*

[*Manoledakis I., 'Can Penal law survive -as it has been shaped to date in the European Area and in the new century?', Yperaspisi 2000, p. 15 et seq.)*

*Μυλωνόπουλου Χ., 'Η επίδραση του κοινοτικού δικαίου στο ελληνικό ποινικό δίκαιο',*

*Υπεράσπιση 1991, σ. 1061 επ.*

*(Milonopoulou Ch., 'I epidrasi tou koinotikou dikaiou sto elliniko poiniko dikaio', Yperaspisi 1991, p. 1061 et seq.)*

[*Milonopoulou Ch.*, 'The influence of Community law on Greek Penal law', Υπερασπισί 1991, p. 1061 *et seq.*]

Παύλου Σ., Το ποινικό δίκαιο και οι «αποφάσεις-πλαίσιο» της ΕΕ - μια ακόμη (επικίνδυνη) πύλη εισόδου του ευρωπαϊκού ποινικού δικαίου στο ελληνικό, Ποινικά Χρονικά 2004, σ. 961 επ. (*Pavlou S.*, 'Το ποινικό δίκαιο και οι "apofaseis-plaisio" tis EE - mia akomi (epikindini) pili eisodou tou evropaikou poinikou dikaiou sto elliniko', Penal Chronicles 2004, p. 961 *et seq.*)

[Pavlou S., 'Penal law and the framework decisions of the EU-yet another (dangerous) gate for European Criminal into Greek Criminal law', Penal Chronicles 2004, p. 961 *et seq.*]

Περράκη Σ., 'Ο χώρος ελευθερίας, ασφάλειας και δικαιοσύνης της ΕΕ. Από το Τάμπερε στη Χάγη και επέκεινα', 2008 (*Perrakis S.*, 'Ο choros eleftherias, asfaleias kai dikaiosinis tis EE. Apo to Tampere sti Chagi kai epekeina', 2008)

[Perrakis S., 'The Area of Freedom, Security and Justice of the EU. From Tampere to The Hague and onwards', 2008]

Συμεωνίδου-Καστανίδου Ε., Για ένα νέο ορισμό του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση', Ποινικά Χρονικά 2006, σ. 865 επ. (*Symeonidou-Kastanidou E.*,

'Gia ena neo orismo tou organomenou eglimatos stin Evropaiki Enosi', Penal Chronicles 2006, p. 865 *et seq.*)

[*Symeonidou-Kastanidou E.*, 'Towards a new definition of organized crime within the European Union', Penal Chronicles 2006, p. 865 *et seq.*]

Τσόλκα Ο., 'Η πορεία προς το Corpus Juris: παράγοντας διαμόρφωσης της δικονομικής προστασίας του κατηγορουμένου', σε Δ. Σπινέλλη Τιμητικό Τόμο: Οι ποινικές

επιστήμες στον 21ο αιώνα, Αθήνα 2001, σ. 1167 επ. (*Tsolka O.*, 'Η πορεία προς το Corpus Juris: paragontas diamorfosis tis dikonomikis prostasias tou katigoroumenou', in *D. Spinellis Timitikos Tomos: Oi poinikes epistimes ston 21o aiona*, Athens 2001, p. 1167 *et seq.*)

[Tsolka, O. 'The way towards the Corpus Juris: factor for shaping the procedural protection of the accused', in *D. Spinellis Honorary Volume: The Penal Studies in the 21st century*, Athens 2001, p. 1167 *et seq.*]

## X. HUNGARY

- Karsai, K.*, Az Europai Birosag buntetőjogi itelkezese (Criminal law adjudication by the ECJ). Szeged 2007
- Karsai, K.*, Az europai buntetőjogi integracio alapkerdesei (Basic issues of European criminal law integration). KJK, Budapest 2004
- Kondorosi, F. and Ligeti, K.* (ed.), Europai Buntetőjog Kezikonyve (Handbook on European Criminal Law), MHK, Budapest 2008
- Ligeti, K.*, Az europai buntetőjog legitimacioja (Legitimacy of European criminal law), in: Geller Balazs (ed.): Festschrift for Kalman Gyorgyi. KJK, Budapest 2004, 373–389 p.
- Ligeti, K.*, Buntetőjog es bűnügyi egyuttműködés az Europai Unioban (Criminal law and Cooperation in Criminal Matters in the European Union). KJK, Budapest 2004.
- M. Nyitrai, P.*, Nemzetkozi es Europai buntetőjog (International and European Criminal Law), Osiris, Budapest 2006

## XI. IRELAND

- Bacik, I.*, Criminal law, in U. Kilkelly (ed.), ECHR and Irish Law (Bristol: Jordan Publishing 2004)
- Conway, G.*, Judicial Interpretation and the Third Pillar: Ireland's Acceptance of the European Arrest Warrant and the Gozutok and Brugge Case, 13 European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law & Criminal Justice 2005, p. 255–283
- Fennelly, N.*, The European Arrest Warrant – Recent Developments, ERA Forum Vol. 4, 2007
- Hamilton, J.*, Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters in Ireland and the Proposed European Evidence Warrant, ERA Forum – Special Issue on European Evidence 2005
- Hamilton, J.*, The Interplay between EU and Irish Domestic Counter-Terrorism Laws, ERA Forum Vol. 4, 2007
- Ni Raifeartaigh, U.*, The European Convention on Human Rights and the Irish Criminal Justice System, 7 Bar Review 2001, p. 111–121
- Ni Raifeartaigh, U.*, The European Convention on Human Rights and the Criminal Justice System, 7 Judicial Studies Institute Journal 2007, p. 18–49
- Peers, S.*, The European Union and Criminal Law: An Overview, 12 Irish Criminal Law Journal 2002, p. 2–6

*Regan, E.*, Irish Criminal Law and the Convention on the Future of Europe, 8 Bar Review 2003, p. 161-166

*Ryan, A.*, The European Evidence Warrant: The Emergence of a European Law of Evidence?, 16 Irish Criminal Law Journal 2006, p. 8-14

*Walsh, D.*, The Democratic Deficit in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice in Title VI of the Treaty on European Union, 12 Irish Criminal Law Journal 2002, p. 7-16

## XII. ITALY

Aa.Vv., La lotta contro la frode agli interessi finanziari della Comunità europea tra prevenzione e repressione, a cura di Grasso, ed. Giuffrè, Milano, 2000, p. 414

Aa.Vv., Profili del processo penale nella Costituzione europea, a cura di Coppetta, ed. Giappichelli, Torino, 2005, p. 259

Musacchio, Diritto penale dell'Unione europea, ed. CEDAM, Padova, 2005, p. 153

*Picotti, L.* (ed.), Il Corpus Juris 2000. Nuova formulazione e prospettive di attuazione, Cedam, Padova 2004, p. XI-292, ed ivi: Picotti, Lorenzo, Il Corpus Juris 2000. Profili di diritto penale sostanziale e prospettive d'attuazione alla luce del Progetto di Costituzione per l'Europa, p. 3-91

*Picotti, L.* (ed.), Prospettive e limiti di un diritto penale dell'Unione europea, Giuffrè, Milano 1999, p. XX-214

*Picotti, L.*, Diritto penale comunitario e Costituzione europea, in Canestrari S., Foffani L.(ed.), Il diritto penale nella prospettiva europea. Quali politiche criminali per quale

Europa? Giuffrè, Milano 2005, p. 325-376

*Picotti, L.*, Il campo di applicazione del mandato d'arresto europeo: i reati "in lista" e "fuori lista" e la disciplina della legge italiana di attuazione, in Bargis M., Selvaggi E. (ed.), Mandato d'arresto europeo. Dall'estradizione alle procedura di consegna, Giappichelli, Torino, 2005, p. 127-152

*Picotti, L.*, Il mandato d'arresto europeo fra principio di legalità e doppia incriminazione, in Bargis M. and E. Selvaggi (ed.), Mandato d'arresto europeo. Dall'estradizione alle procedura di consegna, Giappichelli, Torino, 2005, p. 33-69

- Picotti, L.*, L'attuazione in Italia degli strumenti dell'Unione europea per la protezione penale degli interessi finanziari comunitari, in *Rivista trimestrale di diritto penale dell'economia*, 2006, n. 3, p. 615-671
- Picotti, L.*, Le fattispecie della "parte speciale" del Corpus Juris. Profili sistematici, in *Bargis M., Nosengo S. (ed.)*, *Corpus Juris*, pubblico ministero europeo e cooperazione internazionale (Atti del Convegno di Alessandria, 19-21 ottobre 2001), Milano 2003, p. 237-268
- Picotti, L.*, Presupposti e prospettive di un "sistema" di diritto penale comunitario. Aspetti sostanziali, in *Bargis M., Nosengo S. (ed.)*, *Corpus Juris*, pubblico ministero europeo e cooperazione internazionale (Atti del Convegno di Alessandria, 19-21 ottobre 2001), Milano 2003, p. 95-129
- Picotti, L.*, Ragioni politiche e "principi generali" nel sindacato di adeguatezza della lex mitior a tutela di precetti comunitari, in *Bin R., Brunelli G., Pugiotto A., Veronesi P. (ed.)*, *Ai confini del "favor rei". Il falso in bilancio davanti alle Corti costituzionale e di giustizia* (Atti del Seminario di Ferrara, 6 maggio 2005), Giappichelli, Torino, 2005, p. 311-318
- Rafaraci, T. (ed.)*, *L'area di libertà, sicurezza e giustizia: alla ricerca di un equilibrio fra priorità repressive ed esigenze di garanzia*, Giuffrè, 2007
- Rafaraci, T.*, Ne bis in idem e conflitti di giurisdizione in materia penale nello spazio di libertà sicurezza e giustizia dell'Unione europea, in *Rivista di Diritto Processuale (RDP)*, 2007, p. 621-642
- Sicurella, R.*, *Diritto penale e competenze dell'Unione europea*, ed. Giuffrè, Milano, 2005

## CONTRIBUTION OF THE CONSIGLIO SUPERIORE DELLA MAGISTRATURA

- N. Bartone, A.R. Castaldo, G. Conso, F. D'Isanto, G. Grasso, C. Lembo, S. Moccia, R. Normando, M. Panebianco, F. Roberti, P.L. Vigna, M. Altieri, A. Saccucci, A. Satta.*, *Diritto Penale Europeo*, Spazio Giuridico e rete giudiziaria - CEDAM 2001
- G.M. Armone, B.R. Cimini, F. Gandini, Gabriele Ruzzolino, G. Nicastro, A. Violetti*, *Diritto penale europeo e ordinamento italiano*. GIUFFRÈ' 2006
- A. Barazzetta, G.A. Conte, M. de Salvia, G. Ruzzolino, A. Lang, A. Mambriani, M. Panebianco, F. Poggi, I. Viarengo*, *Mario Chiavario*, *La justice pénale internationale entre passé et avenir* GIUFFRÈ' 2003

1) *N. Bartone, A.R. Castaldo, G. Conso, F. D'Isanto, G. Grasso, C. Lembo, S. Moccia, R. Normando, M. Panebianco, F. Roberti, P.L. Vigna, M. Altieri, A. Saccucci, A. Satta.*

Diritto Penale Europeo (engl. Criminal European Law)

Spazio Giuridico e rete giudiziaria (engl. Judicial space and network)-  
CEDAM 2001

- I. Prospettive di un diritto penale europeo (engl. perspectives for an European Criminal law).
- II. L'involuzione del diritto penale in materia economica e le fattispecie incriminative del *corpus juris europeo*. (engl. The involution of the criminal law in the economic matter and the legal paradigms of the European corpus juris)
- III. Le dimensioni e l'attuazione di un diritto eurointernazionale o euroglobale. (engl. The dimensions and the realization of the Euro-international or Euro-global law)
- IV. Condotte illecite transnazionali e la normativa penale comparata a tutela degli interessi comunitari. (engl. Transnational misfeasance and the European rules to protect EC interests)
- V. La criminalità organizzata transnazionale e il tessuto bancario-finanziario. (engl. Transnational organized crimes and the banking-financial tissue)
- VI. La polizia economica finanziaria in Europa: nuova realtà per la Guardia di Finanza.
- VII. Corruzione privata e tutela penale del sistema economico in Europa.
- VIII. Analisi comparata delle fattispecie di riciclaggio negli Stati dell'Unione Europea.
- IX. L'inquinamento nucleare: la tutela penale in Italia e nella prospettiva comunitaria.
- X. Le nuove frontiere: dal diritto penale internazionale al diritto internazionale penale, alla rete giudiziaria europea.
- XI. Dai tribunali internazionali penali ad hoc alla Corte criminale.
- XII. La problematica di un sistema processuale penale europeo.
- XIII. Lotta alla criminalità organizzata transnazionale: coordinamento e controllo.
- XIV. Le attuali forme di cooperazione europea nella lotta alla criminalità organizzata.



2) *G.M. Armone, B.R. Cimini, F. Gandini, Gabriele Ruzzolino, G. Nicastro, A. Violetti,*

Diritto penale europeo e ordinamento italiano. (engl. European criminal law and Italian legal system) GIUFFRE' 2006

Le decisioni quadro dell'Unione europea: dal mandato d'arresto alla lotta al terrorismo

(Engl. The decisions of the European Courts: from the European Arrest Warrant to the fight against the terrorism)

Parte I – Cooperazione giudiziaria e regole procedurali (Engl. Judicial cooperation and procedural rules)

- I. Il mandato di arresto europeo.
- II. Il congelamento dei beni da sottoporre a sequestro o confisca.
- III. Le squadre investigative comuni.
- IV. Eurojust.
- V. La protezione delle vittime dei reati nella prospettiva dell'Unione Europea.
- VI. La applicazione del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle sanzioni pecuniarie.

Parte II – Il Ravvicinamento delle Legislazioni Nazionali. (Engl. The renewed approach of the National legislations)

- VII. La falsificazione di monete in relazione all'introduzione dell'Euro.
- VIII. Frodi e falsificazioni dei mezzi di pagamento diversi dai contanti.
- IX. Il riciclaggio.
- X. La lotta al terrorismo.
- XI. La lotta alla tratta degli esseri umani.
- XII. La repressione del favoreggiamento dell'immigrazione clandestina.
- XIII. La corruzione del settore privato.
- XIV. La lotta allo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori ed alla pornografia infantile.
- XV. La lotta al traffico illecito di stupefacenti.
- XVI. Il contrasto della criminalità informatica.
- XVII. L'armonizzazione della confisca.

3) *A. Barazzetta, G.A. Conte, M. de Salvia, G. Ruzzolino, A. Lang, A. Mambriani, M. Panebianco, F. Poggi, I. Viarengo,*

Mandato d'arresto europeo e garanzie della persona. (Engl. European Arrest Warrant and guarantees for the people) GIUFFRÉ' 2004

La decisione-quadro sul mandato d'arresto europeo e le problematiche dell'adeguamento dell'ordinamento italiano.

- I. Il mandato d'arresto europeo nel quadro dello spazio di libertà, sicurezza e giustizia.
- II. Mandato di arresto europeo: verso una prima soglia concreta di un diritto penale europeo.
- III. Il mandato di arresto europeo. Adeguamento dell'ordinamento italiano e diritti della persona.
- IV. I principi di specialità e doppia incriminazione: loro rivisitazione nel mandato d'arresto europeo.
- V. Il mandato d'arresto europeo nella prospettiva di un avvocato.
- VI. Mandato di arresto europeo e tutela dei diritti fondamentali.
- VII. Il mandato di arresto europeo: una fuga in avanti?
- VIII. Mandato d'arresto europeo e regime transitorio in attesa della applicazione definitiva.
- IX. L'approvazione parlamentare del mandato d'arresto europeo.

#### 4) *Mario Chiavario,*

La justice pénale internationale entre passé et avenir GIUFFRÉ' 2003

Droi comparé

- I. Droit comparé et droit international : interaction et internormativité
- II. Les dynamiques d'élaboration des normes pénales internationales : une analyse à partir de la jurisprudence sur le violer la participation criminelle.
- III. La procédure pénale internationale et l'utilisation du droit comparé. Essai de modélisation.

Droit international

- I. La Cour pénale internationale et le droit international.
- II. Les principes généraux de droit et le droit international pénal.

- III. Les relations entre la Cour pénale internationale et l'Organisation des Nations Unies.
- IV. Aperçus sur les règles du statut au sujet de la coopération internationale et l'assistance judiciaire.
- V. La contribution des organisations non gouvernementales dans la création du Statut de Rome.
- VI. La position juridique de l'individu dans le Statut de la Cour pénale internationale.

## Droit pénal

- I. A' propos du developpement du droit international penal substantiel.
- II. La contribution de la jurisprudence des Tribunaux pénaux internationaux pour l'ex-Yougoslavie et le Rwanda à la concrétisation de l'incrimination du crime contre l'humanité.
- III. L'incrimination de génocide dans la jurisprudence des Tribunaux pénaux internationaux pour l'ex-Yougoslavie et le Rwanda.
- IV. Le principe *nulla poena sine culpa* dans le Statut de la Cour pénale internationale.
- V. La responsabilité des supérieurs hiérarchiques et l'effet d'exonération de l'ordre du supérieur dans le Statut de la Cour pénale internationale.

## Procedure pénale

- I. Droits de l'accusé.... et autres dans la perspective de la justice pénale internationale.
- II. La victime du crime et la juridiction pénale internationale.
- III. Le rôle du Procureur à la Cour pénale internationale : quelques brèves réflexions.
- IV. «Ecriture» et «oralité» sur la balance de l'équité.

## XIII. LITHUANIA

- Abramavičius, A., D. Mickevičius and G. Švedas*, Europos Sąjungos teisės aktų įgyvendinimas Lietuvos baudžiamojoje teisėje. – Vilnius, TIC, 2005
- Abramavičius, A.*, Lietuvos Respublikos Baudžiamojo Kodekso Specialiosios dalies europeizacijos problemos // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, 2005, Nr. 54
- Burda, R., E. Gruodytė and R. Kriščiūnas*, Prekybos žmonėmis tyrimo bei teismo nagrinėjimo problemos Lietuvoje. – Vilnius, 2006
- Čaikovski, A.*, Tarptautinės ir Europos Sąjungos teisės reikšmė reglamentuojant ir aiškinant nacionalinėje teisėje baudžiamąją atsakomybę už piktnaudžiavimą tarnyba // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, 2005, Nr. 54
- Čepas, A. and G. Švedas*, Tarptautinė teisinė pagalba baudžiamosiose bylose. Asmenų, įtariamų padarius nusikalstamą veiką, išdavimas baudžiamajam persekiojimui (ekstradicija, perdavimas Tarptautiniam baudžiamajam teismui arba pagal Europos arešto orderį). – Vilnius, TIC. 2008
- Fedosiuk, O.*, Prekyba žmonėmis baudžiamojoje teisėje ir teismų praktikoje // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, 2005, Nr. 54
- Gutauskas, A.*, Terorizmo baudžiamasis teisinis vertinimas pagal naująjį Lietuvos Respublikos Baudžiamąjį Kodeksą // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, 2005, Nr. 54
- Mickevičius, D.*, Kai kurie prekybos žmonėmis ir vaiko pirkimo arba pardavimo sampratų Lietuvos Respublikos BK suderinamumo su Lietuvos Respublikos tarptautinėmis sutartimis ir ES teisės aktais aspektai // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, 2005, Nr. 54
- Soloveičikas, D.*, Juridinių asmenų baudžiamoji atsakomybė: lyginamieji aspektai. Vilnius, Justitia, 2006
- Švedas, G.*, Kai kurios asmens perdavimo pagal Europos arešto orderį baudžiamajam persekiojimui teorinės ir praktinės problemos // Mokslo darbai, „Teisė“, Nr. 66(1), 2008
- Švedas, G.*, Tarptautinė teisinė pagalba baudžiamosiose bylose. Nuteistųjų laisvės atėmimu perdavimas tolesniam bausmės atlikimui. – Vilnius, TIC, 2007

#### XIV. THE NETHERLANDS

*Borgers, M.J.*, (ed.), Implementatie van kaderbesluiten, Wolf Nijmegen 2006

- Europese integratie*, preadviezen van Curtin, Smits, Klip en McCahery, Handelingen Nederlandse Juristen-Vereniging 136e jaargang 2006-I, Kluwer Deventer 2006
- Glerum, V. and K. Rozemond*, Overlevering van Nederlanders, copernicaanse revolutie of uitlevering in overgang? *Delikt en Delinkwent* 2008, p. 816-848
- Glerum, V. and V. Koppe*, De Overleveringswet, Sdu, Den Haag 2005
- Klip, A.H.*, Wederzijdse erkenning, *Delikt en Delinkwent* 2008, p. 671-684
- Kristen, F.*, Misbruik van voorwetenschap naar Europees recht, Wolf Legal Publishers, Nijmegen 2004
- Nelemans, M.*, Het verbod van marktmanipulatie, Dissertation University of Tilburg 2007
- Sanders, H.*, Het Europees aanhoudingsbevel, Nederlands en Belgisch overleveringsrecht in hoofdlijnen, Intersentia Antwerpen 2007
- Strijards, G.A.M.*, Het Europees Openbaar Ministerie, *Delikt en Delinkwent* 2008, p. 603-626
- Verheijen, E.A.M.*, Nederlandse strafrechtelijke waarden in de context van de Europese Unie, Wolf Nijmegen 2006, Dissertation Tilburg University
- Y. Buruma, P. Verrest*, Introductie international strafrecht, Ars Aequi Libri, Nijmegen 2004. An introduction in European en international criminal law
- C. Fijnaut, T. Spapens, D. van Daele*, De strafrechtelijke rechtshulpverlening van Nederland aan de landen van de Europese Unie, Kerckebosch, Zeist 2005. An overview of the organization, rules and practice of mutual legal assistance in criminal cases from the Netherlands to the countries of the EU.
- J. Koers*, Nederland als verzoekende staat bij de wederzijdse rechtshulp in strafzaken, Wolf legal publishers, Nijmegen 2001. Legal mutual assistance from the Dutch point of view: backgrounds, borders and possibilities
- G. Korstens, J. Pradel*, Het Europese strafrecht, Kluwer, Deventer 2003. An overview of European criminal view from different perspectives
- P.J.P Tak a.o.*, Heimelijke opsporing in de Europese Unie, Intersentia, Antwerpen-Groningen 2000. An overview of secret investigation methods in the EU
- P.J.P. Tak a.o.*, De normering van bijzondere opsporingsmethoden in buitenlandse rechtsstelsels, Ministerie van Justitie, Den Haag

1996. A comparison between special investigation methods in several countries of the EU

- D. van Daele, T. Spapens, C. Fijnaut*, De strafrechtelijke rechtshulpverlening van België, Duitsland en Frankrijk aan Nederland, Intersentia, Antwerpen 2008. An overview of the organization, rules and practice of mutual legal assistance in criminal cases from Belgium, Germany and France to the Netherlands.
- D. van Daele, B. Vangeebergen*, Criminaliteit en rechtshandhaving in de Euregio Maas-Rijn, deel 2, Intersentia, Antwerpen 2007. A comparison between criminal investigation, investigation methods and prosecution in the Netherlands, Belgium en Germany. Contains also an overview of the organization of the responsible authorities in the three countries
- E. van Sliedregt, J.M. Sjöcrona , A.M.M. Orië a.o.*, Handboek Internationaal Strafrecht, Kluwer, Deventer 2008. An overview of the European and International Criminal Law

## CONTRIBUTION OF THE SSR

- 1) *E. van Sliedregt, J.M. Sjöcrona , A.M.M. Orië a.o.*: Handboek Internationaal Strafrecht, Kluwer, Deventer 2008. An overview of the European and International Criminal Law.
- 2) *J. Koers*: Nederland als verzoekende staat bij de wederzijdse rechtshulp in strafzaken, Wolf legal publishers, Nijmegen 2001. Legal mutual assistance from the Dutch point of view: backgrounds, borders and possibilities.
- 3) *G. Korstens, J. Pradel*: Het Europese strafrecht, Kluwer, Deventer 2003. An overview of European criminal view from different perspectives.
- 4) *Y. Buruma, P. Verrest*: Introductie international strafrecht, Ars Aequi Libri, Nijmegen 2004. An introduction in European en international criminal law.
- 5) *P.J.P Tak a.o.*: Heimelijke opsporing in de Europese Unie, Intersentia, Antwerpen- Groningen 2000. An overview of secret investigation methods in the EU.
- 6) *P.J.P. Tak a.o.*: De normering van bijzondere opsporingsmethoden in buitenlandse rechtsstelsels, Ministerie van Justitie, Den Haag 1996. A comparison between special investigation methods in several countries of the EU

- 7) *D. van Daele, B. Vangeebergen*: Criminaliteit en rechtshandhaving in de Euregio Maas– Rijn, deel 2, Intersentia, Antwerpen 2007. A comparison between criminal investigation, investigation methods and prosecution in the Netherlands, Belgium en Germany. Contains also an overview of the organization of the responsible authorities in the three countries.
- 8) *C. Fijnaut, T. Spapens, D. van Daele*: De strafrechtelijke rechtshulpverlening van Nederland aan de landen van de Europese Unie, Kerckebosch, Zeist 2005. An overview of the organization, rules and practice of mutual legal assistance in criminal cases from the Netherlands to the countries of the EU.
- 9) *D. van Daele, T. Spapens, C. Fijnaut*: De strafrechtelijke rechtshulpverlening van België, Duitsland en Frankrijk aan Nederland, Intersentia, Antwerpen 2008. An overview of the organization, rules and practice of mutual legal assistance in criminal cases from Belgium, Germany and France to the Netherlands.
- 10) *C. Fijnaut, B. de Ruyver*: Voor een gezamenlijke beheersing van de drugsgelateerde crimnaliteit in de Euregio Maas–Rijn, Euregio Maas–Rijn, Tilburg–Gent 2008. Describes the possibilities of joint actions against drugs related crimes in the Euegio Maas–Rijn (Netherlands, Belgium and Germany).
- 11) *W. van der Schans, J. van Buuren*: Keizer in lommen, politesamenwerking in Europa, Papieren Tijger, Breda 2003. A critical analysis of the cooperation between police authorities in the EU, especially on the field of exchanging information.
- 12) *T. Spapens*: Georganiseerde misdaad en strafrechtelijke samenwerking in de grensgebieden, Intersentia, Antwerepen, 2008. The cooperation between the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany on the field of organised crime.
- 13) *P.A.M. Verrest*: Ter vergelijking: een studie naar het Franse vooronderzoek in strafzaken, WODC, Den Haag 2001. A comparison between the Netherlands and France of the rules and authorities in criminal investigations.
- 14) *C.P.M. Cleiren, J.F. Nijboer a.o.*: Tekst en commentaar Internationaal Strafrecht, Kluwer, Deventer 2007 (will be renewed at the end of 2009!). Contains a lot of relevant national law, treaties and other international rules in relation to the daily practice of international criminal cooperation.

15) *D. van der Bel, J.J.T.M. Pieters, A.M. van Hoorn*: Informatie en opsporing, Kerckebosch, Zeist 2007 (will be renewed in July 2009). Contains a large chapter about international exchange and use of information in criminal investigations and for prosecution purposes.

## XV. POLAND

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Ochrona Praw Człowieka w Prawie Karnym Unii Europejskiej (Protection of Human Rights in the European Union Criminal Law), [in]: Prokuratura i Prawo nr 1/2007

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Pomoc prawna państw Unii Europejskiej w sprawach karnych (Mutual Legal Assistance of the European Union Member States in criminal matters), [in]: Magazyn Prawniczy „Jurysta” nr 5/2005

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Rozwój III filaru Unii Europejskiej: od ekstradycji do europejskiego nakazu aresztowania (Development of the Third Pillar of the European Union: from extradition to the European Arrest Warrant, [in]: Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego, tom XVII, red. Leszek Bogunia, Wrocław 2005

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Wpływ prawa Unii Europejskiej na krajowe prawo karne – w kierunku zbliżonych czy identycznych przepisów? (The Impact of European Union Law on National Criminal Law – towards harmonised or unified (identical) regulations?), [in]: Księga Pamiątkowa Profesor Genowefy Grabowskiej, Katowice 2008. Forthcoming

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Wspólne zespoły śledcze jako nowa forma współpracy państw w sprawach karnych (JIT's as a new form of states's cooperation in criminal matters), [in]: Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego, tom XVIII, red., Leszek Bogunia, Wrocław 2005

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Współpraca policyjna na podstawie *acquis* Schengen (Police co-operation based on the Schengen *acquis*), [in]: Przegląd Policyjny Nr 2 (82)/2006 The Police Review 82 (2006)

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Zamrażanie i konfiskata środków pochodzących z przestępstw – regulacje europejskie a prawo krajowe (Freezing and confiscating crime proceeds – European regulations and national law, [in]: Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego, tom XX, red. Leszek Bogunia, Wrocław 2006

*Banach-Gutierrez, J.*, Zasada *Ne bis In idem* w Prawie Karnym Unii Europejskiej (*Ne bis In idem* principle in the European Union Criminal Law), [in]: Magazyn Prawniczy „Jurysta” nr 11-12/2004



- Hudzik, M.*, Przejęcie skazania w ramach europejskiego nakazu aresztowania – zagadnienia podstawowe, [in]: *Palestra* 2006, nr 11-12
- Lach, A.*, Europejska pomoc prawna w sprawach karnych, Toruń 2007
- Lach, A.*, Problemy funkcjonowania europejskiego nakazu aresztowania, [in]: *Europejski Przegląd Sądowy* 2006, nr 11
- Lahti, R. and J. Banach-Gutierrez*, Prawo karne europejskie i jego stosunek do prawa krajowego (European criminal law and its relation to national law), [in]: „*Jurysta*”nr 4/2008
- Ostropolski, T.*, Problemy konstytucyjne państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej w związku z Europejskim Nakazem Aresztowania, [in]: *Prokuratura i Prawo* 2006, nr 5

## CONTRIBUTION OF THE NATIONAL TRAINING CENTRE

- Brunon Hołyst*, *Terroryzm ( Terrorism)*, Volume2, Lexis Nexis, 2009
- Piotr Hofmański*, *Europejski nakaz aresztowania w teorii i praktyce (European arrest warrant in theory and practice)*, Volume 1, Wolters Kluwer Polska sp. z o.o. Oficyna 2008
- Tomasz Aleksandrowicz*, *Terroryzm międzynarodowy ( International terrorism)*, Volum 1 Wydawnictwo akademickie i profesjonalne sp. z o.o., 2008
- Zbigniew Lasocik*, *Handel ludźmi zapobieganie i ściganie (Human trafficking prevention and pursuing)*, Volum 1, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego Wydział nauk stosowanych i resocjalizacji, 2009
- Michał Płachta*, *Kidnapping międzynarodowy w służbie prawa. Studium Prawno międzynarodowe i porównawcze. (International kidnaping supporting international law)*, Volum 1, Dom wydawniczy ABC, 2000
- Andrzej Siemaszko*, *Przestępczość gospodarcza. Doświadczenia europejskie i amerykańskie. (Economic crime. The experience of European and American)*, Volume 1, Instytut Wymiaru Sprawiedliwości, 1995
- Jacek Grzywacz*, *Pranie brudnych pieniędzy (Money laundering)*, Volume 1, Szkoła Główna Handlowa, 2001
- S. Niemierka, B. Smykla*, *Przeciwdziałanie praniu brudnych pieniędzy (Anti-Money Laundering)*, Volume 1, Olympus, 2001
- Arkadiusz Lach*, *Europejska pomoc prawna w sprawach karnych (European legal assistance in criminal matters)*, Volume 1, TONiK, 2007
- Jan Białocerkiewicz*, *Status prawny cudzoziemca w świetle standardów międzynarodowych (The legal status of foreigners in the aspect of*

international standards) Volum 1, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1999

## XVI. PORTUGAL

### CONTRIBUTION OF CENTRO DE ESTUDOS JUDICIÁRIOS

*Alves, António Luís dos Santos, Mandado de Detenção Europeu: Julgamento na ausência e garantia de um novo julgamento, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 103.*

*Azevedo, Maria da Graça, A Convenção 2000 e as declarações do Estado Português, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 91.*

*Brito, Wladimir, Tribunais Penais Internacionais, Da arbitragem aos Tribunais Internacionais ad hoc, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 81.*

*Bucho, José Manuel, Pereira, Luis Silva, Azevedo, Maria da Graça e Serrano; Mário Mendes, Cooperação Internacional em Matéria Penal, Volume I, Centro de Estudos Judiciários, 2000.*

*Costa, Jorge Alves, O mandado de detenção europeu, Polícia e Justiça, III Série, n.º 4, 2004.*

*Costa, Jorge Alves, União europeia – Grupo de Trabalho sobre Cooperação Judiciária em Matéria penal, Revista do Centro de Estudos Judiciários, n.º 7, 2007.*

*Costa, Jorge Alves, Uma outra fase da justiça europeia: as iniciativas sobre o reconhecimento e fiscalização de penas suspensas, sanções alternativas e condenações condicionais e sobre a decisão europeia de controlo judicial, O Direito, Março, 2009.*

*Delgado, Filomena, A extradição, Boletim do Ministério da Justiça, Junho de 1987.*

*Dias, Jorge de Figueiredo e Caeiro, Pedro, A Lei de Combate ao Terrorismo (Lei n.º 52/2003, de 22 de Agosto): Sobre a transposição para o direito Português da Decisão Quadro do Conselho, de 13 de Junho de 2002, relativa á luta contra o terrorismo, Revista de Legislação e Jurisprudência, 2005.*

*Duarte, Jorge Dias, Novas Técnicas de Cooperação Judiciária, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 94.*

*Duarte, Maria Luísa, Direito Penal e Direito Comunitário: o Ordenamento Comunitário e os Sistemas Juscriminais dos Estados Membros, Almedina: 2001*

- Duarte, Maria Luísa*, Tomemos a sério os limites de competência da União Europeia – a propósito do Acórdão do Tribunal de Justiça de 13 de Setembro de 2005, Revista da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Lisboa, 46, 2005.
- Fernandes, Carlos*, A Extradicação e o respectivo sistema português, Coimbra Editora, 1996.
- Frias, Margarida*, Portugal e a Convenção Europeia sobre Extradicação, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 44.
- Guedes, Ester*, A protecção de dados na coordenação da informação nacional e na comunicação entre Estados, in Os direitos dos cidadãos face aos sistemas de informação policial, Lisboa, 1999.
- Marques, José Augusto Garcia*, Cooperação Judiciária Internacional em Matéria Penal, Algumas considerações sobre a matéria no quadro multilateral e no domínio das relações bilaterais entre Portugal e Espanha, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 72.
- Marques, José Augusto Garcia*, Cooperação Judiciária em Matéria Penal no âmbito das Comunidades Europeia, Revista Portuguesa de Ciência Criminal, Ano 1, fascículo 2, 1991.
- Martins, Fátima Adélia*, Cooperação Judiciária Internacional em Matéria Penal, A Rede Judiciária Europeia, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 100.
- Miguel, João da Silva*, Tribunal Penal Internacional: o após Roma e as consequências da ratificação, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 86.
- Miguel, João da Silva*, Justiça Penal Internacional: o Tribunal Penal Internacional, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 90.
- Miranda, Jorge e MACHADO, Miguel Pedrosa*, Processo de extradição e recurso para o Tribunal Constitucional: admissibilidade e tema do recurso, Direito e Justiça, Volume IX, Tomo I, 1995.
- Mota, José Luís Lopes*, A Constituição Europeia e a questão do Procurador Europeu: a EUROJUST, embrião de um futuro Procurador Europeu, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 98.
- Mota, José Luís Lopes*, A nova lei de cooperação judiciária em matéria penal, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 84.
- Mota*, Impunidade e Direito à Memória – A questão da imprescritibilidade dos crimes contra a paz e a humanidade no Estatuto do Tribunal Penal Internacional, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 78.
- Pereira, António Pinto*, O regime da Extradicação, Rei dos Livros, 1999.

- Pereira, Luís Silva*, Alguns aspectos da implementação do regime relativo ao Mandado de Detenção Europeu, Lei 65/2003 de 23 de Agosto, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 96.
- Pereira, Luís Silva e Martins, Teresa Alves*, O princípio ne bis in idem e os conflitos internacionais de jurisdição, Revista do Centro de Estudos Judiciários, n.º 7, 2007.
- Pereira, Luís Silva*, Contributo para uma interpretação dos artigos 12º n. 1 Alínea g) e 13º Alínea c) da Lei 65/2003 de 23 de Agosto, Revista do Centro de Estudos Judiciários, n.º 7, 2007.
- Piçarra, Nuno*, As revisões constitucionais em matéria de extradição: a influência da união europeia, THEMIS, número especial, 2006.
- Piçarra, Nuno*, O espaço de liberdade, segurança e justiça após a assinatura do tratado que estabelece uma constituição para a Europa, Polícia e Justiça, III Série, n.º 5, 2005.
- Piçarra, Nuno*, O Tribunal de Justiça das Comunidades Europeias e o novo espaço de Liberdade, de Segurança e de Justiça, THEMIS, n.º 1.
- Piçarra, Nuno*, A proibição constitucional de extraditar nacionais em face da União Europeia, Revista do Centro de Estudos Judiciários, n.º 7, 2007.
- Soares, António Goucha*, O Tratado de Nice, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 90.
- Soares, António Goucha*, O Tratado Constitucional da União Europeia, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 100.
- Simões, Euclides Dâmaso*, A cooperação judiciária penal no seio da União Europeia, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 86.
- Simões, Euclides Dâmaso*, O Espaço Judiciário Europeu (órgãos e instrumentos para a sua criação), Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 92.
- Simões, Euclides Dâmaso*, Cooperação na recuperação de activos: da partilha à repartição integral, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 105.
- Simões, Euclides Dâmaso e Trindade, José Luís*, Breve incursão comparada pelas origens e modelos da extended forfeiture, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 107.
- Rocha, Manuel António e Martins, Teresa Alves*, Cooperação Judiciária em Matéria Penal, Editorial Notícias, 1992.
- Rodrigues; Anabela Miranda*, O Tribunal de Justiça das Comunidades Europeias no espaço de Liberdade, de Segurança e de Justiça, Separata da Revista Portuguesa de Ciência Criminal, Ano 17, n.º 3, 2007.
- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, O Direito Penal Europeu Emergente, Coimbra Editora, 2008.

- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, O papel dos sistemas legais e a sua harmonização para a erradicação das redes de tráfico de pessoas, Revista do Ministério Público, n.º 84.
- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, As Penas e a sua execução no Estatuto de Roma do TPI, Separata da Revista Direito e Justiça, volume especial. 2006.
- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, O EUROJUST e a construção Europeia: entre a unidade e a diversidade, Scientia Jurídica, Braga, T.56, n.º 309, 2007.
- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda e Mota, José Luís Lopes*, Para uma Política Criminal Europeia, Coimbra Editora, 2002.
- 46) *Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, O mandado de detenção europeu: na via da construção de um sistema penal europeu um passo ou um salto, Revista Portuguesa de Ciência Criminal", n.º 1, 2003.
- Rodrigues, Anabela Miranda*, A União Europeia e a luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos e a exploração sexual de crianças, Direitos Humanos das Mulheres, Coimbra Editora, 2005.
- Rodrigues, A.M.*, O direito penal Europeu emergente, Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 2008. – 435 p.
- Santos, António Furtado*, Direito Internacional Penal e Direito Penal Internacional, Boletim do Ministério da Justiça, Janeiro de 1960.
- Tenreiro, Mário*, Crime de aborto e Direito Comunitário, Revista Portuguesa de Ciência Criminal, II, 1992.
- Valente, Manuel Guedes*, Do Mandado de Detenção Europeu, Almedina, 2006.

## XVII. ROMANIA

- Antoniou, G.*, Activitatea normativă penală a Uniunii Europene (I), Revista de Drept Penal nr. 1/2007
- Antoniou, G.*, Activitatea normativă penală a Uniunii Europene (II), Revista de Drept Penal nr. 2/2007
- Banu, M.*, Perspectiva includerii in primul pilon al Uniunii Europene a unui drept penal comunitar, Revista Romană de Drept Comunitar nr. 3/2006
- Beatrice, A.G. and S. Tudorel*, Drept comunitar, Ed. C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2007
- Costaş, C.F.*, Directiva 91/308/CEE. Prevenirea folosirii sistemului fi nanciar in scopul spălării banilor. Obligația impusă avocaților de a informa autoritățile competente despre orice fapt care ar putea indica o spălare de bani. Dreptul la un proces echitabil. Secretul profesional și independența avocaților [Curtea de Justiție Europeană (Marea Cameră),

- hotărarea din 26 iunie 2007, cauza C-305/05, *Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophone, Ordre français des avocats du barreau de Bruxelles, Ordre des barreaux flamands, Ordre néerlandais des avocats du barreau de Bruxelles c. Consiliu*, cu participarea Consiliului Barourilor din Uniunea Europeană, *Ordre des avocats du barreau de Liege*, acțiune preliminară formulată de *Cour d'arbitrage* (în prezent *Cour constitutionnelle*), Belgia], *Caiete de Drept Penal* nr. 4/2007
- Deleanu, I.*, Obligativitatea hotărârilor Curții Europene a Drepturilor Omului și ale Curții de Justiție a Comunităților Europene, *Dreptul* nr. 2/2007
- Dobozi, V.*, Cooperarea judiciară în materie penală în Uniunea Europeană și limitele sale, *Dreptul* nr. 10/2006
- Drăghici C. et al.*, Aspecte teoretice și practice referitoare la procedura executării mandatului european de arestare, *Dreptul* nr. 10/2007
- Fabian, G.*, Cooperarea judiciară și polițienească în materie penală, (chapitre en Gyula
- Fabian*, *Drept instituțional comunitar*, Ed. Sfera Juridică, Cluj-Napoca, 2006)
- Muntean, C.S.*, Mandatul european de arestare. Un instrument juridic apt să înlocuiască extrădarea, *Caiete de Drept Penal* nr. 1/2007
- Octavian, M.*, *Tratat de drept comunitar*, Ed. C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2006
- Radu, F.R.*, Cooperarea în domeniul justiției și al afacerilor interne în cadrul Uniunii Europene, *Dreptul* nr. 6/2007
- Radu, F.R.*, De la extrădare la mandatul european de arestare. O privire istorică și juridică, *Dreptul* nr. 2/2006
- Radu, F.R.*, Principalele instrumente juridice ale Uniunii Europene în domeniul extrădării și predării infractorilor, *Dreptul* nr. 9/2007
- Raluca, B.*, *Drept comunitar. Principii*, Ed. C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2007
- Streteanu, F.*, Câteva considerații privind mandatul european de arestare, *Caiete de Drept Penal* nr. 1/2008
- Streteanu, F.*, Normele adoptate la nivelul Uniunii Europene – izvoare de drept penal (chapitre en, Florin Streteanu, *Tratat de drept penal. Partea generală*, Ed. C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2008)
- Truichici, A.*, Lupta împotriva corupției la nivelul Uniunii Europene, *Revista de Drept Penal*, nr. 4/2007
- Udroiu, M. and O. Predescu*, Jurisprudența instanțelor europene privind principiul *ne bis in idem*, *Dreptul* nr. 6/2008

## CONTRIBUTION OF THE NIM

*Ioana – Cristina Morar, Mariana Zainea, Cooperare judiciară în materie penală. Culegere de practică judiciară (Judicial cooperation on criminal matters. Collection of courts reports ) C.H.Beck, 2008, 662 pages.*

Short description:

Although titled *Collection of courts reports* the book contains also commentaries of the authors regarding:

- a. Decisions of the Romanian courts of law (between 2004 and 2008) and European Court of Human Rights on extradition (1957 European Convention on extradition);
- b. Decisions of the Romanian courts of law on national legislation and 1959 European Convention on mutual assistance in criminal matters;
- c. Decisions of the Romanian courts of law on national legislation and 1970 European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgments the recognition of criminal judgments;
- d. Decisions of the Romanian courts of law on national legislation and 1972 European Convention on the Transfer of Proceedings in Criminal Matters;
- e. Decisions of the Romanian courts of law on national legislation and European Arrest Warrant;
- f. Decisions of European Court of Justice on *ne bis in idem* principle.

*Florin Răzvan Radu, Cooperare judiciară internațională și europeană în materie penală. Îndrumar pentru practicieni. (International and european judicial cooperation in criminal matters. A practitioner aide), Wolters Kluwer Romania, 2009, 646 pages.*

Short description:

First part is a monography on relevant national provisions, 1957 Council of Europe Convention on extradition and various bilateral Treaties signed by Romania in the area of extradition; second part is a monography on extradition within European Union and European Arrest Warrant and the third part is a collection of international and European acts on judicial cooperation in criminal matters with short comments.

## XVIII. SLOVENIA

- Bavcon, L. and D. Korošec, International Criminal Law, Pravna fakulteta (Ljubljana, 2003) (the textbook is in Slovene language. Original title is Mednarodno kazensko pravo)*
- Bavcon, L., Okvirni sklep sveta Evropske unije o boju proti terorizmu. Pravosod. bilt., 2006, letn. 27, 1, str. 105–116*
- Bavcon, L., The Position of Criminal Law in Legal Order of European Union, Zbornik na trudovi na Pravniot fakultet "Justinijan Prvi" vo Skopje (Skopje - Zagreb, 2007), p. 47–60, (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Status kazenskega prava v pravnem redu Evropske unije)*
- Bošnjak, M., Novelties in EU Criminal Law according to Lisbon Treaty, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 27/2008, p. 19–21 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Novosti v kazenskem pravu EU po Lizbonski pogodbi)*
- Korošec, D., Slovene Substantive Criminal Law in the View of (rising) Common Criminal Law of EU, Zbornik znanstvenih razprav Pravne fakultete v Ljubljani (Ljubljana), No. 61 (2001), p. 59–79 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Slovensko materialno kazensko pravo v luči (nastajajočega) skupnega kazenskega prava EU)*
- Ribičič, C., Uveljavljanje evropskih standardov v praksi slovenskega Ustavnega sodišča, Revus, 2004, V. 2, 2, p. 69–83*
- Šelih, A., Razširitev Evropske unije in problemi kriminalitetne politike. In: Štiblar, Franjo (ed.), Kranjc, Janez (ed.). Pravni vidiki slovenske samobitnosti leto po vstopu v EU, (Littera Scripta Manet, Zbirka Littera, 5). Ljubljana: Pravna fakulteta, 2005, pp. 221–230*
- Selinšek, L., European Dimension of Ne Bis In Idem Principle, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 22/2003, p. 9–12 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Evropske razsežnosti načela ne bis in idem)*
- Selinšek, L., Expansion of EU Competences within Substantive Criminal Law, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 39–40/2006, p. 30–32 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Širjenje pristojnosti EU v kazenskem materialnem pravu)*
- Selinšek, L., Framework Decisions from the Field of Police and Judicial Co-operation, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 39–40/2005, p. 25–27 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Okvirni sklepi s področja policijskega in pravosodnega sodelovanja)*



- Šugman, K. and D. Petrovec*, The European criminal record in Slovenia. In: Stefanou, Constantin (ed.). Towards a European criminal record. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, cop. 2008, pp. 226–241
- Šugman, K.*, EU Criminal Law, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 25/2005, p. II–VII (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Kazensko pravo Evropske unije)
- Šugman, K.*, European Arrest Warrant, Pravna praksa (Ljubljana), No. 14/2004, p. IV–VII (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Evropski nalog za prijetje in predajo)
- Šugman, K.*, Kazensko pravo Evropske unije. PP, Prav. praksa (Ljubl.), 2005, V. 24, št. 25, pril. str. II–VII
- Šugman, K.*, The Implementation of the European Arrest Warrant in the Republic of Slovenia. Eucrim, 2007, issue 3/4, pp. 133–137
- Šugman, K.*, The Reconciliation of Slovene Criminal Procedure–Law Legislation with rising Criminal Law of European Union (Corpus Juris), Zbornik znanstvenih razprav Pravne fakultete v Ljubljani (Ljubljana), No. 61 (2001), p. 265–287 (the article is in Slovene language. Original title is Usklajenost slovenske kazenskoprocesne zakonodaje z nastajajočim kazenskim pravom Evropske unije (Corpus Juris)

## XIX. SPAIN

- Aranguena Fanego, C.* (ed.), Cooperacion judicial penal en la Union Europea: la orden europea de detencion y entrega (Valladolid: Lex Nova 2005)
- Aranguena Fanego, C.* (ed.), Garantias procesales en los procesos penales en la Union Europea/Procedural safeguards in criminal proceedings throughout the European Union (Valladolid: Lex Nova, 2007)
- Armenta Deu, T.*, El Derecho Procesal Penal en la Union Europea. Tendencias actuales y perspectivas de futuro (Madrid: Colex, 2006)
- Bujosa Vadell, L.*, Ejecucion en la Union Europea de las resoluciones de embargo preventivo de bienes y de aseguramiento de pruebas. Comentario a la decision marco 2003/577/ JAI, del consejo, de 22 de julio de 2003, Revista General de Derecho Europeo
- Bujosa Vadell, L.*, Reconocimiento y ejecucion de resoluciones judiciales penales; estado de la cuestion en la Union Europea, Cuadernos de Derecho Judicial, ISSN 1134–9670, No. 13, 2003 ( Derecho penal

- supranacional y cooperacion juridica internacional, Angel Galgo Peco (dir.), p. 449-504
- De Hoyos Sancho, M.* (ed.), El proceso penal en la Union Europea: garantias esenciales/ Criminal proceedings in the European Union: essential safeguards (Valladolid: Lex Nova, 2008, forthcoming)
- De Hoyos Sancho, M.*, Causas de denegacion de la euroorden, en la obra "Cooperacion judicial penal en la Union Europea: la orden europea de detencion y entrega", Coord.: C. Aranguena Fanego, Editorial Lex Nova, Valladolid, 2005. Paginas 211 a 315
- De Hoyos Sancho, M.*, El principio de reconocimiento mutuo de resoluciones penales en la Union Europea: .Asimilacion automatica o corresponsabilidad?, Revista de Derecho Comunitario Europeo, editada por el Centro de Estudios Politicos y Constitucionales. Num. 22, Madrid, sept.-dic. 2005, pp. 807 a 841
- De la Oliva Santos, A., T. Armenta Deu and M.P. Calderon Cuadrado* (eds.), Garantias fundamentales del proceso penal en el espacio judicial europeo (Madrid: Colex, 2007)
- Martin Diz, F.* (ed.), Constitucion Europea: aspectos historicos, administrativos y procesales (Santiago de Compostela: Torculo, 2006)
- Martin Diz, F.*, Confl ictos entre jurisdicciones nacionales concurrentes y delincuencia organizada transfronteriza en la Union Europea: problemas y soluciones procesales, Revista Justicia, num. I-II, Barcelona, 2008
- Ormazabal Sancehz, G.*, Espacio penal europeo y mutuo reconocimlEnto (perspectivas aleman y espanola), Madrid: Akal 2006

## XX. SWEDEN

- Asp, P.*, EG:s sanktionsratt; Uppsala 1998
- Asp, P.*, EU & straff ratten; Uppsala 2002
- Groning, L.*, EU, staten och ratten att straff a; Lund 2008
- Pale, K.*, Villkor for utlamning; Uppsala 2003
- Persson, G.*, Gamla och nya lagstift are - om EU och straff ratt; rep. 2005:2
- Persson, G.*, Granslos straff ratt; rep. 2007:4
- Th unberg Schunke, M.*, Internationell rattslig hjalp i brottmal inom EU; Uppsala 2004
- Traskman, P.O.*, Straffl agen for Europeiska Unionen - fakta och fi ktion; Svensk Juristtidning 2002, p. 345-362
- Traskman, P.O.*, Vad gor vi med den 2005, p. 859-875

*Wersall, F.*, EU och straff rätten; Svensk Juristtidning 2004 p. 665–675