

Rethinking international cooperation in criminal matters in the EU

Moving beyond actors,
bringing logic back,
footed in reality.

**IRCP research series
Volume 42**

Gert Vermeulen
Wendy De Bondt
Charlotte Ryckman
(eds.)

Principal
European Commission
DG Justice
(JLS/2009/JPEN/PR/0028/E4)



Maku

Antwerpen | Apeldoorn | Portland

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	15
Abbreviations and Acronyms	17
Executive summary	23
1 Introduction and methodology.....	41
1.1 Background to the study	41
1.2 Purpose of the study	44
1.3 Design of the methodological framework.....	45
1.3.1 Methodological triangulation	45
1.3.2 Combining different perspectives	46
1.4 EU-level Analysis	46
1.4.1 Diversity of the respondent group	47
1.4.2 Desktop review	47
1.4.3 Delphi method inspired questionnaire.....	51
1.4.4 Development of initial future policy options.....	52
1.5 MS level analysis	53
1.5.1 Building a SPOC Network.....	53
1.5.2 Building of the Questionnaire.....	54
1.5.3 Focus Group Meetings.....	56
1.6 Integration of results.....	60
2 Scoping international cooperation in criminal matters in the EU.....	63
2.1 International cooperation in criminal matters: More than cooperation between judicial authorities	65
2.1.1 Authorities involved are not a determining factor	65
2.1.1.1 Part of the EU acquis	65
2.1.1.2 Contradicted by the EU acquis	73
2.1.2 Necessity of the involvement of judicial authority	76
2.1.2.1 Defining a judicial authority	78
2.1.2.2 Need for reservatory competences revised	79
2.1.2.3 Role of legal remedies in debate on reservatory competences	85
2.1.2.4 Refusal ground <i>ratione auctoritatis</i> ?	88
2.2 Criminal justice finality: A decisive element in the development of international cooperation in criminal matters	91
2.2.1 Criminal justice finality as a decisive element in the EU acquis	91

2.2.2	Problematic character of the lacking finality demarcation	94
2.2.2.1	Separation of powers.....	94
2.2.2.2	Procedural guarantees applicable in criminal matters	94
2.2.2.3	Data protection and the purpose limitation principle	98
2.2.3	Extension and limits of the finality demarcation	100
2.2.3.1	Administrative sanctions: an extension	100
2.2.3.2	Prevention of immediate and serious threat to public security: a legitimate link.....	102
3	General principles and concerns related to international cooperation	105
3.1	Double criminality in international cooperation in criminal matters.....	106
3.1.1	Introduction.....	106
3.1.1.1	Double criminality: what's in a name?	106
3.1.1.2	Two-party talk between the member states involved.....	108
3.1.1.3	The European Union as the third party	111
3.1.1.4	The person involved as the fourth-party.....	115
3.1.1.5	Four-party talks.....	117
3.1.2	Extradition and surrender	117
3.1.2.1	Extraditable offences: double criminality as a rule of customary law	117
3.1.2.2	Surrenderable offences: double criminality for non-listed offences.....	119
3.1.2.3	Viability of 'surrenderable offences' as a substitute for the 'extraditable offences'	121
3.1.2.4	Too much too soon?.....	125
3.1.2.5	Safeguarding the approximation acquis.....	128
3.1.2.6	No obligation to maintain a double criminality-based limit.....	130
3.1.3	Mutual legal assistance	131
3.1.3.1	No general double criminality requirement in MLA.....	132
3.1.3.2	The search and seizure exception	133
3.1.3.3	Extension to other investigative measures	133
3.1.3.4	Limitation by the 32 MR offence list.....	136
3.1.3.5	Drawing parallels for other investigative measures	140
3.1.3.6	Threat of the declaration.....	145
3.1.3.7	Impact of capacity as a refusal ground	146
3.1.3.8	Requirements for the formulation of national provisions.....	147

3.1.4	Transfer of pre-trial supervision.....	149
3.1.4.1	Variation on the same theme: a partial double criminality limit.....	149
3.1.4.2	Threat of the declarations	150
3.1.4.3	Possible perverse effect of double criminality as a refusal ground	154
3.1.5	Relocation and protection of witnesses	159
3.1.5.1	Execution of protective measures	159
3.1.5.2	Recognition of granted benefits	161
3.1.6	Transfer of prosecution.....	162
3.1.7	International validity and effect of decisions.....	164
3.1.7.1	Cross-border execution of convictions.....	164
3.1.7.2	Cross-border effect of convictions	171
3.1.8	Exchange of criminal records information	175
3.1.8.1	Diversity in the storage practice	175
3.1.8.2	Anticipating to future double criminality issues.....	177
3.1.9	Rethinking double criminality in international cooperation	179
3.1.9.1	Perspective of the issuing member state.....	179
3.1.9.2	Perspective of the executing member state	180
3.1.9.3	Perspective of the EU in its capacity of a criminal policy maker.....	182
3.1.9.4	Perspective of the person involved	184
3.2	Horizontalisation and decentralisation: Future perspectives on communication and decision making.....	185
3.2.1	Depoliticisation and simplification	185
3.2.1.1	Identifying competent counterparts on a decentralised level.....	188
3.2.1.2	Institutional capacity: Language and translation	189
3.2.1.3	Technical capacity: Staff, Training and Equipment	190
3.2.2	Exceptions.....	195
3.2.2.1	Criminal records exchange	195
3.2.2.2	Transfer of sentenced persons.....	196
3.2.2.3	Current state of play	198
3.3	Enhanced stringency in cooperation.....	205
3.3.1	Consent reduction & built-in proportionality.....	206
3.3.1.1	Reducing the need for consent from the executing member state	206
3.3.1.2	Reducing the need for the issuing member state to state the reasons for the order/request.....	207
3.3.1.3	Built-in proportionality as counterweight.....	213
3.3.2	Transforming consistency issues into refusal grounds	218
3.3.2.1	Ratione auctoritatis.....	219
3.3.2.2	Ratione materiae	219

3.3.2.3	Ratione poenae, loci and temporis	220
3.3.2.4	Ratione personae.....	220
3.3.3	Limiting the number of refusal grounds	227
3.3.3.1	Fundamental rights, fundamental principles, general principles.....	229
3.3.3.2	Specific offences	241
3.3.3.3	Ordre Public	244
3.3.3.4	Lapse of time	251
3.3.3.5	Age/Health.....	255
3.3.3.6	Ne bis in idem	261
3.3.3.7	Immunity	274
3.3.3.8	Amnesty and Pardon.....	284
3.3.3.9	In absentia.....	286
3.3.3.10	Extra-territoriality	288
3.3.3.11	Sanction/sentence too low	292
3.3.3.12	Specific to deprivation/restriction of liberty – Role of person concerned.....	296
3.3.4	Limitation versus extension of refusal grounds	301
3.3.4.1	Mutual Recognition of refusal grounds: not feasible nor desirable.....	301
3.3.4.2	Exclusion of refusal grounds when detrimental to position of person involved.....	302
3.3.5	Deadlines and postponement grounds.....	303
3.3.5.1	Deadlines	303
3.3.5.2	Grounds for postponement	310
3.3.6	Capacity	316
3.3.6.1	Financial capacity.....	317
3.3.6.2	Operational Capacity	332
3.4	Correction mechanisms: A necessity in the current cooperation climate.....	337
3.4.1	Trustbuilding measures.....	337
3.4.2	Minimum standards.....	339
3.4.3	Flanking measures.....	343
3.4.4	Lex mitior principle.....	348
3.4.4.1	Lex mitior & transfer of prosecution.....	349
3.4.4.2	Lex mitior & equivalence of sentence/measure	350
3.4.4.3	Lex mitior & execution of sentence/measure	355
3.4.4.4	Lex mitior & review of sentence/measure	360
3.5	Liability of legal persons for offences: ensuring consistent cooperation.....	361
3.5.1	Providing mutual legal assistance.....	361
3.5.1.1	Position of legal persons in cooperation instruments.....	361

3.5.2	Execution of foreign sentences.....	362
3.5.2.1	Position of legal persons in cooperation instruments.....	362
3.5.3	Need for the EU to safeguard its own approximation policy.....	364
3.6	Implementation issues: An old sore in international cooperation in criminal matters.....	367
3.6.1	Practical considerations regarding implementation.....	367
3.6.1.1	Slow or incorrect implementation: Problems and causes.....	367
3.6.1.2	Slow or incorrect implementation: Solutions.....	370
3.6.1.3	Enhanced scrutiny by the European Union level?.....	374
3.6.2	Overview of national implementation status.....	379
4	Unregulated and inadequately regulated forms of cooperation.....	389
4.1	Unregulated forms of cooperation.....	390
4.1.1	Relocation and protection of witnesses.....	390
4.1.2	Post-Trial MLA.....	398
4.2	Inadequately regulated forms of cooperation.....	401
4.2.1	Mutual admissibility of evidence gathered abroad following a cooperation request: the FRA illusion.....	402
4.2.1.1	Introduction of FRA.....	402
4.2.1.2	Conceptual flaws and weaknesses of FRA.....	403
4.2.1.3	Practice developed with respect to FRA.....	405
4.2.1.4	Conclusion: Minimum standards as opposed to FRA in future instruments.....	409
4.2.2	Tensions between supervision, surrender and transfer of prosecution.....	412
4.2.2.1	Tensions between FD Supervision and FD EAW.....	413
4.2.2.2	Active transfer of prosecution.....	415
5	Overarching EU Issues.....	419
5.1	EULOCS in support of international cooperation in criminal matters ...	421
5.1.1	Introduction.....	421
5.1.1.1	Approximation: what's in a name?.....	422
5.1.1.2	Identifying approximation <i>acquis</i>	424
5.1.1.3	Building a classification system.....	428
5.1.1.4	Maintaining the classification system.....	433
5.1.2	EULOCS & double criminality.....	435
5.1.2.1	EU's perspective: Safeguarding the approximation <i>acquis</i>	436

5.1.2.2	Member state’s perspective: Limiting double criminality verification.....	439
5.1.2.3	Individual’s perspective: Strengthening the position of the person involved	440
5.1.3	EULOCS & proportionality and capacity.....	442
5.1.3.1	Considering built-in proportionality.....	442
5.1.3.2	Recognising capacity concerns.....	444
5.1.4	EULOCS & admissibility of evidence	446
5.1.4.1	Gaps in the current regimes	446
5.1.4.2	Minimum standards as an alternative	448
5.1.5	EULOCS & information exchange between member states	450
5.1.5.1	Notifying the conviction of an EU foreign national.....	450
5.1.5.2	Seeking cross-border execution of a sentence.....	453
5.1.6	EULOCS & EU level actors.....	455
5.1.6.1	Delineating mandated offences.....	456
5.1.6.2	Finding the best place for prosecution.....	460
5.1.6.3	Awarding the status of collaborator with justice	462
5.1.7	Conclusion.....	463
5.2	Eurojust & the European Public Prosecutor’s Office: Reflections on future policy options.....	465
5.2.1	Taking note of the current strengthening of Eurojust	466
5.2.1.1	Strengthening the position of the Eurojust national members.....	467
5.2.1.2	Strengthening the position of the Eurojust College	469
5.2.2	Future strengthening of Eurojust and implications for the debate regarding EPPO.....	471
5.2.2.1	A clear demarcation of Eurojust’s mandate – “EU-worthy” offences.....	471
5.2.2.2	In detail: Future Eurojust competences regarding information exchange.....	473
5.2.2.3	In detail: Future Eurojust competence to initiate investigations/request initiations of prosecutions.....	474
5.2.2.4	In detail: Future Eurojust decision-making power in solving conflicts of jurisdiction	475
5.2.3	Necessity of an EPPO revised	482
5.3	EU-wide effect in criminal matters: Logical domestic consequences of international cooperation.....	487
5.3.1	Cross-border admissibility of evidence gathered in a mere domestic context: a legal basis?	488
5.3.1.1	The difference between existing evidence and evidence still to be gathered	488
5.3.1.2	Unsuitability of existing solutions.....	488

5.3.1.3	Conclusion: Minimum standards for existing evidence?.....	490
5.3.2	Mutual recognition of collaborators with justice.....	492
5.3.3	Mutual understanding of the ne bis in idem principle.....	496
5.3.4	EU wide effect of disqualifications.....	500
5.3.4.1	Gap in current instruments regulating the execution of foreign sentences	500
5.3.4.2	Difficulty in defining ‘a disqualification’.....	503
5.3.4.3	Limits to mutually recognising a disqualification.....	525
5.3.4.4	Exploring the possibility to introduce equivalent disqualifying effects.....	529
6	Critical recommendations to rethink the entirety of international cooperation in criminal matters in the EU	533
7	Bibliography.....	549
7.1	Legislation and policy documents	549
7.2	Jurisprudence.....	561
7.3	Doctrine	561
	Annex – First Dephi Round.....	581
1	Part 1 – The basic principles.....	581
1.1	Horizontalisation.....	582
1.2	Issue 1 – The scope of ICCM.....	583
1.3	Stringency in cooperation.....	585
1.4	Law governing execution.....	588
1.5	Issue 2 – Flanking measures.....	589
1.6	Final questions in part 1	590
2	Part 2 – The (un)regulated nature.....	591
3	Part 3 – The position of the central European judicial authority	592
4	Issue 3 – The position of offences and sanctions in judicial cooperation in criminal matters.....	594
4.1	The position of offences.....	594
4.2	The position of sanctions.....	597

Annex – Second Delphi Round	599
PART 1 – Clarifying the scope of the study	599
1 Authorities involved	599
2 Domains of cooperation	605
PART 2 – Interpretation of leading principles.....	609
1 Horizontalisation & direct communication	609
2 Mutual recognition.....	610
2.1 Law applicable to the order/decision in the issuing member state	612
2.2 Law applicable to the execution in the executing member state.....	615
2.3 Capacity issues when working in a mutual recognition context	622
2.4 To what extent is it an acceptable future policy option to introduce mutual recognition of <i>criminal liability for legal persons</i> ?	627
PART 3 – Lacunae.....	629
1 Domain-specific lacunae	629
2 General lacunae	631
PART 4 – The position of offences and sanctions	633
3 The position of offences in international cooperation in criminal matters	633
4 The position of sanctions in international cooperation in criminal matters	637
 Annex – Member state questionnaire.....	 639
1 Authorities involved in cooperation.....	639
1.1 Nature of competent authorities	640
1.2 Criminal justice finality and purpose limitation	644
1.3 Central authorities and national contact points	653
1.4 Position of Eurojust, EJN and EPPO.....	662
2 Proportionality limits to cooperation.....	664
2.1 Introduction	664
2.2 The list of 32 MR offences.....	665
2.3 Sanction thresholds	668
2.4 Extraditable offences.....	672

3	Deadlines, postponement, refusal and conditional cooperation.....	674
3.1	Deadlines.....	674
3.2	Grounds for postponement.....	677
3.3	Grounds for refusal.....	679
3.4	Conditional cooperation.....	689
4	Law applicable to cooperation.....	693
4.1	Law governing the decision / order.....	693
4.2	Law governing the execution.....	702
4.3	Combined use of different instruments.....	710
5	Capacity issues caused by cooperation.....	712
5.1	Uncertain financial arrangements.....	712
5.2	Sharing of costs.....	714
5.3	Sharing of benefits.....	716
5.4	Operational capacity implications.....	717
6	Lacunae in the current legislative framework.....	719
6.1	Post-trial MLA at EU-level.....	719
6.2	Criminal records exchange.....	720
6.3	Relocation of witnesses at EU-level.....	721
6.4	Transfer of prosecution.....	721
6.5	International validity and effect.....	722
6.6	General lacunae.....	722
7	Final questions.....	722
7.1	Good practice.....	722
7.2	Mutual trust issues.....	723
7.3	General feedback questions.....	725
	Annex – EU Level Offence Classification System.....	727
	Published in the IRCP research series.....	765