

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)



Maklu

Antwerpen | Apeldoorn | Portland

An overview of all publications in the IRCP research series is listed at the end of this book.

G. Vermeulen, W. De Bondt and C. Ryckman (eds.)
Rethinking international cooperation in criminal matters in the EU.
Moving beyond actors, bringing logic back, footed in reality.
Antwerpen | Apeldoorn | Portland
Maklu
2012

767 pag. - 24 x 16 cm
ISBN 978-90-466-0487-8
D2012/1997/28
NUR 824



© 2012 European Commission

All results or rights on the present study, including copyright and other intellectual or industrial property rights, are owned solely by the European Commission. Any distribution or publication of information relating to the study requires prior written authorisation from the European Commission.

The opinions expressed by the project team do not represent the European Commission's official position

Maklu-Publishers

Somersstraat 13/15, 2018 Antwerpen, Belgium, info@maklu.be
Koninginnelaan 96, 7315 EB Apeldoorn, The Netherlands, info@maklu.nl
www.maklu.eu

USA & Canada

International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave., Suite 300, Portland, OR 97213-3786, orders@isbs.com,
www.isbs.com

UK & Ireland

R. Bayliss, 81 Milehouse Road, Plymouth, Devon PL3 4AE

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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	Depolitisation 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 acquis	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 acquis.....	436

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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