

VU Research Portal

The freedom of movement of asylum-seekers within the host State under international and European human rights law

Ruiz Ramos, Juan José

2024

DOI (link to publisher)
[10.5463/thesis.522](https://doi.org/10.5463/thesis.522)

document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Ruiz Ramos, J. J. (2024). *The freedom of movement of asylum-seekers within the host State under international and European human rights law*. [PhD-Thesis - Research and graduation internal, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam]. <https://doi.org/10.5463/thesis.522>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:
vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Table of Contents

Abstract	XI
Table of cases	XV
1. Introduction – Judgments and decisions	XV
2. Chapter 2 – International law judgments and decisions	XVI
3. Chapter 3 – International law judgments and decisions	XVII
4. Chapter 4 – International law judgments and decisions	XIX
5. Case study – Spanish law judgments	XXI
6. Case study – German law judgments	XXI
List of abbreviations	XXIII
Introduction	1
1. Background	1
1.1 Internal restrictions on asylum-seekers in Europe	1
1.2 Internal restrictions resembling detention	4
2. Aim and objectives: the right to free movement of asylum-seekers	6
3. Contribution to existing legal doctrine	8
4. Scope of the research	9
4.1. Member States of the Council of Europe	9
4.2. The exclusion of EU law from the analysis	10
5. The Spanish and German case studies	13
6. Two theoretical pillars	14
6.1. Multi-sourced equivalent norms	15
6.2 Migration exceptionalism or the ‘two-tier system’	15
7. Methodology	18
7.1 Systematic analysis of travaux préparatoires	18
7.2 Systematic review of legal doctrine on the Refugee Convention	19
7.3 Systematic content analysis of judicial and quasi-judicial decisions	20
7.3.1 The ECtHR and the HRC	20
7.3.2 The focus on the ECtHR in Chapter 3	22

7.4 Classical legal doctrinal analysis in the case studies 24

8. Thesis structure 25

Chapter 1 – A historical exploration of the right to free movement within the country in international law 27

1.1 Introduction 27

1.2 The right in international law at the time of the League of Nations 28

1.3 State practice at the time of drafting of the UDHR 29

1.4 The American Declaration of Human Rights 31

1.5 The right to free movement in the travaux of the UDHR 32

1.5.1 Importance of the right 32

1.5.2 Purpose of the right 34

1.5.3 The position of migrants in the debates 35

1.6 The right to free movement in the travaux of the ICCPR 37

1.6.1 Importance of the right 37

1.6.2 Purpose of the right 39

1.6.3. The position of migrants in the debates 40

1.6.4 The parallel debates on ‘problems of assistance to refugees’ 41

1.7 The right to free movement in the travaux of Protocol 4 ECHR 43

1.7.1 Importance of the right 44

1.7.2 Purpose of the right 45

1.7.3 The position of migrants in the debates 46

1.8 The right to free movement in the travaux of the Refugee Convention 49

1.8.1 Importance of the right 50

1.8.2 Raison d’être of the restrictions 52

1.8.3. Restriction grounds 53

1.9 Conclusions 54

Chapter 2 – The personal scope of the right: are asylum-seekers entitled to freedom of movement? 59

2.1 Introduction 59

2.2 The personal scope of the right in the Refugee Convention 61

2.2.1 Who is ‘lawfully in’ or ‘regularised’ and thus falls under Article 26 RC?	62
2.2.2 Do ‘criminalisable asylum-seekers’ have a right to free movement? The relationship between Article 31(1) and 31(2) of the Refugee Convention	75
2.3 The personal scope of the right in the ICCPR	78
2.4 The personal scope of the right in Protocol 4 to the ECHR	81
2.5 The principle of ‘conditional lawfulness’	86
2.5.1 The source of the principle in the Refugee Convention	86
2.5.2 The source of the principle in the ICCPR and in Protocol 4 ECHR	88
2.5.3 Analysis of the principle	90
2.6 Case study: Spain	93
2.6.1 The reasons why the right was reserved for ‘Spaniards’ in the Constitution	94
2.6.2 The personal scope of the right in early domestic case law	95
2.6.3 The Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Aliens and the Law on the Right to Asylum	96
2.6.4 The expansion of the personal scope of the right by the Spanish Supreme Court	97
2.7 Case study: Germany	100
2.7.1 The reasons why the right was reserved for ‘Germans’ in Article 11 GG	100
2.7.2 The personal scope of the right under Article 11 GG in domestic case law	103
2.7.3 The personal scope of the right under Article 2(1) GG	104
2.7.4 No extension of the guarantees of Article 11 GG through other norms	106
2.8 Conclusions	107
2.8.1 Summary of findings	107
2.8.2 Concluding thoughts	109
Chapter 3 – The material scope of the right: when does a ‘restriction on movement’ become ‘detention’ of asylum-seekers?	113
3.1 Introduction	113
3.2 The definition of detention in ‘migration-related cases’ following Ilias and Ahmed and Z.A. and Others	116
3.2.1 The facts of Ilias and Z.A.	116
3.2.2 The principles applied in Ilias and Z.A. to establish the applicability of Article 5 in ‘migration cases’	118
3.2.3 Some reflections on the concept of ‘procedural protection’	123

3.2.4	Must the measure be necessary for the purpose?	124
3.2.5	On the meaning of a ‘direct threat to life or health’	125
3.3	The Ilias and Z.A. criteria compared to previous migration-related judgments	126
3.3.1	The applicant’s individual situation and choices	126
3.3.2	The applicable legal regime, its purpose and the relevant duration in the light of that purpose and the attendant procedural protection	127
3.3.3	The nature and degree of the actual restrictions	132
3.3.4.	A summary or an innovation?	135
3.4	The Courts’ criteria to determine the applicability of Article 5 in ‘domestic cases’	137
3.4.1	The applicant’s individual situation and choices	137
3.4.2	The applicable legal regime, its purpose and the relevant duration in the light of that purpose and the attendant procedural protection	139
3.4.3.	The nature and degree of the actual restrictions	144
3.4.4	The burden of proof	147
3.4.5	Other criteria not present in Ilias and Z.A.	148
3.4.6	Ranking of the relevance of criteria in domestic cases	152
3.5	The differences between the Ilias and Z.A. criteria and those applied in ‘domestic cases’	153
3.5.1.	The applicant’s individual situation and choices	154
3.5.2	The applicable legal regime, its purpose and the relevant duration in the light of that purpose and the attendant procedural protection	156
3.5.3	The nature and degree of the actual restrictions	159
3.5.4	The burden of proof	162
3.5.5	Other criteria not present in Ilias and Z.A.	163
3.5.6	Migration exceptionalism in the Article 5 applicability test	166
3.6	The development of the migration-related case law after Ilias and Z.A.	167
3.6.1	Trends confirming the migration exceptionalism of Ilias/Z.A.	167
3.6.2	Mixed trends	169
3.6.3	Trends that may help reverse the migration exceptionalism of Ilias/Z.A.	169
3.7	Conclusions	170
Chapter 4 – The safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers		175
4.1	Introduction	175

4.2 The safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers	177
4.2.1 The safeguards for unlawfully present asylum-seekers: Article 31(2) of the Refugee Convention	177
4.2.2 The safeguards for lawfully present asylum-seekers: Article 26 of the Refugee Convention	195
4.3 The safeguards of the right to free movement of individuals in general: the European Court of Human Rights	212
4.3.1 In accordance with law	212
4.3.2 The legitimate aims	214
4.3.3 The proportionality principle	216
4.3.4 Procedural safeguards	219
4.4 The safeguards of the right to free movement for individuals in general: the Human Rights Committee	220
4.4.1 Provided by law	222
4.4.2 The legitimate aims	223
4.4.3 The proportionality principle	224
4.4.4 No procedural safeguards	227
4.4.5 Indirect restrictions on movement	228
4.5 Comparison: The safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers vs. the safeguards for individuals in general	230
4.5.1 The Human Rights Committee's views vs. Refugee Convention doctrine	230
4.5.2 The strong protection of the European Court of Human Rights	232
4.5.3 Conclusion of the comparative analysis	233
4.6 Case study: Spain	234
4.6.1 The Constitutional safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers and of nationals	234
4.6.2 The legal safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers and for individuals in general	237
4.7 Case study: Germany	243
4.7.1 The Constitutional safeguards of the right to free movement of asylum-seekers and of nationals	243
4.7.2 Comparison at the legislative level: Residenzpflicht vs. Residence bans under the Länder-Police Acts	254
4.8 Conclusions	260
4.8.1 Safeguards for asylum-seekers under the Refugee Convention	261

4.8.2 Safeguards for asylum-seekers under the Spanish and German Constitution 263

Conclusions 265

1. First key objective: historical origins 266

2. Second key objective: personal scope 267

3. Third key objective: material scope 268

4. Fourth key objective: safeguards 269

Concluding thoughts 271

References 275

1. International and European Law and Policy – Doctrine 275

2. International and European Law and Policy – Institutional sources 283

3. Case study – Spain 285

4. Case study – Germany 286